

Midwest Glacial Lakes Partnership Steering Committee Conference Call

Thursday, May 21, 8:00-11:00 Central time

Present

Joe Ferencak- IL DNR
Maureen Gallagher- U.S. FWS
Mike Luehring (for Neil Kmiecik)- GLIFWC
John Lott- SD GF&P
Ron Payer- MN DNR
Pat Rivers- MN DNR
Mike Staggs- WI DNR
Gwen White (for Bill James)- IN DNR

Actions

- Co-chairs and Pat will extend invitations to new members for Steering Committee.
- State coordinators can identify a suite of good project types to send to Steering Committee by email for consensus.
- Will send timeline and current copy of strategic plan to Steering Committee.
- Will send MSCG Letter of Intent (on BaseCamp, can provide access).
- Email Ron Payer with any issues that should be particularly carried to the NFHAP partnership conference (week of June 22).

Notes

1. **Steering committee member additions** (see table below)
 - a. Talked about which groups weren't represented in Feb call. Diverse membership in group and geographic scope. Input from state and federal coordinators.
 - i. Talked with Mark Ermer about Pheasants Forever contact or other group for South Dakota. List appears fine with good representation. Have representative from main part of glacial lakes area, which is important. Coordinators group expressed some concern about weighting towards Minn/Wisc, but the organizations represented will be valuable.
 - ii. How many will be on the Steering Committee? Will be 20 with this slate. No intention of overweighting but if there are more, should remove some as more than 20 would be less manageable. Don't want to exclude anyone, so others could be on second and third tier involvement (network).
 - iii. Not too concerned about it unless those individuals are representing *interests* of Wisc/Minn. Coordinator from Upper Great Lakes Joint Venture could find board member from Illinois or Indiana. As the coordinator, she happens to sit in Minn may not be a problem. Want to reassure people that there is not an intent to bias funding or action in a certain geographic area.
 - iv. Have been looking for names from associations that GLFWC was involved with and haven't found any yet.
 - b. Maureen expressed that we will have the most diverse steering committee of any of the FHPs, which is a great thing.

- i. Thanks to Maureen for assistance. Good to have the assurance that we are on the right track.
 - ii. All on the calls were satisfied with the list. Would like to keep door open for additional tribal representation.
 - c. **Action:** Co-chairs and Pat will extend invitations to get these people on board in next month or so. List of talking points for personal phone call to introduce the MGLP and follow up with a letter and essential materials to review before getting final commitment (Mike, Ron, Pat).
2. **Assessment direction** - how do we fund the work that needs to be done?
- a. Making good progress through GIS team. Patterned after Michigan process. First get lakesheds delineated, then clip the land uses by watershed to get quantification done, then can do the assessment to identify stressors and priority areas for protection and restoration.
 - i. Michigan and Iowa catchment delineations are done. Iowa was flown with LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging).
 - ii. Minnesota and South Dakota in process through grant. Able to use Michigan IFR methods to delineate catchments with somewhat automated processes.
 - iii. Dr. Tomas Hook, Purdue Univ, has agreed to complete Indiana by using Michigan methods at no cost to MGLP.
 - iv. Need Illinois, possibly through USFWS resources.
 - v. WI is investigating USGS office for internal contract, but would require 70% match.
 - vi. North Dakota will be provided with AML methods developed for use in South Dakota (partially funded with \$10K provided by John Lott).
 - b. Plan to proceed with assessment after lakesheds are done by Oct 2009
 - i. Considering interim assessment based on lakesheds that are already done, will do initial cut to prioritize areas in next year or two.
 - ii. Delay for Wisconsin (8-10 months delay for that state).
 - iii. Funding so far in hand: \$10K from SD, \$50K from USFWS for GIS staff, in-kind support including many partners.
 - iv. Funding potential: MSCG may have resources. internal Minn grant, Fish America Foundation RFP for July with funds in Jan (\$20-40K), other in-house resources (USFWS, Wisc DNR).
 - v. For FWS, Pat and Maureen will find out from Mike Weimer whether assistance funds are left over to divert to do work out of Joint Venture office in East Lansing, MI, with GIS analyst who could do this.
 - c. Update for Steering Committee and to make sure they are comfortable with the approach.

3. **Funding updates from USFWS**

- a. Grant matrix – Student working on this at USFWS. Quite a challenge to find specific information on the internet. There are a lot of grants out there.
 - i. Trying to compile matrix for grants offered on an annual basis, not one-time opportunities as we don't have capacity to maintain matrix over time.
 - ii. Includes only grant sources specific to Midwest, broken down by category of types of work (specific to conservation delivery, research & monitoring, planning, operations & support). Will have it done by end of next week, then send to partners for review and additions, then will get details. Up to 40 grant opportunities on the list now.
 - iii. Working with USFWS to get up on website for link to MGLP website.
 - iv. Will be maintained on annual basis to save time in figuring out what grants are available to reduce missed opportunities due to grant deadlines.
 - b. Have signature for More Fish grant, hope to get final signature in next few weeks for funding. Automatic overhead worked out at national level.
 - i. Have \$10K per partnership to cover travel to meetings (was \$50K total shared by 5 FHPs) for steering committee, planning meetings, assessment team travel, meeting space, etc.
 - ii. Can make adjustments as needed. Request from Fishers & Farmers to produce brochures, so if not needed for travel could use it for outreach. Possible to change to assessment work, as they prefer concrete actions towards conservation.
 - iii. Will get it signed first, and then consider changes to actions in the grant.
4. **Operational framework for projects** - getting proposals and a selection process
- a. May expect NFHP funds in low six figures in federal funding. Projects need to be in FONS this fall (Sept/Oct).
 - i. Need to be prepared to submit projects that meet MGLP and NFHAP priorities. See funding opportunities, but haven't had time to react to submit highly competitive projects. Need to have good projects ready to go. We now have time for project development and selection for NFHAP funding.
 - b. Selection of projects to submit to USFWS
 - i. At Minnesota meeting, talked about each partner proposing projects with range of actions (watershed, fish passage, etc).
 - c. Currently USFWS is in flat-budget situation for NFHAP. In 2009, \$5.13 million with \$2.7 million to partnerships for funding projects.
 - i. President's budget for 2010 has \$5.135 million with additional \$2 million under climate change package marked for NFHP.
 - ii. On last call and email with Tom Busiahn, were \$7 million. Maureen is more conservative than Tom with letting partnerships know what is available or how the \$2 million in climate change would be used. Probably not for small, on-the-ground projects. There are now 9 partnerships from 6 FHPs previously. At least 4 and as many as 7 candidate FHPs will apply in August.

- d. Don't want to chase money in vain, starting with open request for proposals across geographic area (40-50 projects). Will not have enough money, so will be difficult for NFHAP or USFWS to give more than \$100K per partnership. Will have to reduce what other FHPs are getting. Driftless and Matsu had \$300K with \$200K of that on the ground. Will not see a tremendous amount of money. Recommend focusing on building demonstration projects.
 - i. Could be integrated project with multiple facets or 1-2 projects that demonstrate a narrower piece? Both open avenues. Continue with assessment, research, monitoring needs. Project is something finite, not long-term monitoring scenario.
 - ii. Thorough and justified from planning process, interim assessment information, specific objectives for next few years, projects that best represent types of activities to meet those objectives such as continuing with lake habitat restoration funded by stimulus. Articulate and show how location was identified strategically.

- e. Latest NFHCA legislation: it will be introduced in Senate first (week of June 8) then into the House a week or so later. One concern is that haven't done a good job in being truly strategic about where projects will be done. Most partnerships don't have detailed planning information in place to be strategic. Can narrow to focus efforts on 1-2 projects rather than spreading it out. Will be interested in congress.
 - i. Possibility of taking two approaches with funding large projects that fill gaps for each state-level programs or use smaller amounts as cost-share funding for state-level projects? Don't want to look like federal funds are just supplementing state budgets.
 - ii. Could do large project but take credit for state-level program projects as a partnership.
 - iii. Could do cross-border projects between states, such as the lakescaping workshops coordinated between Minnesota and Indiana.
 - iv. Use strategic plan to identify a place to get started as opposed to an open request for proposals. Could go to each state agency to submit one project and still have to whittle it down from there.

- f. Examples of projects
 - i. Work in Minnesota to identify which lakes are most likely to maintain cold water for cisco.
 - ii. Illinois Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning is working on lake classification system to prioritize lakes for restoration efforts. Most glacial lakes are in Lake County. Fits in well with potential future funding. Very focused in terms of geographic area. Would have application to urban lakes across the region.
 - iii. Other partnerships (SARP) struggling with learning from what others are doing. Those opportunities are limited to presentations at conference, which is valuable, but could be pioneers in developing demonstrations.
 - iv. NFHAP is one potential source of funding, but will be identifying smaller local habitat projects for other sources with involving local partners,

which will step up into broader landscape-level process-type projects. Anticipate multiple funding sources.

- g. Form on available funding sources. Content and project proposal content for each source.
- h. Process to identify projects would be glacial lakes coordination work group which would be most adept at providing insight if the steering committee can provide side boards.
 - i. Different opportunities for leveraging, potential for climate change projects, such as Minnesota project on sustaining lakes in a changing environment, including climate change. That type of project would be useful to other states.
 - ii. How we structure from smaller local projects to landscape-level and process through the coordination group for recommendations to the steering committee.
 - iii. No one in FWS has good handle on how to spend climate change funds. Projects specific to climate change issues, such as cisco, that could lead directly to recommendation or action on additional protection measures. New threshold with how far south the species can go. The \$2 million is small change in overall climate package, may see tremendous opportunities with anything in climate change. Will be a lot of big-ticket multi-million research needs that have to be met, but will be limited opportunities to identify where we need to take action.
 - 1. Indiana would be very supportive of work done on how to maintain cisco. Had about 40 lakes with cisco and down to a handful. Would be a great benefit to have that work done whether it is in Indiana or Minnesota.
- i. How to develop list of projects and prioritize a half dozen or so that the steering committee could review.
 - i. Worthy process. Would the first step be to glean some projects? Could figure out a process and ask to put projects together. Mechanisms could be worked out. A lot of ideas but nothing ready. Would be solicitation and guidelines on format and financial sideboards.
 - ii. In Wisconsin, going through biennial work plan process. Told people to use short pre-proposal approach. Would be worthy effort to have a repository.
 - iii. What amount for project, assuming 1:1 match? Could be a range not over \$75K unless there is a specific grant source with more available. Over that threshold, will reduce amount of grant sources most of which will be so specific that will need to build project that fits that source. Minimum match is 1:1 for a lot but one way to be competitive is to show that grantee is paying the smallest share.

- iv. **Action:** State coordinators can identify a suite of good project types to send to Steering Committee by email for consensus.
 - 1. FONS form gives standard shorter pre-proposal format. Funding availability and erosion makes sense to have a list to access quickly.
 - 2. Get projects in and compare them to strategic plan.

5. Strategic plan revision and endorsement

- a. At NFHP board meeting in March, stated it would be finalized by September. At time of application, needed to add SGCN from Mich/Wisc, ecoregion descriptions, break down overall partnership targets by state or entity (difficult to do that on coordinator calls).
 - i. Would like to the Steering Committee to provide comment by June 30 and endorsement of plan by mid-August. Final edits and submit to NFH Board in September.
 - ii. Approval from the Steering Committee or at MOU level? From Steering Committee, but same at this point? Little different in some states. Question about whether standard process is for strategic plan to be product of steering committees or sign-off from all participants. MOU in Wisconsin is signed by Secretary of DNR, different person in US Forest Service. Letter from Kelly Hepler indicated Steering Committee approval. Better for process.
 - iii. Need to identify any course corrections now.
 - iv. Tom Busiahn highlighted the Desert Fish Habitat plan. Not far from that, but look at it if you have time. Reason is that they have much more detailed information and can make tight linkages between landscape, goals and activities on the ground. It is further along than others.
 - v. Challenge for MGLP is that we don't have a lot of species on the brink like desert pupfish. Bluegill decline across the region is more diffuse.
 - vi. Strategic Plan is 31 pages long (42 with appendices). Is this enough time? All on the call confirmed timeline.
 - vii. **Action:** Will send timeline and current copy of strategic plan to Steering Committee.

6. Update on Multi-State Conservation Grant (MSCG)

- a. Letter of Intent went in May 6, similar to last year but with tighter objectives. Have not promised as much. Requested \$450-500K to solidify coordination among partnerships. Does not meet all needs for MGLP but with competitive nature, better to work together.
- b. Will hear June 26 whether to continue with full proposal development.
- c. MAFWA involved as fiscal agent/applicant rather than TU. Will cost some overhead (\$40K) but will take away headache of administering grant. Will be great benefit and possibly elevate buy-in for proposal. Were competitive last year. Getting MAFWA engaged brings it to the forefront for them to get word out. Impressed with interest in grant administration but also in what we are trying to do.
- d. **Action:** Will send Letter of Intent to Steering Committee members (available on BaseCamp, can provide access if needed).

7. Other comments

- a. AFWA Fisheries & Water Resources policy committee who have been asked to rank projects. If you are involved in submission of project, should probably recuse from voting. However, if all states involved in FHPs would recuse themselves, no one left. He clarified that it was primary person preparing the proposal. All have say in whether letter of intent is accepted.
- b. NFHP meeting- One year out.
 - i. Will send at least one person from Minnesota to national workshop towards end of June. Ask who is attending and insight on importance of multiple attendees. Mike Staggs had hoped to go but will not be able to attend as it overlaps with work and restrictions on out-of-state travel. Disappointed that it is not a cheap meeting. Maureen received email that Joe Larscheid and Martin Konrad from Iowa, possibly Mike McGee from Reservoirs Partnership. Indiana not going due to tight out-of-state travel.
 - ii. Looking at agenda, unless there are major changes, the importance to actual FHPs and what they might get out regarding products, tools, information, connections, may be somewhat limited. If a few represent the partnership that would be sufficient. USFWS may figure out a way to send anyone who really wants to go. The NFH board wants the meeting to happen. Really more for meeting the NFH board milestones that they set for themselves. Secondly to provide atmosphere to mix.
 - iii. As a national workshop, agenda did not seem very powerful. Networking aspects would be valuable. Costs for conference center lodging and per diem are high. In the future, should consider budget and travel restrictions imposed on most partners.
 - iv. Might be valuable to send email to Tom Busiahn with concern that it is difficult to identify specific benefits to FHPs outside of networking. Did make considerable suggestions for agenda to present concrete tools to assist FHPs in meeting their responsibilities. Already committed to process, but need resources.
 - v. **Action:** Email Ron Payer with any issues that should be particularly carried to the meeting.
- c. NFWF grant for MGLP partner and lakescaping workshops
 - i. Planning going well for MGLP partner input meeting in Indiana on June 20 and Lakescaping workshop on August 1. If anyone has input or questions on those workshops, Indiana would be happy to provide information.

8. Future steering committee conference call - after new members are added

- a. To get new members up to speed and provide input to process in July or early August. Send plan to new members in advance of the call. Solicit new member involvement in project proposals. Schedule soon to allow for larger group than today's call.

Potential MGLP Steering Committee Additions

<p>Academic First Choice INDIANA Bill Jones Clinical Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs Indiana University 1315 East Tenth Street Bloomington, IN 47405 812-855-4556 joneswi@indiana.edu</p>	<p>Alternate MICHIGAN Pat Soranno Associate Professor, Dept. of Fisheries and Wildlife 9B Natural Resources Building Michigan State University East Lansing, MI 48824-1222 Office phone: (517) 432-4330 FAX: (517) 432-1699 soranno@msu.edu</p>
<p>Waterfowl First Choice MINNESOTA Barbara Pardo (or other UMRGLJV representative) Upper Miss. River and Great Lakes JV Project Coord. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, BHW Federal Building 1 Federal Drive Fort Snelling, MN 55111-4056 612-713-5433 FAX 612-713-5393 Barbara.Pardo@fws.gov</p>	<p>Alternate D.U. is more interested in working on projects than steering committee involvement</p>
<p>Angling Group First Choice MICHIGAN Dennis Muchmore Exec. Director, Michigan United Conservation Clubs PO Box 30235 2101 Wood Street Lansing, MI 48912-3785 517-346-6455 dmuchmore@mucc.org</p>	<p>Alternate FLORIDA Christopher Horton Conservation Director ESPN/BASS 200 Celebration Place, Suite 900 Celebration, FL 34747 Christopher.M.Horton@bassmaster.com</p>
<p>Statewide Lake Association First Choice WISCONSIN Earl Cook (or other WAL representative) President, Wisconsin Assoc. of Lakes PO Box 62 Springbrook, WI 54875 715-766-3702 elcook@interserve.com</p>	<p>Alternate MINNESOTA Marian Bender Executive Director, Minnesota Waters Minnesota Waters 720 West Saint Germain, Suite 143 St. Cloud, MN 56301 P: 800-515-5253 or 320-257-6630 MarianB@minnesotawaters.org</p>
<p>Industry First choice MINNESOTA Stephen Quinn Editor, In-Fisherman 7819 Highland Scenic Rd. Baxter, MN 56425-8011 218-829-1648 StephenQuinn@IMoutdoors.com</p>	<p>Alternate Cabela's- Troy Bosard (Director of Fishing). He will be contacting me soon. Recommended by Randy Moeller, Marketing Manager, 308-255-2872</p>
<p>Land Trusts First choice WISCONSIN Mike Strigel Exec. Director, Gathering Waters Conservancy</p>	<p>Alternate MINNESOTA Trust for Public Land Central Region Office 2610 University Ave., Suite 300</p>

<p>211 S. Paterson Street, Suite 270 Madison, WI 53703 Phone: 608-251-9131 x 14 Fax: 608-663-5971 http://gatheringwaters.org</p>	<p>St. Paul, MN 55114 (651) 917-2240</p>
<p>Tribal No names at this time</p>	
<p>American Planning Association No names at this time, however two Divisions of interest are: -Environment, Nat. Resources, and Energy -County Planning</p>	
<p>Pheasants Forever Waiting to hear from Dave Nomsen, VP Gov't Affairs; dnomsen@pheasantsforever.org 877-773-2070; cell 320-491-9163</p>	