

**Great Lakes—St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Council
Meeting Summary**

Conference Call Meeting
June 10, 2010
Avenue Crowne Plaza Hotel
160 E. Huron
Chicago, Illinois 60611
2:45 p.m. EDT – 3:30 p.m. EDT

Notice:

Notice of the meeting was provided to the public through the Great Lakes Information Network's distribution list on May 10, 2010. Notice was also posted at the same time to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Council (Compact Council) website at www.glscompactcouncil.org. Included in the meeting notice was that the draft resolutions and materials to be discussed were available at www.glscompactcouncil.org.

Call of Meeting:

3:00 p.m. EDT—The meeting was called to order by Kari Evans, alternate of Compact Council Chair, Governor Mitch Daniels. Ms. Evans apologized for the delay in calling the meeting, which was caused by the delayed adjournment of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Water Resources Regional Body (Regional Body) meeting, held immediately prior to the Compact Council meeting.

Roll Call:

The following Compact Council members, constituting a quorum, were present:

Illinois (alternate of Governor Pat Quinn): Gary Clark, Director, Office of Water Resources, Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

Indiana (alternate of Governor Mitch Daniels): Kari Evans, General Counsel, Indiana Department of Natural Resources.

Michigan (alternate of Governor Jennifer Granholm): Ken DeBeaussaert, Director, Michigan Office of the Great Lakes.

Minnesota (alternate of Governor Tim Pawlenty): Jim Japs, Deputy Director, Division of Water, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

New York (alternate of Governor David A. Paterson): Don Zelazny¹ on behalf of Jim Tierney, Assistant Commissioner for Water Resources, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

Ohio (alternate of Governor Ted Strickland): Sean Logan, Director, Ohio Department of Natural Resources.

Pennsylvania (alternate of Governor Ed Rendell): John Booser¹ on behalf of Cathleen Curran Myers, Special Assistant for PA Recovery, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection.

¹ Copies of executed proxy forms are available upon request.

Wisconsin (alternate of Governor Jim Doyle): Matt Frank, Secretary, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Actions Taken

Review of December 8, 2010, Compact Council meeting minutes.

A motion was made by Mr. Clark of Illinois to formally approve the minutes of the December 8, 2010, Compact Council meeting. The motion was adopted without objection.

Reports

Noting that the meeting of the Regional Body adjourned immediately prior to the Compact Council meeting, a motion was made by Mr. Clark of Illinois to incorporate minutes of the Regional Body reports into the Compact Council minutes.

The motion was approved without objection. Pursuant to the approved motion, the following reports are incorporated by reference into the Compact Council's record and re-printed in their entirety below:

- ***State and Provincial updates on implementation of the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence River Basin Sustainable Water Resources Agreement.***
- ***Overview of work related to the regional science strategy including the 2010 International Association for Great Lakes Research Conference.***
- ***Water Resource Managers' Initiative update.***
- ***Procedures Committee.***

Reports

State and Provincial updates on implementation of the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence River Basin Sustainable Water Resources Agreement (Agreement).

Each Regional Body designee provided an update on their jurisdiction's efforts to implement the Agreement including the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact (Compact) legislation or other mechanisms as appropriate.

In addition, each of the States and Provinces was asked to report on the status of its: 1) Water Management Program Report; and, 2) Water Conservation and Efficiency Program Report. The States' reports were due on December 8, 2009, pursuant to the terms of the Compact.

Finally, each of the States was to report by December 8, 2009, all existing Withdrawals, Diversions and Consumptive Uses that existed as of December 8, 2008 ("the baseline"). All States submitting baseline information indicated that such submissions were subject to corrections and amendments.

Michigan

The State is moving forward to adopt further State legislation to implement its new water management program. Under the new program, already about 170 proposals have used the new process. Approximately 25% of the applicants have been required to take a follow-up step in the approval process, and one has been denied. The State is now working with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to better implement the program, including the online application process. The State is also developing online conservation measure questions, and will provide sector-specific information as appropriate.

Illinois

The amount of water diverted by the State of Illinois in 2006 pursuant to the consent decree entered into for Wisconsin et al. v. Illinois et al. was recently certified. The amount was below 3200 cubic feet per second (CFS). Unofficial tallies for 2009 also show that less than 3200 CFS have been diverted.

There have been 12 new requests for water use allocation under the State's allocation program. Ten are for new infrastructure projects, with costs of approximately \$250 million.

The State is also creating a Northeast Illinois Regional Plan, with a strong emphasis on demand management and conservation.

Indiana

Like Michigan, the State of Indiana adopted implementing legislation when the Compact was passed. The State finished its baseline reporting process last year. An effort is underway to create a process for appealing baseline determinations, and most of the outstanding issues have been resolved.

The State is now working on its conservation and efficiency goals and objectives. The efforts through a task force have involved substantial public outreach.

The State has not received any formal diversion applications under the Compact or Agreement. There have been some informal inquiries but nothing that would be considered serious to date.

Minnesota

Minnesota has in place a long-standing water management program. This last year, the legislative session ended on May 18. As part of legislation passed during this session, the Department of Natural Resources is now allowed to monitor impacts from approved groundwater withdrawals. The new provision mirrors surface water provision laws, with groundwater protection areas, thresholds and criteria for applications.

New York

The State of New York did not pass implementing legislation with the Compact. The State is now considering a Statewide management program in legislation that should be introduced shortly. This new legislation should enhance the Compact implementation program.

Last year, the State altered its water registration program. The threshold is 100,000 gallons per day, which complements the 100,000 gallons per day registration threshold in the Agreement and Compact. Through this program, the State learned of a few irrigators who were not registered under the previous registration program. The State is also considering performing updates/corrections to the previously submitted baseline information.

The State's Great Lakes Advisory Council should be completing a report in the next month or so, and the State will share the report with the other Parties to the Agreement/Compact. The report will address science needs, cumulative impact assessments and thresholds.

Ohio

A 28-member advisory panel has been formed in the State to work on implementing the Compact. The deadline for recommendations from the panel has been extended from June to December. The meetings of the panel have been robust and the State should be in a position to submit its Water Conservation and Efficiency objectives to the Compact Council and Regional Body by the deadline of December 8, 2010. In an effort to address other issues, the panel has broken down into smaller sub-groups. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources is assisting with steering these discussions.

Director Logan also indicated that he felt blessed to be part of the ground level discussions for implementing the Compact, and emphasized that the State is committed to seeing its full implementation.

Pennsylvania

The Compact enabling legislation in Pennsylvania was self-executing. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's Office of the Great Lakes is now in the process of aligning programs to the meet the terms of the Compact.

In addition, the Commonwealth is initiating conservation and efficiency programs Statewide. To that end, the Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC) recently issued a Request for Proposals with the Pennsylvania Environmental Council to create a conservation center. Furthermore, a study being performed on watersheds should help with the separate Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

Pennsylvania Act 220 now requires registration of withdrawals over 10,000 gallons per day. The Commonwealth is now in the process of ensuring compliance.

The Commonwealth is also obtaining assistance from the SRBC and the Potomac River Commission, who in turn are working with The Nature Conservancy to do streamflow modeling.

Finally, it was noted that there was a recent spike in the Commonwealth to use water for natural gas exploration.

Wisconsin

The State is currently working on the development of rules addressing large water withdrawals in the State. The Natural Resources Board has authorized the WDNR to hold public hearings on proposed rules that focus on registration and reporting of large withdrawals (100,000 gallons per day or more averaged over any 30-day period), proposed water use fees, and the proposed water conservation and efficiency program. The program includes mandatory elements in the Great Lakes Basin, for proposed diverters of Great Lakes water, and for withdrawers with water losses greater than 2 MGD statewide. There are voluntary elements of the program statewide.

The State is also looking at the issue of climate change with a focus on human activity. It was noted that the State is looking to collaborate with others on this project. To that end, the State is working with the Nelson Institute to perform climate change impact research.

The State has received an application from the City of Waukesha for a proposal to divert water under the “community in a straddling county” exception to the general prohibition of diversions. It was reported that the State earlier today had returned the application to Waukesha for a variety of reasons. The letter outlining the reasons is available from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources upon request.

Secretary Frank finished his report by stating that he was proud to be part of this collaborative effort between eight States and two Provinces. He noted that this effort is an important opportunity to build capacity to cooperate and work together. He also noted that the States and Provinces will learn as they go along and that we shouldn’t overlook the substantial successes made to date. He also noted that the Regional Body and Compact Council are unique organizations and could serve as a model to help with other parts of the world.

Mr. DeBeaussaert of Michigan echoed Secretary Frank’s comments and indicated his appreciation of the work of the Regional Body and Compact Council staff.

Overview of work related to the regional science strategy including the 2010 International Association for Great Lakes Research Conference.

Mr. Eric Boysen of Ontario provided a report on the 2010 International Association for Great Lakes Research Conference. A copy of the written report read into the record is attached as Appendix “A” to these meeting minutes.

Water Resource Managers' Initiative update.

Mr. DeBeaussaert of Michigan noted that in support of the commitments made by the Governors and Premiers in the Agreement related to water use impacts, the Council of Great Lakes Governors has launched The Great Lakes Water Resource Managers' Initiative. He also noted that this Initiative is a collaboration with the Great Lakes States and Provinces, and project partners including The Nature Conservancy, with generous support provided by the Joyce Foundation.

Mr. DeBeaussaert then asked David Naftzger, Executive Director of the Council of Great Lakes Governors, to provide an update on the initiative. Mr. Naftzger reported that a toolkit has been created that includes State and Provincial programs as well as best practices across the world. A corresponding website has also been created, which is available on the Council of Great Lakes Governors website. Furthermore, the Initiative held a meeting on January 13-14, 2010 to review the toolkit, and hear from a variety of experts on performing water use impact analysis. He indicated that a meeting had also been held on the day preceding the Regional Body and Compact Council meeting to discuss State and Provincial procedures for performing impact analysis. To that end, he also reported that it was likely that the States and Provinces were to begin developing a water budget for the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence River Basin and for the source watersheds. Further work will be undertaken with project partners, including USGS, to initiate this process.

Rules Committee

Mr. DeBeaussaert asked Peter Johnson of the Secretariat staff to deliver a report of the Procedures Committee.

Mr. Johnson reported that the Procedures Committee has been meeting via conference call since the spring of 2009. The Procedures Committee has met jointly throughout the process with the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Council's (Compact Council) Rules & Regulations Committee. The Joint Committee has made substantial steps forward in creating recommendations including the creating of draft "Contents of an Application" documents. It was further reported that early drafts of those documents were shared with the Joint Committees' Advisory Panels, Resource Groups and Observers, as well as Tribes and First Nations. Comments were received from those organizations and changes were made accordingly. Revised drafts were again shared with the Advisory Committee, Resource Group and Observers, as well as Tribes and First Nations. Additional comments received were taken under consideration and changes were made accordingly.

Mr. Johnson also reported that draft "Procedures" had been developed, and similarly shared with the Advisory Committee, Resource Group and Observers, as well as Tribes and First Nations. Comments received were taken under consideration and changes were made accordingly.

As a result, draft Interim Procedures have been completed by the Procedures committee and given to the Regional Body with the recommendation that they be adopted during this meeting.

Mr. Johnson also reported that work has begun on drafting procedures for the Compact Council to follow if a decision is appealed, and other procedures related to enforcement of decisions.

Administrative

Ms. Evans asked David Naftzger, Executive Director of the Compact Council, to provide a report of the administration of the Compact Council.

Mr. Naftzger reported expenses were slightly ahead of projections. He noted that some of that was due to additional costs for conference calls and this face-to-face meeting. He also noted that the new Compact Council website had been launched and could be found at www.gslcompactcouncil.org.

Opportunity for public comments.

Members of the public were given an opportunity to ask questions or provide comments.

- Ed Glatfelter, Alliance for the Great Lakes: Mr. Glatfelter began by expressing his appreciation for the opportunity to comment.

Mr. Glatfelter commented on the draft Interim Guidance to be considered by the Compact Council. He raised a concern that the rule-making section had not been commented on by the public. He also indicated that there should be a section for the adoption of fees, which he felt was important to address because of what he felt was the relatively small Compact Council budget to be considered later during today's meeting.

He also raised concerns about the potential adequacy of the review of proposals under the community in a straddling county exception to the general prohibition on diversions, and that the burden of proof needed to be clearly on the applicant.

He also raised a concern that because the draft under consideration by the Compact Council was only Interim Guidance, it could be set aside too easily by the Compact Council. Specifically, he raised the concern that if the States did not collaborate well in the future, the Interim Guidance would be set aside, creating uncertainty. Consequently, Mr. Glatfelter stated that having Rules in place is critically important. Mr. Glatfelter requested that the Compact Council table the motion to adopt draft Interim Guidance and instead begin a rulemaking process that would include formal rule-making notice and opportunity for public comment.

He then stated that if the Compact Council is still intent on adopting the draft Interim Guidance to be considered later on the agenda, that the Compact Council please view it as a short-term process, and please consider the Interim Guidance as a “living” document that should be subject to ongoing review, comment and improvement.

- Marc Smith, National Wildlife Federation: Mr. Smith also thanked the members for meeting face-to-face. He indicated that it was important to be able to meet the members before and after the meeting, and to see them work during the course of the meeting as well.

Mr. Smith indicated that he agreed with Mr. Glatfelter and that he felt that it was inappropriate to adopt Interim Guidance, and that a rulemaking process should be initiated instead. He further stated that he felt that the draft Interim Guidance was a good start, but just that. He also indicated that approximately 40 environmental groups from across the Basin believed that the members should initiate a rulemaking process instead of adopting the draft Interim Guidance.

Mr. Smith finally stated that if the draft Interim Guidance was adopted by the Compact Council, it should be treated as temporary, and then the Compact Council should initiate a rule-making procedure. He stated that the notion of flexibility requires time to comment on rules.

- Sara Gosman, National Wildlife Federation: Ms. Gosman supported the comments made by Mr. Glatfelter and Mr. Smith about the importance of initiating the rule-making process because the draft Interim Guidance needed improvement. She also indicated that it is important to have a public comment period over a set period of time as well as a public meeting before any guidance or rules are adopted by the Compact Council. While she appreciated the opportunity to comment as a member of the Advisory Committee, she felt that there needed to be a broader opportunity to comment by the general public. With regard to specific provisions of the draft Interim Guidance, Ms. Gosman felt that the public hearing provision was too restrictive by requiring participants to register three days before any such hearing. She noted that the provision was very similar to the public hearing provisions in the Susquehanna River Basin Commission rules but the proposed provisions in the draft Interim Guidance were more restrictive.

She also stated that comments should be solicited from the public on Declarations of Finding received from the Regional Body before the Compact Council issues its approval or disapproval of any proposals that come before it.

She also raised concerns that it was not clear if a public hearing had to be held before the Compact Council could take action on any water use proposal that

comes before it, and that there were no procedures for how a public meeting would function.

Lastly, she stated that records for rule-making should be made more broadly available. She asked that if the draft Interim Guidance was adopted, some sense of next steps should be provided.

- Dale Phenicie, American Forest and Paper Association: Mr. Phenicie asked that the members look at the decision-making process from the perspective of a future applicant. He noted that the members of the Compact Council are in a tough spot because decisions to be made will be tough. Therefore, he noted that it would be important to have a process for review in place and expressed his belief that the draft Interim Guidance before the Compact Council would do a good job of giving that process to future applicants.

He also asked the members of the Compact Council to remember that its processes will be different than typical rule-making processes because multiple sovereign entities are involved.

- Lyman Welch, Alliance for the Great Lakes: Mr. Welch endorsed Mr. Glatfelter's comments. He noted that there was a long process for getting the Compact into place and time must be taken to adopt rules. He emphasized that now is the time to adopt rules that have been fully vetted through the rule-making process. Even if the draft Interim Guidance is adopted, he indicated that the members should immediately move forward with the rule-making process.

Mr. Welch expressed concerns that public hearings are not required under the draft Interim Guidance before the Compact Council. He stressed that public hearings should be held in all instances. Furthermore, the requirement that notice of intention to participate must be given three days before a Public Hearing should be done away with. He felt that the public should not be barred from speaking simply because an individual had not registered.

- Brittany, resident of Waukesha, Wisconsin: Brittany stressed that public hearings are very important and should be considered going forward.
- Marc Hudon, Nature Québec: Mr. Hudon stressed the importance of public meetings and stated that he thought it was important for the Compact Council to adopt rules rather than Interim Guidance.

New Business

Consideration of Regional Body Fiscal Year 2011 (July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011) budget resolution.

At the invitation of Ms. Evans, Mr. Naftzger as the Compact Council's Executive Director provided an overview of *Resolution #12—Adoption of Fiscal Year 2011 (July 1,*

2010-June 30, 2011) budget. Mr. Naftzger noted that Great Lakes Protection Fund resources will be used to meet this budget, and that approving the budget would serve as authorization for the Compact Council staff to perform work on its behalf.

Mr. DeBeaussaert of Michigan moved that the resolution be adopted. The motion was adopted unanimously pursuant to roll call vote.

Illinois—Yes
Indiana—Yes
Michigan—Yes
Minnesota—Yes
New York—Yes
Ohio—Yes
Ontario—Yes
Pennsylvania—Yes
Québec—Yes
Wisconsin—Yes

Consideration of Guidance resolution.

Ms. Evans then introduced *Resolution #13—Adoption of Interim Guidance*. She noted that adoption of the resolution would adopt the draft Interim Guidance before the Compact Council, and would replace in its entirety the Interim Guidance previously adopted by the Compact Council on December 8, 2008. Director Logan of Ohio moved that the resolution be considered.

Director Logan then moved that the resolution be amended to strike the requirement in Section 201.2.4.c. requiring registration three days before any public hearing. The motion to amend the resolution was adopted without objection.

Upon discussion of the amended resolution, Mr. DeBeaussaert of Michigan indicated that he would not vote in favor of the resolution because he felt that the draft Interim Guidance could benefit from further public review, which would hopefully result in greater clarity. Mr. DeBeaussaert stressed that his concern was not with the substance of the proposed motion, but rather one of process.

The question was then called and a roll call vote was taken on the resolution.

Illinois—Yes
Indiana—Yes
Michigan—No
Minnesota—Yes
New York—Yes
Ohio—Yes
Ontario—Yes
Pennsylvania—Yes

Québec—Yes
Wisconsin—Yes

Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. DeBeaussaert of Michigan to adjourn the meeting. The motion was adopted without objection.

The full text of the materials discussed is available online at www.gslcompactcouncil.org.

Attachment “A”
JULY 8, 2010, DRAFT

International Association for Great Lakes Research
Conference on Great Lakes Research
May 17-21, 2010 Toronto, Ontario

Session: Building a Collaborative Science Strategy for the Great Lakes Basin

On December 13, 2005, the eight Great Lakes States, Ontario and Québec signed the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Sustainable Water Resources Agreement (Agreement). This session focused on issues related to the information and science commitments as they are outlined in Articles 301 and 302 of the Agreement, and in particular on initiatives related to the assessment of cumulative water use impacts.

Presentations*

Laura Seaman of the Council of Great Lakes Governors presented “*Assessing and Managing Water Use Impacts in the Great Lakes Basin.*” Ms. Seaman gave an overview and introduction to the Agreement and companion U.S. interstate Compact. She also provided a description of how the Council of Great Lakes Governors is collaborating with water managers from the Great lakes States, Ontario and Québec to develop a resource “toolkit” to highlight what each State and Province is doing related to assessing cumulative/individual impacts and to provide water managers with tools and processes to assist in their assessments. Next steps include the development of guidance, programs in each State and Province and the development of a mechanism and process to collaboratively assess the cumulative impacts of water use on the Basin and the watersheds of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

Sam Bellamy of AquaResource Inc. presented “*Development of a Climate Change Hydrologic Assessment Framework for the Province of Ontario.*” This project provides the ability for water managers to assess the possible impacts of climate change on the hydrology of the Great Lakes and contributing watersheds. The objectives of the project include developing a hydrologic impact assessment that focuses on water budget studies, building connections between the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and local water resource practitioners, and standardizing the assessment of hydrologic impacts of climate change. The study investigated many future climate scenarios covering a wide range of potential outcomes and scaled global climate models down to the local climate level. The recommended approach was the Change Field method, due to its ability to easily generate large numbers of local climates to determine the range of possible impacts. A case study in the Orangeville, Ontario, area was presented. Using impact assessment probabilities can better inform decision-makers for future development of a climate change framework.

David Van Vliet of AquaResource Inc. presented, “*Conjunctive Models and the Assessment of Cumulative Hydrologic Impacts.*” The objective of the project is to understand the benefits of utilizing conjunctive models (models of groundwater and surface water interaction) in Ontario, which coordinates with Article 302 of the Agreement. Benefits of conjunctive modeling are that physical representation of all hydrologic processes will lead to more reliable assessment of cumulative impacts (water

Attachment “A”
JULY 8, 2010, DRAFT

takings, land use change, climate change), lows flows are well represented, water budgets associated with wetlands and other complex features are well represented, existing model data and models can be utilized and solution time is manageable. MIKE SHE is the recommended model because it properly reflects the influence of wetlands and hummocky terrain on recharge and is best for predicting ecological impacts.

Alex Mayer of Michigan Technological University presented “*Modeling and Analyzing the Use, Efficiency, Value and Governance of Water in the Great Lakes Region through an Integrated Approach.*” The objective of this multi-year project is to determine the impact of direct and indirect drivers on water quality, quantity and availability in the Great Lakes region. This project is studying various scenarios of population growth, climate change, land use and emissions, and analyzing the underlying factors affecting water use and allocation decisions. The project is also developing cost frameworks for capturing the value of having a specific amount of water available at a given purity, time and location. Current work involves studying surface water availability, groundwater availability and surface water quality.

Mary Khoury of The Nature Conservancy presented “*Principles of Environmental Flows in the Great Lakes Region.*” The first principle refers to the quality, quantity and timing of water flows required to maintain the components, functions, processes, and resilience of aquatic ecosystems that provide goods and services to people. The second principle focuses on equitable distribution of and access to water and services provided by aquatic ecosystems. Equitable distribution should factor in eco-efficiency, environmental stewardship, social progress, socio-environmental, socio-economic and economic growth factors to meet in the middle and achieve sustainability. These two principles, flow and distribution, place an emphasis on accounting for multiple benefits, indirect effects, coordinated and consistent approaches, and promoting efficiency, which all compounded should result in a higher standard. Ms. Khoury stressed that there cannot be a focus on only minimum flow requirements. Finally, as a whole we must learn from one another and lean on each other for solutions.

Lenore Keeshig Tobias, University of Toronto presented “*Geomythology and the Great Lakes.*” Geomythology is the study of geological occurrences and events documented in myth and legend. Aboriginal peoples were the first to inhabit the Great Lakes watershed and hold meaningful knowledge about the geologic history of the area. Their knowledge is embedded into their myths and legends, which potentially store a vast amount of scientific information. Using geomythology can provide new insight into geologic research, provide a model for the use of traditional knowledge and allow for a contemporary position for Aboriginal storytellers. The presentation highlighted how Aboriginal traditional knowledge can interface with western science and contribute to a greater understanding of the Great Lakes.

Henry Lickers of the *Mohawk Council of Akwesasne* presented “*Lessons from the Past – Solutions for the Future. Naturalized Knowledge System: An Old Idea Made New.*” Mr. Lickers stated that First Nations and Provincial government representatives have been discussing resource management issues for years and would like to continue the dialogue.

Attachment “A”
JULY 8, 2010, DRAFT

However, as of late there is a more structured “consultation” between the Province and First Nations as opposed to open and casual dialogue which can be as effective if not more effective. Mr. Lickers emphasized that the concept of “peace and respect” should be applied regarding how the relationship/dialogue between First Nations and the Provincial government should proceed.

Shaili Pfeiffer of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources presented “*Water Quantity and Ecological Impact Assessment in Wisconsin.*” Ms. Pfeiffer gave an overview of the water use program in Wisconsin. The objective of the program is water quantity management and sustainable water availability including public health, ecological health and economic health. The program was implemented in 2008 to adhere to the Great Lakes Compact. Ms. Pfeiffer discussed the importance of water use registration and reporting in order to assess cumulative impacts. Thus, Wisconsin developed a permit system in order to better monitor and allocate water. Individual water use permits are required for uses over one million U.S. gallons per day. Each permit contains the withdrawal amount, water loss monitoring and estimating, water conservation requirement and monitoring and reporting requirements. Limits are placed on location, dates, season, use etc. In addition, Wisconsin has developed a three-tiered approach to water conservation. Next steps include the revision of Wisconsin groundwater law, integration with existing programs and aquifer mapping.

Poster Presentations:

The session also had three poster presentations:

- Jim Nicholas from the U.S. Geological Survey prepared a poster presentation on a “*Great Lakes Basin Framework for Ecological Flow.*”
- Andrew Piggott from Environment Canada prepared a poster on “*Groundwater Discharge to Surface Water in Southern Ontario and the Great Lakes Basin.*”
- Fabio Tonto (formerly of Pollution Probe) prepared a poster called “*The Weather- Water Information Gateway.*”

Suggested Steps Forward:

- It is suggested that the Regional Body host a session once again focused on the information and science commitments of the Agreement at the IAGLR 2011 conference in Duluth, Minnesota; consideration should be given to including a panel discussion following the presentations.
- It is suggested that an analysis be performed of the presentations given at the Agreement-focused IAGLR sessions from the past four years. This will determine how the presentations may help to inform the individual and collective efforts of Great Lakes jurisdictions in meeting the commitments of the Agreement and the Compact.