

**International Lake Ontario - St. Lawrence River Study Board
Meeting on 12 - 13 March, 2003
Ottawa**

SUMMARY OF MEETING

Board members in attendance were: Eugene Stakhiv; Doug Cuthbert; Frank Sciremammano; Andre Carpentier; Frank Quinn; Marcel Lussier; Dan Barletta; Jim Snyder; Lynn Cleary; Ian Crawford; Tony Eberhardt and Ed Eryuzlu. Others in attendance for all or part of the meetings were: Joe Atkinson; Elaine Kennedy; Max Streibel; Bill Werick; Wendy Leger; Roger Gauthier; Ian Gillespie; Brad Parker; Ralph Moulton;; Serge St-Martin; Roger Haberly; John Ching; Tom McAuley; Russ Trowbridge; Michelle Tracy; Stephane Dumont; Roger Haberly; Denis Peloquin; Tom Croley; Syed Moin; David Fay; Chris Stewart; Henry Stewart; Al Schiavone and Anjuna Langevin.

1. Agenda: approved (See attached)

2. Actions from last Board meeting:

- a. The draft proposal for awards and recognition was submitted to the IJC. The IJC supports and encourages the Board non-monetary rewarding of Study team members; the Commission considers this to be within the jurisdiction on the Board to act upon. The Commission does not have a decision about monetary rewards. However the Commission will consider non-monetary awards for Study Board and PIAG members.
- b. The IJC has asked that the Study final report be made available by Oct 1, 2005 to allow the Commission about 6 months for consultations they may deem appropriate.
- c. The IJC requests briefings with the Commissioners in year-4 and year-5 (sometime about the June timeframe). The Gantt chart now shows two such briefings and two others as optional/possible.

(At 9:30 on March 12, a video-conference was arranged with IJC Legal and technical advisors: The Commission staff were Jim Chandler, Michael Vechsler, Lisa Bourget, Frank Bevacqua, Russ Trowbridge and Tom McAuley).

The IJC has advised that on the issue of interpreting the Treaty the Board should:

- d. Focus on benefits and impacts on interests and let the Commissioners interpret the "priorities and order of preferences" in the Treaty;

- e. Lay out impacts of various options;
- f. Not attempt to interpret the Treaty; that is the prerogative of the Commissioners;
- g. Not argue about the Treaty priorities;

As an action item, in the April Board presentation to the Commission the Board co-chairs will address the above issue and advice to get Commissioner's concurrence.

3. **Issues from the PFEG March 10-11 workshop**

The Board reviewed all 16 discussion items from the Test Evaluation Workshop held on March 11, 2003 in Ottawa at their Study Board Meeting on March 12-13th. The following are the main decision points from the Board's discussion:

The Board discussed items #3, #4, #6 and #7 together.

#3 - Defining new regulation criteria

#4 - Evaluating environmental impacts

#6 - Model integration of science/engineering and plan formulation

#7 - Plan Formulation/Evaluation

The following decisions were made.

- #3: The Board decided the following actions will take place.
 - a. The PFEG will work with the TWGs to compile a list of all of their Performance Indicators with metrics.
 - b. The PFEG will send a list of the 1956 Orders of Approval criteria to the Board and the TWGs.
 - c. Starting with the 1956 Criteria, the PFEG will examine all existing IS curves and other preference indicators to build a new set of hydrologically based criteria.
 - d. The revised criteria will be sent to the TWGs for comment in April.
 - e. PFEG will send the list of PIs and the new criteria to the Board two weeks prior to the May Board Meeting (by May 14th)

- #4: the Board agreed to treat the Environment similar to other interests.

- #6: the recommendation was to change the basic thinking of the process to allow numerous impact evaluation models to be run outside the SVM. The Board agreed to stay with the current thinking, which is to incorporate, as best as possible, the mathematical definitions of the larger models into the SVM. It was agreed that these definitions would be tested against runs of the more detailed models to ensure the results were correct.

- #7: the Board agreed that PFEG should continue to meet and work with the TWGs and hold workshops as they see fit. No specific guidelines for these workshops were imposed. Otherwise, it was felt that the items under #3 would address this topic.

#1 Integration With LaMPs/IJC/SOLEC/RAPs - Overlapping Interests

- The Board agreed that linkages with these groups are important to maintain. Names of these organizations and their lead contact people should be forwarded to the General Managers. Study personnel who have linkages with these and other similar groups and who can keep them informed of Board activities and results are asked to self-identify to the General Managers and take on this coordination role.

#2 Spatial Resolution

- The Board requested the TWGs to work out the issue of spatial scale recognizing that decisions must be made at a more general level.

#5 Monitoring success of adaptive management

The Board agreed to the following schedule:

- Sept 2003 - PFEG hold another test run of the SVM and decision process with the new test criteria as part of a regular Board meeting.
- March 2004 - PFEG hold the draft evaluation workshop as a dress rehearsal of the decision process
- March 2004 - At this workshop, the PIAG presents a public communication plan for presentation of these alternatives and feedback to the study process from the public.
- June 2004 - The PIAG test its communication strategy and reports back to the Board
- June 2004 - The Board meet with the IJC Commissioners to engage them in the decision process.

(#8 was discussed with #11)

#8: How to weight dollar information or indicators

#11: How to better support the decision-process

- The Study Board agreed to allow PFEG to adopt these suggestions discussed under this item, as they see fit.

#9: Improved data access for effective decision-making

- The Leads of the IM group agreed to work with members of the Study Board (Lynn Cleary and Andre Carpentier) and IJC staff to help ensure access to necessary data layers for use in the study.

#10: How to actively engage the Study Board and PIAG in the decision process

- The Board requested the General Managers to continue providing material to all participants about 2 weeks prior to meetings.
- This will continue to be done electronically;
- The GMs will also try using the ftp site to see how that methods works.
- Revised critical path (Gantt Chart) and updated budgets will be provided.

#12 - Integrating, explaining and displaying criteria in a simplified manner

- The Board agreed the SVM could be presented to the public through the PIAG, but that this should not happen for about a year when a draft SVM will be available.

#13 - Goals and guiding principles of the study

- Frank Sciremammano agreed to develop a set of draft guiding principles based on the January 23rd vision statements to present to the Board for their consideration.

#14: Can and should TWGs evaluate/explain the selected plan to the Study Board, IJC or the public

- The Board agreed with the layered approach to the SVM and supported the link with the IM strategy. This task was left to PFEG and the IM group.
- Regarding the issue of Adaptive Management, the Board agreed that a revised plan should be considered in terms of potential changes to the hydrologic regime (e.g. climate change) and potential changes in the social/economic paradigm.
- Board agreed to have the TWGs provide economic and social trend information without doing formal forecasting.

- Board asked that this approach be put before the Economics Advisory Committee.

#15: Economic calculations for Coastal TWG performance indicators

- The Board decided that this item could best be handled within the Coastal TWG. No further decisions were made.

#16: Proposal to improve the process by the Commercial Navigation TWG

- The Board requested PFEG to take this proposal into consideration and consider the 42 metrics proposed by the TWG.
- The TWG should indicate which of the metrics are critical to the interest.

4. Update of y-2 spending:

- Canadian Section: It is expected that from the total amount of \$4 M available, about \$800K will not be used. The IJC US and Canadian Sections have signed an MOU to allow up to that amount be transferred to the US Section in support of the Coastal TWG work contracted by the US. The Coastal TWG Leads, General Managers and IJC staff will determine the final amounts to be transferred.
- a. The US Section: To date, \$985K has been distributed for the year-3 funding of activities for all groups except the Coastal and Environmental TWGs.

5. Board Policy Statement for the Release of Information:

The draft Statement developed by the GMs will be revised to show that "all information" will be provided via the Study web site and that a statement will be included to address the provision of information in bilingual format. The GMs will provide the revised document at the next meeting in Rochester.

6. TWG Membership

- The membership list was approved. It will be presented to the IJC and posted on the Study web site.
- The IM group does not have a Board Liaison and requested some one be identified.
- RecBoating asked for active participation in their group of PIAG Liaisons.

7. TWG y-3 Work Plans and Budget

The table below shows the y-3 budget approved by the Board.

	U.S. (\$1000 US)		Canadian (\$1000 Cdn)	
	POS	Budgeted at 3/12/03 Mtg.	POS	Budgeted at 3/12/03 Mtg.
Common Data	0	20	0	0
Environmental	575	697	1055	1300
Rec. Boating	160	208	160	190
Coastal ⁽¹⁾	670	670	570	700
Com. Navigation	105	89	638	333
Hydroelectric	0	30	0	50
Water Uses	32	30	52	65
H&H	185	81	385	500
PIAG	270	240	340	340
Inter. Review	50	0	50	0
PFEG	0	215	0	280
IM Strategy	0	77	0	175
Study Mgmt. / IJC	200	200	200	200
Secretariat	0	100	0	340
Grand Total	2247	2657	3450	4473

8. (1) Including transfers in U.S. Year 3 of Canadian Year 2 funding of approximately \$500,000 (Canadian); figures not final.

9. **The draft semi-annual was approved with minor revisions to be incorporated.**

10. **Frank Sciremammano and Andre Carpentier provided update from the Control Board.**

11. **PIAG Update:**

- The TWGs are asked to provide input to the PIAG survey questionnaire being designed by Tommy Brown;
- The PIAG survey will be placed on the Study web site for anyone who wants to respond via that channel;
- Next PIAG public meetings:
 - May 15 in Cornwall, Ontario
 - June 18 in Ste. Catharines, Ontario
 - June 19 in Wilson, NY
 - Sept. 10 in Sodus Bay, NY
 - Sept 24: Lake St. Louis area

12. IM Meeting (the meeting did not take place)

13. Future meetings:

- Apr 8 (joint with Control Board) in Washington
- May 28-29 (two full days): Criteria Review and Coastal TWG Presentation
- Sept 24-25 in Montreal
- (TBD - before Christmas)
- It was agreed, the Board will not hold a year-3 public meeting; instead the Board co-directors and IJC staff will participate in a "Lake Levels" workshop at the IJC biennial meeting in Ann Arbor in September 2003.

*Submitted by:
Ed Eryuzlu and Tony Eberhardt
April 3, 2003*

AGENDA

International Lake Ontario - St. Lawrence River Study Board
Meeting, March 12 - 13, 2003
Ottawa, Canada

1. Agenda review
2. Action items from Alex Bay meeting (other than Work Plans)
3. Issues from PFEG March 10-11, 2003 meeting

4. Update of y-2 YTD spending (Ed/Tony)
5. Board Policy Statement for release of information
6. TWG Memberships
7. TWG: Finalize y-3 Work Plans and Budgets; Updates
 - a. Power
 - b. Water Uses
 - c. Environment
 - d. Coastal (include clarification re proprietary issues)
 - e. Commercial Navigation
 - f. H&H
 - g. RecBoating
8. Review of draft Semi-annual progress report (Tony/Ed)
9. Update from Control Board members
10. Update from PIAG
11. Update from IM meeting
12. Future meetings
13. Other issues

Notes:

1. The Board meeting will be held at the IJC main boardroom; proposed starting time on March 12 is 9:00, given that the PFEG workshop (also in Ottawa) will be the two days before.

2. The TWG Leads are requested to submit their proposed (final) Work Plans, to the GMs, latest by Monday, March the 3rd

.

3. IM group wants to hold a meeting with the TWG leads at an appropriate time concurrent with the Board meeting and then brief the Board, as noted above. They will then brief the Board on their meeting. This may not be feasible given the heavy Board agenda and the need for the TWG Leads to participate - (TBD).