

### Meeting 3. Migratory Species

	Save Lake Superior Association	Lake Superior Steelhead Association	Kamloops Advocates	North Shore Wholesale Processors	1854 Authority	Grand Portage Reservation	Commercial Fishermen	Arrowhead Fly Fishers	Lake County	St. Louis River C.A.C.	Trout Unlimited	Fond Du Lac Band	Independent	Isaak Walton
<b>Discontinue CHS</b>	Yes	<i>Yes?</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Rationale</b>	Natural reproduction is occurring; Program too expensive	<i>Not productive</i>	Returns to low	Exotic that the lake can't support	Natural reproduction; Non native shouldn't be focus	Not native; compete with other species CBKT	Should be discontinued	Cost too high	Desirable spp; Conspiracy to discontinue; Equal effort with STT	Poor benefit/cost ratio	High cost, poor survival, no need with natural reproduction; Need to honor agreement	Criteria for discontinuing have been met; Waste of money; CHS lakewide-a success	CHS is non-native; natural reproduction is occurring	Not cost effective
<b>Additional RBT issues</b>	Habitat protection; E. Split R early stages of Poplar-like degradation	<i>Additional comments to follow</i>	Criteria/timeframe for STT success			Look at KAM STT introgression; Examine future economic value of RBT fishery		None; Plan is working		Choose either KAM or STT if noncompatible; Or reproductive isolation of KAM and STT; Timing through selective breeding	Prioritize STT streams for protection and restoration; Genetic monitoring of STTstocking/KAM influence; Monitor for KAM introgression, eliminate if shown; Criteria for resumption of STT harvest; STT sanctuaries tied to no KAM stocking	Criteria for harvest of STT; Shouldn't use rehabilitate w/exotic STT		More emphasis on C&R; Make it illegal to give away CRBT; CRBT limit to 2
<b>Rationale</b>			Not present in current plan			Increased knowledge for stocking justification					Angler harvest of KAM necessary to prevent introgression			More equitable catch
<b>BKT comments/recommendations</b>	Educate anglers; Stocking; Restrictive gear; Native spp should take priority	Continue to monitor and evaluate tribal efforts			Habitat focus; Study genetics; Viability of restoration; Support native spp restoration	Increase spring fry stocking and supplement with yearling stocking; It is a native species		Stock if conditions are favorable; Ground water poor shoreline; Need to improve watershed	Not concerned; Too costly; Will not be harvestable	BKT habitat very limited; Where habitat exists, attempt BKT establishment; Need to increase ground water habitat	Education and enforcement of current regs; Identify and protect critical habitat	Why allow harvest of any BKT? ; More effort towards rehab of BKT ; Complete protection for exotic STT; BKT is a native spp	BKT is native; Work to establish self-sustaining population that supports C&R.	C&R for BKT; Spawning sanctuary on two tribes; Speed results
<b>Additional comments</b>	Mercury reduction; Designate more trout streams; Independent study of exotic salmonid impact on native spp in LS	MN tribes seem to be poor quality for BKT	Commercial incidental tags; Use CHS space for KAM	Incidental tag for CHS	Augment sturgeon and whitefish	Manage watersheds			Need to actively manage these spp	RBS are bad for TLC	Focus on watershed protection	Opposed to opening St. Louis to CHS		Control water quality from cities and marinas

*Comments in italics indicate position communicated, but not recorded in the issue response*