

**LAKE MINNETONKA CONSERVATION DISTRICT
AIS TASK FORCE
MINUTES**

8:30 a.m., Friday, March 12, 2010

LMCD Office, 23505 Smithtown Road (Suite 120), Shorewood, MN 55331

Present: Herb Suerth, LMCD Board; Dick Woodruff, LMCD Board; Lisa Whalen, LMCD Board; Chip Welling, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR); Brittany Hummel, MN DNR; Tim Ohmann, MN DNR; Sean Sisler, MN DNR; John Barten, Three Rivers Park District (TRPD); Randy Lehr, TRPD; Dick Osgood, Lake Minnetonka Association (LMA); Dr. Udai Singh, Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD); Tony Brough, Hennepin County Environmental Services; Greg Nybeck, LMCD Executive Director. Also present: Thomas Lowe- a Carmans Bay resident; Rob Roy- a St. Albans Bay resident; M. Tucker- a Carmans Bay resident.

Minutes

The minutes from the 2/12/10 EWM/Exotics Task Force Meeting were accepted with two changes. First, the fourth bullet on page one under Task Force feedback was deleted. Second, the word "evidence" in the fourth bullet point on page two was changed to "reports".

No action was taken on the draft 2/17/10 EWM/Exotics Task Force Meeting to allow Welling to provide some updates to the four bullet point on page two under "Carmans Bay".

2010 Coordinated Herbicide Treatment Project:

- **Review of RFP II**
- **Review of quotes received**

Suerth asked for background on this agenda item from Osgood.

Osgood stated that two proposals were received in response to RFP II (Professional Lake Management (PLM) and Clean Lakes, Inc/Clarke (Clean Lakes)). An e-mail was received from a third vendor (Lake Management, Inc.) who expressed concern about the control of Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM) and curly leaf pondweed (CLP) based on the water temperature ranges spelled out in the RFP. He reviewed the PLM and Clean Lakes proposals in detail.

The Task Force discussed both proposals, with a summary of the discussion as follows:

- PLM:
 - On page one, the fourth goal should note that the survey work is compared to "2007" rather than "2008".
 - On page two under A2 (EWM), there seems to be a disconnect on the RFP requiring early season treatments for EWM and this should be clarified.
 - On page three for "Posting and Notification", there was discussion of what's required by state law and what additional steps for notifying the public should be considered.
 - Both non-guaranteed pricing (a total of \$92,721) and guaranteed pricing (\$112,176) was discussed.

- There was discussion on the use of granular triclopyr on Carmans Bay and whether it was consistent with the herbicide treatment protocol agreed to at the February 17th meeting.
- On Appendix A, a question was raised as to whether the CLP estimates for Grays Bay were from 2007.
- Clean Lakes:
 - On page 12, a question was raised as to whether the “General Instructions” was needed or whether it was a legal requirement.
 - The treatment of Carmans Bay was discussed utilizing liquid triclopyr vs. granular triclopyr.
 - A cost estimate of \$136,816.29 for the three bays was discussed (\$92,156.29 for the herbicides and \$44,600 for the herbicide application).
 - A request was made to clarify CRADA Research Investigation.

The consensus of the Task Force was that both proposals generally met the goals and objectives of the Lake Vegetation Management Plan. Since the proposal from PLM was significantly lower than the proposal from Clean Lakes, the consensus of the Task Force was that the LMA should consider awarding the 2010 contract.

Osgood confirmed that he concurred with the Task Force’s consensus and committed the LMA to the following:

- He asked the MN DNR to forward him language to be inserted relating to the State of Minnesota rules and/or statutes for “Posting and Notification” requirements. Although the LMA will not be the enforcement body, the LMA will require the contractor to abide by all laws, statutes, and permit requirements.
- Participating parties will be notified when the treatment occurs through “Posting and Notification” requirements consistent with Minnesota rules and regulations.
- Non- participating parties (although not required by Minnesota rules and statutes) will be notified by the LMA through the bay captains. This notification will include: 1) when the treatment occurs 2) what the restrictions are, and 3) when the restrictions have been lifted.
- Participating parties will also be notified when irrigation restrictions have been lifted.

MN DNR, update of flowering rush (FR) on Lake Minnetonka

Suerth asked for background on this agenda item from Welling.

Welling stated that FR was discovered by Patrick Selter from PLM last summer. This was confirmed by the MN DNR and Hummel spent a good portion of last summer with an intern on establishing current stands of FR on Lake Minnetonka. There are at least 57 sites of FR on nine bays, although a full-lake inventory was not conducted because of the size of Lake Minnetonka. FR appears to be well established in Lake Minnetonka. If FR were much more limited in extent

and abundance, he believed that a more aggressive control could be justified. However, he expressed some reservation in the control methods for FR because its elimination is very difficult based on past experiences. Baywide treatments for FR are not planned in 2010; however, grant funds are available to lake residents if it becomes abundant in off-shore areas that impede use.

Whalen asked why the MN DNR would not consider treating identified FR areas that are segregated from clustered FR areas.

Welling stated that the map establishes identified FR areas on Lake Minnetonka. A question remains as to the extent of FR, taking into consideration Lake Minnetonka as one basin. Generally FR grows in water depths between two and three feet, although it can grow in zero to eight feet. He discussed the differences between chemically treating EWM and FR, noting that treating EWM is much easier to manage. He added that identifying FR is difficult to determine because of similarities to some native plants.

Hummel provided further background on the fieldwork that she conducted in 2009 for FR.

Woodruff stated that he and Suerth had recently met with LMCD staff to discuss the 2010 EWM Harvesting Program. He asked Welling how the LMCD should handle areas with FR for mechanical harvesting.

Welling stated that the LMCD should stay away from areas that have established FR, which should be achievable since there is a map with GPS waypoints. A large amount of the FR is emergent and the LMCD cannot mechanically harvest emergent plants by permit with the MN DNR.

Whalen stated that these areas with FR will be impacted just as much by boaters, if not more, because of the props. She questioned whether it made sense to identify these areas with buoys.

Welling stated that this was done in the early years with EWM and was not really effective.

Hummel stated that she believed boaters would most likely fish from the edge of the FR because it is thick. Typically, the emergent FR grows in water depths of two to three feet. There is submerged FR, which is difficult to identify, and was not too prevalent based on the 2009 fieldwork.

Osgood stated that he believed it was presumptuous to believe that FR was confined to the areas documented in 2009 until a full assessment is done on a lakewide basis. He realized that a full assessment is a tedious, lengthy, and difficult process. In the meantime, he believed that it would be irresponsible to allow things that could further spread FR. Mechanical harvesting (public and private), boating, and weed rollers could accelerate the spread of FR and he believed that it made sense to control these activities until we have a better idea of the extent of FR on a lakewide basis.

The Task Force briefly discussed the recommendations of Osgood and believed that the majority of the concerns raised could be addressed in 2010. Some of the discussion included:

- Potential costs involved in conducting a lakewide survey.
- Permitting by the MN DNR for weedrollers is not allowed for emergent vegetation.

- The LMCD's EWM Harvesting Program will stay away from the established areas of FR, coordinating with the MN DNR on these locations.
- A number of these areas are within a properties dock use area (DUA), which the LMCD does not currently harvest. Private harvesting can be done within a DUA and the MN DNR can educate private harvesting companies on these locations.
- Current LMCD boat restrictions on Lake Minnetonka, in particular that the entire perimeter has a 150' shorezone restriction with minimum wake speeds 150' from the shore or dock structure.

Additional Business

Brough stated that Hennepin County was in the process of submitting a LCCMR Grant Application for an innovative public boat access design for the purpose of preventing and slowing down the spread of AIS. The first two paragraphs on page one provides background of the past efforts of this Task Force and he wanted to make sure that it was accurate and there were no concerns.

The Task Force briefly discussed this and no concerns were raised as to language in the draft LCCMR Grant Application.

Next AIS Task Force Meeting

The next AIS Task Force Meeting was scheduled for Friday, 4/9/10, at 8:30 a.m. in the LMCD office.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Greg Nybeck
Executive Director