

# **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Great Lakes Advisory Board (GLAB)**

**March 30<sup>th</sup> – 31<sup>st</sup>, 2021 Virtual Public Meeting**

## **Minutes of the Meeting**

**(Version 6 10 2021)**

Respectfully Submitted: Edlynzia Barnes, GLAB Designated Federal Officer

Certified as Accurate:

Note and Disclaimer: The minutes that follow reflect a summary of remarks and conversation during the meeting. Such ideas, suggestions and deliberations do not necessarily reflect consensus advice from the Board. Formal advice and recommendations may be found in the final advisory reports or letters prepared and transmitted to the agency following the public meetings.

**Meeting Objectives:**

The purpose of this meeting is for the GLAB workgroups to report out to the full committee on their progress in addressing EPA's charge questions. The designated lead of each workgroup will present a plan for how they intend to address their assigned charge questions. GLAB members will deliberate strategies and other considerations necessary to draft a preliminary report by July 2021.

**Attendees:**

For full roster, see Attachment A.

**Welcome Remarks from EPA:**

Edlynzia Barnes, the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the GLAB convened the meeting.

Welcoming remarks were provided by Cheryl Newton, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Acting Region 5 Regional Administrator/Great Lakes National Program Manager. In her remarks, Ms. Newton emphasized the importance of the Great Lakes to the region and the nation, highlighting the acceleration of Great Lakes cleanup and protection thanks to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) and strong collaboration with partners, including the GLAB. Ms. Newton thanked the GLAB for serving as federal advisory committee members and turned the meeting over to the GLAB Co-Chairs.

**Introductory Remarks and Agenda Review:**

GLAB Co-Chairs Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells and Steve Galarneau welcomed GLAB members and additional attendees to the meeting. Co-Chair Dreyfuss-Wells provided an overview of the GLAB charter (renewed in December 2020), presented the current committee membership, and outlined the GLAB's mission.

Co-Chair Dreyfuss-Wells reminded the GLAB of the existing timeline to deliver a report with advice and recommendations to EPA later in the calendar year and introduced the topics to be covered during the meeting.

**Overview on Workgroup Presentations and Discussion:**

The GLAB members have assembled into three ad-hoc workgroups to address EPA's six charge questions. The three workgroups are categorized under the following themes: Nutrients, GLRI, and Invasive Species.

The Nutrients Workgroup focuses on charge questions 1 and 2 (*Innovative Strategies to Address Legacy Phosphorus and Managing Excess Nutrients*); the GLRI Workgroup focuses on charge questions 3, 5, and 6 (*GLRI Outreach, Outcome Based Investments in the Great Lakes Basin, and GLRI's Role in the Vitality and Reinvestment of Great Lakes Communities*); and the Invasive Species Workgroup focuses on charge question 4 (*Advice and Recommendations on Invasive Species*). (see [here](#) for charge questions).

### **Nutrients Workgroup Presentation:**

Dr. Scudder Mackey presented on behalf of the Nutrients Workgroup. Dr. Mackey provided an overview on the workgroups two charge questions and presented an approach that the workgroup is taking to review, analyze and respond to EPA's charge questions. Dr. Mackey reported actions/rationale that are underway by workgroup members. Dr. Mackey noted that the Nutrients Workgroup will take a technical science and data-driven approach by reviewing recent/ongoing work, publications, and monitoring reports; and having discussions with external entities and EPA Focus Area 3 subject matter experts where appropriate. Dr. Mackey also noted that the workgroups will take a process/management related approach by reviewing funding allocations, project identification process, project selection criteria, and performance metrics. In closing, Dr. Mackey indicated that the workgroup will perform a problem identification/gap analyses (what's working and what is not working), identify innovative/different approaches, and review prior GLAB recommendations.

### **Questions & Discussion:**

Co-Chair Galarneau asked for Dr. Mackey to expand on the idea of new projects and product developments.

Dr. Mackey suggested ways to bring together innovative technologies by encouraging project teams to develop solutions to ongoing issues rather than passively waiting on projects to be developed.

Dr. Larry Antosch provided an example of successful initiatives in the past where federal agencies solicited pilot projects that were specific to a theme, building onto Dr. Mackey's suggestion on new and innovative projects to address legacy phosphorus and nutrients in Lake Erie.

### **Invasive Species Workgroup Presentation:**

Lisa Frede presented on behalf of the Invasive Species Workgroup. Ms. Frede reviewed the workgroup's charge question and highlighted the importance of invasive species control and prevention in the Great Lakes basin. Due to the significance of invasive species and its wide-ranging challenges, the workgroup decided how they will define invasive species by adopting

USDA's definition of "Aquatic Invasive Species." Ms. Frede summarized the workgroup's outline, which will address pathways/vectors, regulatory issues, challenges, and recommendations. Examples of early pathways and vectors that the workgroup has reviewed include vessel discharges (salties, lakers, and barges), canals and waterways, recreational activities, aquaculture, organisms in trade, and others. Early recommendations from the workgroup will include early warning systems, monetary allocations, innovative approaches, regulatory alignment, and others.

### **Questions & Discussion:**

Co-Chair Dreyfuss-Wells invited opinions from all GLAB members on the pathway and vector approach that the workgroup is taking.

Dr. John Hull supports the pathway and vector approach to address environmental risks in upland areas.

Dr. Mackey supports the pathway and vector approach, but noted pathways and vectors mostly review establishments of invasive species in new locations but does not address existing establishments of invasive species. Dr. Mackey also raised the idea of potential benefits of invasive species if the possibility of eradication is unfeasible.

Dr. Antosch asked if the workgroup considered live importation of non-native species and brought to attention the Lacey Act for existing legislation.

Co-Chair Galarneau questioned how invasive species can be managed to maintain the native vegetation in a sustainable way overtime.

In response to Co-Chair Galarneau's question, Dr. Alan Steinman referenced a [report](#) from the Science and Information Subcommittee (SIS) of the previous GLAB that incorporates duration and longevity into GLRI projects.

Dr. Hull suggested the workgroup consider the concept of living with invasive species and prioritizing how to control/minimize its negative impacts.

Dr. Antosch noted a potential "positive" pathway living with invasive species by expanding protein sources and aquaculture industrial expansions.

Dr. Mackey asked if rapid response groups exist and emphasized funding in order to sustain such activities.

Ms. Frede thanked GLAB members for their input and noted that input provided will be taken into consideration as the workgroup drafts their advice and recommendations to EPA.

GLAB Co-Chairs and the DFO concluded Day 1 of the meeting.

## **Day 2 GLAB Public Meeting**

GLAB Co-Chairs Dreyfuss-Wells and Galarneau welcomed GLAB members and attendees back to the meeting and recapped the presentations and key messages from day one.

The Co-Chairs reminded GLAB members and attendees that recommendations on EPA's charge questions will range from tangible/immediately actionable items, to actions that will take additional coordination beyond the GLAB, and lastly will provide thoughts and guidance that are directional and set longer term agendas and actions for the Agency.

GLAB Co-Chairs concluded their opening remarks by presenting the GLAB 2020-2021 timeline of work that leads the committee to a final report to EPA by the end of the 2021 calendar year.

### **GLRI Workgroup Presentation:**

GLAB Co-Chair Galarneau presented on behalf of the GLRI Workgroup and highlighted the three charge questions to be address.

Covering charge question 3, Co-Chair Galarneau stated that the workgroup will largely focus on communication considering how EPA reports on the goals, challenges, and accomplishments of the GLRI. The workgroup will determine if there are stakeholders' groups that are not being reached, ways to improve communication overall, and ways to improve outreach.

For charge question 5, Co-Chair Galarneau stated that the workgroup will consider annual ecological outcomes (baseline data, metrics and monitoring data, and return on investments), and community-based outcomes and how to measure both coherently. The workgroup will also consider the accomplishments achieved in restoring Areas of Concern (AOCs), restoring and protecting habitats, controlling and preventing invasive species, and reducing nutrients. The workgroup will also rely on the recommendations from other workgroups that are currently discussing/reviewing these topics in order to review and respond to the charge question holistically.

Lastly, Co-Chair Galarneau emphasized that the workgroup will explore the feasibility on how to leverage the GLRI through multiple federal agencies and programs in order to maximize environmental and economic benefits to communities forcing the GLRI to be reviewed through an environmental socio-economic lens.

### **Questions & Discussion:**

Sylvia Orduño observed the importance of environmental justice (EJ) nationally and opportunities to incorporate EJ within the work of EPA's charge questions. Ms. Orduño suggested that the workgroup look at the EJ screening tools to review the layers of data that captures the disproportionate impact in communities with long standing environmental issues. Ms. Orduño also pointed to the Executive Order 12898 directing Agencies to make EJ part of their mission and noted the new work occurring through the White House Environmental Justice Advisory Council, encouraging the GLAB to incorporate such policies when considering

recommendations on the charge questions back to EPA. Lastly Ms. Orduño mentioned incorporating climate change data into the GLAB's recommendations and pointed to Healing Our Water's EJ suggestions for the GLRI.

Dr. Hull suggested changing the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative to the Great Lakes Restoration Program. Dr. Hull also acknowledged the celebration of delisting an Area of Concern but stressed not to lose sight of the communities that continue to exist after the delisting.

Ms. Orduño supports the GLRI moving beyond an initiative but highlighted an abundance of work that still needs to occur before considering a transition out of the GLRI.

Dr. Val Klump questioned the meaning of restoration and return of investment, taking into account ecological services and economic evaluation of the environment to human activity. Dr. Hull also emphasized the significance of restoration but noted the need for long term sustained efforts in the Great Lakes.

Chairman James Williams expressed the need of discussing the inherent value of the Great Lakes and not looking from just an economic commodity perspective.

Kay Nelson pointed out the need to improve the dialogue on the preexisting activities that are occurring individually in the Great Lakes in order to become a part of a broad picture that reviews what's currently underway and how to maximize the GLRI.

Jeff Stollenwerk spoke to the need of more emphasis of economic impacts for GLRI funding and investments. Mr. Stollenwerk noted the constraints of GLRI funding and the time constrained work schedule for specific projects. Mr. Stollenwerk also mentioned that not enough attention is given to shipping slips and their economic values in supporting regional industry and industrial jobs that are important to the economy.

Co-Chair Dreyfuss-Wells asked if the workgroup is categorizing the three charge questions into better ways to communicate, better ways to measure return of interest, and better ways to leverage. Co-Chair Dreyfuss-Wells also noted Ms. Orduño's comment to incorporate EJ into the GLAB's work product, recognizing that not all members are experienced or fully understand EJ concepts.

Dr. Mackey suggested building capacity at the state and local levels to maintain a sustainable system where many issues originate and for the capacity to be supported by the GLRI.

**Public Comments:**

See Attachment C.

**Next Steps and Action Items:**

Co-Chair Dreyfuss-Wells wrapped up the meeting with next steps for the GLAB. The DFO will schedule the next public meeting around the June/July timeframe and will coordinate with each workgroup to schedule individual workgroup meetings.

The GLAB is targeting for draft recommendations to be prepared and presented at the next public meeting.

**Meeting Adjourn:**

The meeting was adjourned by the DFO.

## Attachment A – List of Attendees

### GLAB Members:

**Co-Chair: Stephen Galarneau**, Director of the Office of Great Waters – Great Lakes & Mississippi River, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

**Co-Chair: Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells**, Chief Executive Officer, Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District

**Scudder Mackey**, Chief of the Office of Coastal Management, Ohio Department of Natural Resources

**James Williams Jr.**, Tribal Chairman, Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians

**Jeff Stollenwerk**, Director of Government and Environmental Affairs, Duluth Seaway Port Authority

**John Hull**, Founder and Chairman, Hull & Associates Inc.

**Lisa Frede**, Director of Regulatory Affairs, Chemical Industry Council of Illinois

**Larry Antosch**, Senior Director, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation

**Kay Nelson**, Director of Environmental Affairs, Northwest Indiana Forum

**J. Val Klump**, Dean and Professor of the School of Freshwater Sciences, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

**Alan Steinman**, Director of Annis Water Resources Institute, Grand Valley State University

**Brian Miller**, Retired, Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant and Illinois Water Resources Center

**Sylvia Orduño**, Organizer, Michigan Welfare Rights Organization

### Designated Federal Official (DFO):

Edlynzia (Lynzi) Barnes – EPA, Great Lakes National Program Office

### Additional Attendees:

Andrew Slade

Ann McCammon-Soltis

Brian Chalfant

Carl Platz  
Cheryl Newton  
Chris Korleski  
Danielle Chesky  
Davis Benjamin  
Eileen Deamer  
Erika Jensen  
Hannah Arbuckle  
Hannah Northey  
Harold Peterson  
Jen Vanator  
Jennifer Day  
Jill Reinhart  
John Stone  
Kathryn Sullivan  
Kristina Heinemann  
Lara Beaven  
Laura Rubin  
Lauren Sandhu  
Lauren White  
Matthew Child  
Rebecca Knocke  
Robert Sullivan  
Scott Sigman  
Stephanie Swart  
Todd Main

Attachment B – Record of Public Comments during Meeting

Record of Public Comments – March 30 <sup>th</sup> 2021 GLAB Meeting		
Commenter	Comment	Response (If Applicable)
Erika Jensen	<p>To follow-up on Scudder's comment: a pathway/vector approach is valuable for prevention and early detection, but gets more challenging as you move through the invasion curve to response, management and control - those tools and approaches may need to be more taxa or species specific.</p> <p>The Great Lakes Panel on ANS is working to develop a priority list of species established in the Great Lakes basin that should be looked at for management/control.</p>	
Erika Jensen	There is an interjurisdictional surveillance and response group that has established a regional surveillance and response framework. In addition, the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Governors and Premiers (GSGP) have a mutual aid agreement in place to facilitate response	
Scott Sigman	A top down/bottom up methodology that as an analogue has generated positive interest as applied in the MARAD Federal Advisory Committee for freight performance management, is a regional periodic dashboard on a set of ~7 metrics in a simple green yellow red spectrum for each, regionally cataloging conditions and engaging the wide range of public, private, academic engagement, include not-for-profit stakeholders, building separate local groups up to a continental approach, and drill back down to local basin circumstances. This can correspond to rapid response, and generate communications within the Great Lakes Basin and external to a range of stakeholders,	
Scott Sigman	Is there a conduit to initiate non-fungible tokens (NFT) for the benefits from a particular nutrient load reduction. Alternatively, is there a form of TIF structure that considers a baseline level, and provides a tax credit for proven reductions, in some respects, or increases in other respects to incent or disincentive behaviors or outcomes for the private sector stakeholders.	Scudder Mackey: Scott, what you describe is one of the market-based approaches that could be considered. I don't know if that structure exists or if it has been applied in the Great Lakes region. Larry Antosch and/or other GLAB team members may have additional information/experience with these market types of market mechanisms. Always up for a follow-on discussion to share ideas.
David Benjamin	Great Lakes issues are very complex And could be organized based on watershed, airshed and concentrations of city and industrial flow sources from Michigan. Could that be helpful?	

Laura Rubin	Yes, there is a lag time, but there are also interim metrics and measures of success. We need to show progress toward goals (environmental, economic, and social benefits) to continue to receive funding AND communicate long-term results	
Scott Sigman	Recommendations to EPA, or stakeholders in general, are offered in the context of either A.) funding-financing, B.) legislative, C.) operational-enforcement, or D.) aspirational - policy. The value of the recommendations could be categorized as on a matrix of easy hard to implement and extent of impact/results/consequences and could be shown in a bubble map one relative to the others.	
Laura Rubin	Thanks for this rich discussion. In addition to community engagement, another issue is local workforce development. Is there a way to place greater priority on developing local water workforce and skills through GLRI programs? This would be another way that communities can benefit.	