

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|------------------------------------|---|--|------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Discontinue CHS | Yes | <i>Yes?</i> | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rationale | 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 |
| Additional RBT issues | 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 |
| Rationale | | | Not present in current plan | | | Increased knowledge for stocking justification | | | | | Angler harvest of KAM necessary to prevent introgression | | | More equitable catch |
| BKT comments/recommendations | 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 |
| Additional comments | 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