

**GREAT LAKES PANEL ON AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES**  
**Ann Arbor, Michigan**  
**Tuesday, June 9, 1998, 1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.**  
**Wednesday, June 10, 1998, 8:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Day 1: Tuesday, June 9**

**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND AGENDA REVIEW**

The meeting was convened at 1:00 p.m. by the chair of the Great Lakes Panel, Gary Isbell, Ohio Department of Natural Resources. Isbell welcomed the meeting attendees and reviewed his background and professional responsibilities as the fisheries chief for the Division of Wildlife within the Ohio DNR. He noted that he had been involved in the aquatic nuisance species (ANS) issue for some time. He has concluded that it is very difficult to balance the emphasis needed at the national level with what needs to occur at the local level. Ohio is implementing an ANS state management plan, but it has become clear that there is only so much that can be done at the state and local levels and that the state needs to be involved in policy making at the national level. Through his involvement with the national ANS Task Force and other forums, he has learned that there is growing interest in and concern over the ANS issue. Some of his concerns include defining "success

There has been a great deal of action in the area of state management plans. Plans have been approved for Michigan, Ohio and New York. The St. Croix River interstate plan has been submitted to the Task Force and Washington State is expected to submit a plan in July. Many other plans are under development. The Task Force reviews and approves the plans after which the Fish and Wildlife Service is authorized to fund up to 75 percent of their implementation costs. Draft guidance for developing management plans is being circulated by the Task Force for review to supplement the model state management plan developed by the Great Lakes Commission. It begins to address some new issues that have come up in reviewing state ANS management plans. Panel members are invited to comment on the proposed guidance in preparation for the Task Force's review at its July meeting.

The ANS legislation calls for a ballast water management demonstration program and regional research grants. Funds have been appropriated for these efforts to NOAA and U.S. FWS. A RFP was published in the Federal Register on May 27 outlining what could be submitted for the funding. NOAA has \$500,000 to be spent on activities related to the Chesapeake Bay and U.S. FWS has \$150,000 that can be spend on any ANS work. Proposals must be submitted by July 8, with decisions to follow quickly thereafter.

The Administration has a new invasive alien species initiative that began last summer. An Executive Order will be issued to establish a framework for meaningful public involvement in program development. It establishes a national commission with provisions for regional involvement to help agencies be more proactive on the issue. A proposed Executive Order has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget.

An incident occurred in Washington State when an individual found a shell from a green crab and proceeded to publicize the finding before coordinating with state officials. This upset the state agencies, and the state ANS coordinator has prepared materials for the Western Regional Panel on a proposed process for announcing new ANS introductions. Peoples provided copies to the Panel support staff for distribution. Discussion followed on various issues related to reviewing and publicly announcing new ANS introductions. Jay Rendall, MN DNR, suggested that the Panel's Information/Education Committee review the issue and consider developing proposed guidelines.

## **REPORT ON ANS ISSUES AND INITIATIVES**

U.S. Legislative and Appropriations Update: Allegra Cangelosi was unable to attend the meeting, so Bob Peoples provided as much information on the topic as he had. He was not aware of any new ANS legislation or proposals at the federal level. Congress is currently considering the FY 1999 appropriations bills, which take effect October 1. The U.S. FWS has a one million dollar increase proposed in their budget for ANS work. There is some concern that this funding may be at risk. The process is just beginning, however. Matt Doss, Great Lakes Commission, reported that Rochelle Sturtevant, coordinator of the Senate Great Lakes Task Force, had informed him that the only appropriations bill marked up to date is the Senate's Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, which provides \$1.5 million to the Corps of Engineers for zebra mussel research, equal to the President's request. There is no funding in the bill for the dispersal barrier demonstration project and four million dollars for aquatic plant research, an increase from the President's request of \$2.6 million. Cangelosi has noted that the Coast Guard has released the draft guidelines for ballast water management for public review. These should have been provided to all Panel members, who are encouraged to comment on them. The comment period has been extended to August 8.

Donahue noted that the Great Lakes Commission has prepared a 26-point legislative and appropriations policy position, including support for the President's request of \$3.2 million for U.S. FWS to implement NISA; \$750,000 to USGS, Biological Resources Division to implement NISA; a minimum of \$55,000 as pass through from U.S. FWS to the Commission to support the Panel; \$450,000 to U.S. FWS for comprehensive ANS state management plans; \$500,000 to the Corps of Engineers for design and construction of the dispersal barrier; two million dollars to the Corps for public facility research and development for zebra mussel control; and \$2.5 million for the Coast Guard for the ballast water guidelines and prevention program. The Commission's statement was distributed to all members of the Great Lakes Congressional Delegation in April and a more targeted mailing will be conducted shortly to the appropriate Appropriations Committee members.

Ballast Technology Demonstration Project: Rick Harkins, Lake Carriers' Association, presented on the status of the project. Harkins reported that the ship is currently laid up due to a decline in grain prices and barge

shipping rates. It is not economical for the ships to operate if they can't take grain on the return leg of their trips. This highlights the significance of the NOBOB (no ballast on board) problem, which accounts for 80 percent of the ships entering the Great Lakes. Since the ship is not operating, they are considering removing the equipment and testing it on a barge in Duluth Harbor. They have had difficulty testing the equipment while docked in harbor due to the configuration of the piping. Using a barge as a test platform will allow them to run the filter continuously for five or six hours under more realistic conditions than have been available to date. They plan to submit a final budget for this work soon, which will include both filter testing and biological testing. They are also using funding from the State of Minnesota to conduct a study of potential use of ultraviolet, ultrasound and heat. That report is due in a week or so. This will help them consider alternatives for secondary treatment. They are also conducting a project to examine pathogens and virus sampling in ballast water.

Mark Coscarelli, Office of the Great Lakes, Michigan Dept. of Environmental Quality, reported on their study of gluteraldehyde as a ballast water treatment option. They contracted with the Cooperative Institute for Limnology and Ecosystems Research (CILER) to conduct a literature review on the feasibility of this option. They reported that it did appear to be a feasible option for NOBOBs that warranted further study. The Great Lakes Fishery Trust has since accepted a \$300,000 proposal over three years to study the option further. Russ Moll, Michigan Sea Grant, described the project further. He emphasized that the project's emphasis is research, not advocacy of this option. The project will have three phases: lab research; testing on board a vessel; and wrap up. The goal is to find a chemical—possibly gluteraldehyde—that will be effective against micro-organisms; that will break down quickly in the environment; and that can be use safely in a ship environment. The chemical is not effective against large organisms. Thus, it is viewed as an adjunct and potential second step to filtration. It is most promising for ships in a NOBOB condition, as a small amount of the chemical could be added to the ballast tanks.

CDR. Eric Reeves, U.S. Coast Guard, noted that the project is founded on sound science, but that there are serious political concerns related to the release of chemicals into the Great Lakes that must be addressed very carefully. Many people have an instinctual reaction against releasing any chemicals into the environment, and the ANS community must be explain the research, and the issue in general, very clearly. One worthy point is to note that the use of nonoxidizing biocides is a potential approach for keeping other chemicals, such organochlorides, out of the lake. They also are an option for dealing with NOBOBs, which represent a major gap in the current regulatory regime. The chemicals would be used in a very limited way to prevent additional, future ANS introductions that may require chemical control measures.

Kathe Glassner-Shwayder, Great Lakes Commission, noted that Great Lakes United had reprinted the recent *ANS UPDATE* article on the project. This is a positive sign that the environmental community may be taking an interest in the ANS issue and the potential use of chemical control measures. Jay Rendall, MN DNR, raised the issue of the effect of federal regulations on the use of gluteraldehyde to treat ballast water. If the chemical is not approved for this use, it could take years to go through the review process to receive clearance for such use.

Model Guidelines for ANS Prevention and Control: Rendall noted that the Panel's I/E Committee continued to work on new model guidelines for various activities. Rendall is the Panel's representative on the national ANS Task Force's Recreational Activities Committee. He has provided the committee with the guidelines produced by the Panel, and they are interested in using them as a starting point for national guidelines. They are developing a standard format for each activity listing the activity, source/author, introduction, guidelines and additional information. Rough drafts have been produced for researchers, agency field operations, and commercial barges. Doug Jensen is working on guidelines for the aquaculture industry and Pat Charlebois is working on guidelines for the aquarium industry. Glassner-Shwayder recommended that the Panel members consider how the model guidelines can best fit with the model legislation.

Ballast Water Management Guidelines: Reeves noted that the Coast Guard is in the process of writing regulations to implement NISA's ballast water management provisions. This will include development of a performance standard applicable for both fresh and salt water. He also wants to develop a benchmark standard for judging various control options. Good science is critical to this process. He emphasized the importance of broad input in solving the problem. Government will not, by itself, provide an answer.

Chicago Waterways Dispersal Barrier Project: Sandra Keppner, U.S. FWS, provided a brief update on project activities since the Panel's previous meeting. The project's advisory panel met in February and established an executive committee co-chaired by the Corps of Engineers and U.S. FWS. The location of the barrier was

a major topic of discussion. River mile 302.4 is now the likely location, given the need for shoreline space for equipment. The Corps is working on the barrier design in conjunction with Smith-Root, the contractor. They are also consulting with barge captains to determine if the barrier will need to be recessed into the bottom and walls of the channel. June 1999 is the target date for the barrier becoming operational. The next round goby roundup is scheduled for next week. Other activities include continuing research on the goby's response to an electrical field; a field trial, using a small scale electrical barrier, on the Shiawassee River in Michigan; and toxicity tests of various piscicides. The Corps is exploring other technologies for use in a dispersal barrier.

## **REVIEW OF FY 1999 FUNDING FOR PANEL OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES**

Donahue reviewed funding available for Panel operations and activities in FY 1999. Since 1993 the Panel has been level funded by U.S. FWS at about \$40,000, augmented with about \$12,000 in funding from NOAA via Indiana's Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act funding. This funding supports baseline Panel operations. In addition, funding has been available for special projects, such as the model state management plan, model state legislation and the ANS Action Plan. With other regional panels now in place, current plans at U.S. FWS call for a reduction to about \$30,000 in FY 1999 funding for the Great Lakes Panel. The Commission has identified a continuing need for approximately \$50,000-\$55,000 for baseline Panel support and is working with Sally Yozell at NOAA to explore the possibility of receiving additional funding from that agency. The Commission will also continue to seek funding for special projects.

## **COMMITTEE BREAKOUT SESSIONS: FY 1999 COMMITTEE WORK PLAN ACTIVITIES**

The Panel's three implementation committees, Information/Education, Research Coordination and Policy and Legislation, met separately to consider their respective FY 1999 work plans. Summaries of these sessions were provided to the full Panel on day two of the meeting.

### **Day 2: Wednesday, June 10**

#### **AGENDA REVIEW**

Ron Martin, Panel vice chair, WI DNR, opened the meeting and invited attendees not present the first day to introduce themselves. Martin noted that, due to their impending retirement, it was the last meeting for Eric Reeves and Rhae Giacomia as representatives from the Coast Guard. Martin thanked them for their many years of valuable service on the Panel.

## **REPORT ON FY 1999 COMMITTEE WORK PLANS**

### *Policy and Legislation Committee*

Martin reported on the outcome of the Policy and Legislation Committee work plan on behalf of the committee chair Mike Donahue, who was unable to attend the second day of the meeting. Most of the discussions centered on the model legislation and ANS Action Plan projects. Martin reported that Donahue reviewed the purpose, methodology and timeline for the model legislation project. A final draft of the legislation will be circulated to the Panel members for final review with a three-week turn-around time. Review from the states is particularly important. It will also be circulated on a national level, via the Task Force, for review. Bob Peoples distributed copies of his comments on the model legislation. He believed that a separate section is needed on research and monitoring, similar to the section on the designation of infested waters. It would also be better to simplify the legislation by limiting the list of designated species to an approved and prohibited list. The current draft focuses on intentional introductions and he felt greater balance was needed in the area of unintentional introductions. Most of his comments were addressed in the second draft of the model legislation. Some state representatives expressed concern about the recommended creation of new advisory boards, noting that this was contrary to current trends.

Martin reviewed the ANS Action Plan project. He noted that it is currently in its research phase, with a draft of the plan to be reviewed at the next Panel meeting. A drafting committee composed of Panel members and other individuals will provide input during the plan's development. The committee members felt the Action

Plan concept was well thought out and comprehensive. Comments received will be incorporated during the drafting process.

Martin reviewed the overall work plan for the Policy and Legislation Committee. The committee members accepted the work plan as presented. There was some discussion of the ANS documentary that will be developed in the next fiscal year.

#### *Information/Education Committee*

Sandra Keppner, U.S. FWS, reported on the Information/Education (I/E) committee discussions. The committee discussed a number of items, several of which they would like to present for the Panel's approval. The Panel is producing a number of products, but promotion and dissemination remain a major need. The cost of some of the products is an impediment to their effective distribution. The committee wants to update and reprint the *Biological Invasions* brochure and distribute it at an affordable cost. The committee recommends that the brochure be reprinted, with Panel members invited to request bulk quantities, after which the Commission will mail the brochures and a bill to those who ordered them. Staff encouraged the Panel members to consider how many brochures they could use over the next three years and any editorial changes they feel should be made to the brochure. Within the next two weeks staff will survey Panel members on these questions. The Panel members agreed to this process.

The committee discussed the I/E inventory and considered input received from polling users within their agencies on the usefulness of the inventory. The feedback received was very positive. A one-page advertisement sheet for the document was recommended together with a target audience list. The availability of the inventory online needs to be publicized. Doss noted that he has been able to copy sections of the inventory into email messages to respond to requests for information on specific issues. This has been very convenient. The Panel supported pursuing this process.

The committee believed that it should have more input into the publication of the *ANS UPDATE*. It is recommending a review process through which the committee can review the topic and initial draft of the feature article for each issue. Potential article topics include the Ontario angler boater survey; live food fish industry; high-risk plant species; recreational activities guidelines; ballast water regulations and rulemaking; Eurasian watermilfoil control; vectors of introductions; model ANS state legislation; and low-profile species.

The committee wants to update the I/E strategy and incorporate information on new vectors of introduction, among other changes. A new status and feature activities section will be added for each goal. Staff will contact Panel members to determine the status of the ANS activities they are involved in. The committee will then meet via conference call to discuss updates to the strategy, after which a revised draft strategy will be disseminated to the full Panel. This is expected to occur in the late fall, early winter timeframe.

The committee recommended a number of changes to the I/E committee work plan. The reprinting process for the *Biological Invasions* brochure will be added as activities under Task 3. The advertising sheet and dissemination process for the I/E inventory will be added to Task 4. New tasks include continuing to review and support development of recreational activities guidelines; and to promote ANS control options using existing mechanisms.

#### *Research Coordination Committee*

Matt Doss reported that the new chair for the Research Coordination Committee is Lt. Commander Pat Gerrity, U.S. Coast Guard, replacing Eric Reeves. The committee's work plan has four tasks: general committee support; enhancing interregional communication and coordination; updating and maintaining the ANS research inventory; and convening a workshop on ballast water research.

Committee support is provided by the Commission and includes conducting mailings to the committee, convening conference calls and handling other tasks to support the committee's work. Interregional communication and coordination includes two activities. To promote the research inventory and recommendations, the Commission has done email announcements, press releases, and placed notices in the registration packets at the zebra mussel conference. The inventory will soon be available online and staff will promote its availability in this new format. The second activity is participating in the annual zebra mussel conference and other forums. Commission staff has had presentations at the conference in recent years and will continue to showcase the Panel's activities through this and other forums. Staff is also available to help

Panel members prepare presentations. In regard to the research inventory, the Commission continues to coordinate with the International Joint Commission's larger Great Lakes research inventory to incorporate a separate form, both online and hard copy, for submitting ANS-related projects. This has been a very cost-effective process for updating the research inventory. The committee did not feel it was worthwhile publishing an updated, hard copy of the research inventory.

The fourth task is new and emerged from the yesterday's committee meeting. This involves convening a workshop to review the status of knowledge on ballast water research and to develop a focused, three-to-five-year research agenda for ballast water research related to the Great Lakes. This will provide guidance to funders regarding the areas of research that offer the greatest promise for producing feasible answers to the question of preventing ANS introductions via ballast water. The workshop is envisioned as involving a small group of key researchers and managers in the area of ballast water. Staff will work with the members of research committee in developing the agenda and additional details for the workshop.

**There was no further discussion of the Panel's FY 1999 work plan and a motion was made and seconded to adopt it with the additional tasks discussed previously. The motion was approved by a voice vote and the work plan was adopted.**

#### **SPECIAL SESSION: PROMOTING ANS PREVENTION AND CONTROL THROUGH MODEL STATE ANS LEGISLATION**

- Panel members agreed that it would be helpful to include, on a state by state basis, a listing of prohibited nonindigenous aquatic nuisance species. It was recommended that these state listings be presented in a matrix to be included as an appendix for the model guidance.
- Questions were posed on how to handle state regulation as it applies to private waters and wetlands. Is it feasible to assume that the states can hold the authority to regulate such waters (e.g., aquaculture stocking operations in ponds and control of aquatic nuisance plants, such as purple loosestrife, in wetlands)? How can the states be prepared to prevent the potential spread of aquatic nuisance species from private waters? What is an appropriate definition of private waters?
-

Reports from Panel members were provided over lunch following adjournment of the meeting. These reports were not recorded. Updates on ANS activities from the Panel's state representatives are provided in each issue of the *ANS UPDATE*; other Panel members may be contacted individually regarding their ANS work.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Tom Crane, Great Lakes Commission, noted that attendance at the meeting was lower than normal and asked the Panel members if they wished to consider a different schedule for the meetings from the current one, which generally involves meetings in December and June. The consensus was that the current schedule was convenient for most members. It was also suggested that meetings be held in a member state or in conjunction with major events, such as the annual zebra mussel conference and the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference. Panel members with suggestions for meeting dates and locations should contact the Commission staff, who will seek to accommodate such requests whenever possible.

#### **ADJOURN**

To conserve time, Martin suggested that the final remaining agenda item, Reports from Panel Members, be provided over lunch. The members accepted this proposal and the meeting was adjourned.

**GREAT LAKES PANEL ON AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES  
Ann Arbor, MI  
June 9-10, 1998**

Tom Busiahn	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	715/682-6185
Mike Conlin	Illinois Department of Natural Resources	217/782-6424
Mark Coscarelli	Michigan Department of Environmental Quality	517/373-3588
Tom Crane	Great Lakes Commission	313/665-9135
Mike Donahue	Great Lakes Commission	313/665-9135
Matt Doss	Great Lakes Commission	313/665-9135
Rhae Giacoma	U.S. Coast Guard	216/962-6050
Richard Harkins	Lake Carriers' Association	216/861-0591
Kathe Glassner-Shwayder	Great Lakes Commission	313/665-9135
Gary Isbell	Ohio Department of Natural Resources	614/265-6345
Randy Lang	Indiana Department of Natural Resources	317/232-4094
Ron Martin	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	608/266-9270
Bob Peoples	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	703/358-1718
Eric Reeves	U.S. Coast Guard	216/902-6049
Jay Rendall	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	612/297-1464
Randy Sanders	Ohio Department of Natural Resources	614/765-6344
Dan Thomas	Great Lakes Sport Fishing Council	630/941-1351
Al Dextrase	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	705/755-1950
Marc Tuchman	U.S. EPA-GLNPO	312/353-1369
Sandra Keppner	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Northeast Region	716/691-5456
Don Schloesser	USGS, Great Lakes Science Center	313/994-3331
Hank Vanderploeg	NOAA-Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory	734/741-2284
Pat Gerrity	U.S. Coast Guard	216/902-6049