

Great Lakes Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species
Research Coordination Committee Meeting
May 8, 2025
3:00 – 4:30 PM EST

Attendees

Lindsay Chadderton, *The Nature Conservancy, Committee Chair*
Nick Phelps, *MN Aquatic Invasive Research Center , Committee Vice Chair*
Matt Neilson, *U.S. Geological Survey*
Doug Jensen, *MN Department of Natural Resources*
Andrew Tucker, *The Nature Conservancy*
Brook Schreyer, *Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters*
Amy Kretlow, *WI DNR*
Debra DiCianna, *Lake Carriers' Association*
El Lower, *NOAA Great Lakes Aquatic Nonindigenous Species Information System*
Eric Fischer, *IN DNR*
Mike Langendorf, *Chippewa Ottawa Resource Authority*
Rochelle Sturtevant, *NOAA Great Lakes Aquatic Nonindigenous Species Information System*
Aubree Szczepanski, *IN DNR*
Lily Thompson, *National Park Service*
Ceci Weibert, *MI Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy*
Kate Wyman-Groethem, *US Fish and Wildlife Service*
Kelly Pennington, *MN DNR*
Tim Campbell, *Wisconsin Sea Grant*
Mike Greer, *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*

Staff (Great Lakes Commission)

Theresa Gruninger
Autumn McGowan
Sam Tank
Nichole Angell

Meeting Startup

Lindsay Chadderton, Committee Chair

- Chadderton led a round of introductions
- Participants were Instructed to fill out a [form](#) for Great Lakes Panel (GLP) members to identify what committees they wish to participate in. Panel members must be members of at least one standing committee. Committee members will be added to GLP committee group for communications.

- No changes to the agenda were made

Review and approve RCC charge

Lindsay Chadderton, Committee Chair

- The Research and Coordination Committee (RCC) brainstormed the priority work topics in the committee charge during a previous meeting. A revised version will be shared following the updates made in discussion during this committee meeting
- The layout of the charge follows what the Management Coordination Committee (MCC) had drafted for consistency
- Within the section for priority topics, it will make sense to identify where the RCC wants to focus most of the collective effort
- Members can make comments on the charge through the end of June, and then meet sometime in late summer/early fall to finalize changes ahead of the fall GLP meeting

Discuss potential GLP work plan priorities

All members

- There is a need to determine what work falls under the RCC and what will be MCC work
 - Reconciling the various lists may better fall under the MCC, with engagement from the RCC
- Invasive aquatic plant work has been included as something for the committee to keep in mind to maintain momentum
- Chadderton is looking for volunteers to help describe what actions will be achieved under each of the priorities to help determine what the RCC will pursue moving forward
- Campbell volunteered to support product development for recreation priorities
- The committee chairs and vice chairs will collaborate on clarifying where the work lies between the various committees
- Pennington volunteered to help advance the genetic biocontrol topics
 - The ethical and ecological criteria for suitable biocontrol agents may likely be better suited for the MCC as it seems more policy-oriented
 - For genetic biocontrol, the first step may be to determine the current state for each of these topics
 - Identifying what has been completed, the status of existing projects, and what gaps exist. Discussing the ethical and ecological concerns now make less sense without a more specific context in mind
 - It would also be helpful if there were particular places where the GLP would like to see biocontrol implemented

- Jensen would like to connect with David Fulton to better understand the communication messaging behind genetic biocontrol
 - For consideration: How can the panel provide value and coordination on genetic biocontrol at the state/national/Tribal levels
- In understanding the impacts of control, Tribal partners have concerns of collateral damage to environmental conditions and other species, and will need better assurance of understanding the impacts of various control methods
 - The Invasive Mussel Collaborative will continue to make this point in developing control tools for mussels, including better communication of risk versus benefit
- The RCC should consider removing “promoting work and information on tradeoffs of canal and barrier removals” from the work plan priorities. This may be a topic for a GLP meeting at some point
- The RCC may not need to take on “promoting climate impacts on pathways”, and is not an obvious objective for the RCC right now
 - May also be an area to complete due diligence before removing, and potentially for a future Panel meeting
- For the priority of tackling the reconciliation of prohibited species list, this may be under the responsibility of the MCC
 - There is a role with the RCC in establishing risk of species and justifying their listings
 - The information is available and maybe the RCC can get it compiled and support the MCC in taking the next steps
 - There is a good baseline for risk assessments, but the need is determining how to harmonize across state boundaries
 - It would be helpful to replicate the OIT analyses across pathways, since each species has different criteria for becoming listed in certain jurisdictions – line up species regulations with the pathways of concern
 - The MCC would have more of a role in compiling how a state prohibits a species
- Interjurisdictional (IJ) projects need additional thought in defining what a good IJ project is and who will do the work
 - The role of the Panel should be to identify researcher providers that have an interest in these topic areas and looping them in to develop projects with these providers to make progress on the objectives
 - Engagement in the IJ process is necessary
 - As priorities are identified, it is important to also identify champions and providers so that work does not get perpetually pushed

- The duck hunting pathway has been missing a champion to lead a project and do the research
 - Campbell would be interested in pushing forward the duck hunting project and that it would be good to have a committee member facilitating, as a better connection between the GLP and outside researchers
 - Jensen would also be willing to support this and identify who has done waterfowl pathways research and lead an inventory on waterfowl hunter products
 - This can be done collaboratively with the Outreach and Coordination Committee to inform the research

Next steps for the recommendations listed in the GLP Ruffe Memo

All members

- The Ruffe Working Group agreed they wanted to communicate to fish committees their priorities, and refine the letter submitted the ANS Task Force for the fish committees
- The group would like to define the high-risk locations, and define what is a major range expansion within the Great Lakes and spatially define high-risk locations
 - This is something the RCC could do with a couple of working sessions, and likely with input from the MCC
- The Mississippi River Basin Panel's (MRBP) Executive Committee is beginning to discuss the Ruffe Plan because of the potential of ruffe to spread
 - MRBP is okay with archival of the plan and continued surveillance but would also like notification of big expansion range or population expansions
 - The MRBP may be going to ANSTF with a recommendation of a two-way transfer point at the Chicago Area Waterway System as a high priority location
 - Kretlow should communicate with the GLP and ExCom, as she learns more
- The general timeline is to finalize this in next 6-8 months
- Effort can be split between the MCC and RCC
 - The MCC has prioritized range-expanding species generally and high-priority or high-risk locations may be better suited for the RCC

Member updates

- Wisconsin DNR: Wisconsin had a breakthrough in OIT convictions and has issued [a new release](#) . Kretlow will check if WI DNR can disclose the seller
- MN DNR:

- Recent research conducted by Castle Lake and Minnesota Aquatic Invasive Research Center has indicated the rate of spread has slowed in Minnesota since the enactment of the Prevention Aid funding that began in 2014
- This is a result of partner actions, and results are [available in an initial report](#)
- Since signal crayfish were found in 2023 there have been ongoing research efforts and have so far found no other specimen
- [10-year retrospective on AIS management published by the Minnesota DNR](#)
- *Phragmites* research continues being led by the University of Minnesota – there are 2000 infestations that have been documented in MN with most being small and treatable

Wrap up and adjourn

Committee chair and staff

- Work plan next steps:
 - Have comments by end of June for final draft to approve before fall meeting
 - New draft by late May with next RCC meeting to be scheduled
 - Then next step is to tackle ruffe action items for June and July