

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Phelps Bay does not treat with herbicide any more				X												
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Consider contacting lake service providers to collect information on vegetation and herbicide management. Lake Service Providers report to MNDNR. They have delineation reports and issue permits. Contact Adam at Premier Harvesting per Nicole Stone- LMCD				X							X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Questions about the timing of information presented on the map of historic harvesting locations. EOR clarified that the map presented information from 2010 through 2018 and was based upon the information provided from LMCD.					X						X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Consider contacting Dr. Neumann to collect his information about Eurasian Watermilfoil in Lake Minnetonka.																
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	People concerned that there will not be opportunity for debate/discussion.												X				
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Recommend publishing an article in the local papers on engagement and the social pinpoint site. Information in articles and social media should frame the feedback we are looking for and be educational to help readers identify invasive species we are concerned about.											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Press releases should be scientific.											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Create a list serve to let people know when new information is available for input.											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	How will public-provided input be handled. Evaluate options for providing information using social pinpoint to target feedback. All information will be reviewed by the Administrator.											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Pictures of AIS species of concern should be on Social Pinpoint											X	X	X			
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Political nature of the subject is going to consume a lot of time and energy over the course of the plan development process. There will be many policy discussions that need to be held as part of the plan development process.													X			
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Using existing information, existing programs and research to evaluate the different management options the LMCD should consider. Not science from Lake Minnetonka specifically.											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	It would be good to present trends in aquatic vegetation densities and distributions and pairing it with vegetation management to see if there is cause and effect. How to articulate all of the factors that play a role in species representation (richness and diversity) to make the point that isolated management actions may not be a direct influence on these variations.				X	X						X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Will this Plan include a survey of aquatic vegetation? No, the consultants will use existing information to characterize past management activities and use social pinpoint to identify where nuisance vegetation is located on the lake. Meeting participant felt a vegetation survey would substantiate the information on social pinpoint (it would verify that what is being recorded is accurate).											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	the time consuming part of this effort is not the science- it will be the politics.	Eric Evenson												X			
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Will the Plan address invasive animals? We will build a Master Plan that includes modules for the imminent species (as defined in the scope of services). The Starry Stonewort Protection Plan and Emergency Response Plan is an example of what these modules will look like. The template will be set up so that new species can be added as needed.											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Need good lake-wide data- lots of gaps, need to prioritize data collection, sediment samples are needed where gaps exist											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	climate change suitability analysis would be useful to have in MP- note Curly-leaf response to climate change	Eric Evenson										X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Meeting participant asked if we were conducting a bay-by-bay assessment. No, the consultants are conducting a risk assessment of species that are not in Lake Minnetonka or in all of the bays yet. This will give the LMCD an idea of what to really be worried about.											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Again, meeting participants asked how the consultant will come to a conclusion (develop recommendations) without a trend line. Suitability analysis is going to give us a good indication. There are a lot of factors that play a role in the proliferation of aquatic vegetation including climate change, sediments in the bays.													X			
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Runoff affects weed growth- need to coordinate with MCWD and Cities to control fertilizer and other nutrients entering the lake													X			
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Need to understand effect of wastewater discharge points- excessive N will cause rapid growth of EWM											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Large support for lake-wide LID model.											X					
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	adopt a shoreline. Break shoreline into manageable units. He thinks LMCD is being wasteful of a huge annual budget. Rod and Gregg Thomas debated this for some time.	Ron Kern								X	X						
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Participants questioned the motivation for getting the Plan done in the next 6 months. Vickie clarified that the timeline was established by the desire to develop a Starry Stonewort Emergency Response Plan.							X						X			
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	It was also noted that the Plan would not address all comments. During the plan development process gaps me be identified that preclude the ability to address all comments. Comments that cannot be addressed may be reflected as next steps in an on-going lake vegetation and AIS Management process. If priorities shift over the course of the project, this may also influence plan content. In the end the LMCD will have more information and will be better informed in making future decisions.													X			
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	It has always been LMCD's intent to leverage partnerships in conducting lake vegetation and AIS management. LMCD cannot do all the work and the outcome will be better if more people are involved.										X		X				
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	Will the harvesting review effort as part of this project be used to make decisions about 2020?													X			
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	No preconceived notions on harvesting. He is confident there will be holes identified in the program. The harvesters are already paid for, the capital is already spent, it does not make sense to say we have to keep using them because we already paid for them. That just means more money spent.	Gregg Thomas - LMCD												X			
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	no harvesting needed in channels- boat traffic takes care of that by chopping it up.	Michael Mason															
Public Meeting 1	6/19/2019	weeds are a big problem this year. In past years harvesting in August is too late. He made the analogy of a snow plow clearing your street a week after a blizzard; by that time you have dealt with it too long. Transient users of the lake need to pay.	Martin Sundquist	X			X	X										

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Social Pinpoint		The weeds along the north shore of Cooks Bay are the worst we've ever seen. Is there a way we can address this next year. It is not possible to get our jet skis out and very difficult to get the boat out. I believe there was a treatment on Carmens Bay that was effective. Could this be considered for Cooks Bay		X			X											
Social Pinpoint		The LMCD was informed years ago harvesting is a poor choice. Think about it. Plants you have pulled apart intentionally or not likely became multiple plants. Harvesters are similar. Broken pieces equal potential plants. The surface looks clean, until floaters, but there are now millions of pieces floating below. Unless your aquatic weed eater collects every piece you are contributing to the problem. Harvesting and shore cutting is a mistake. Benefits only shoreowners temporarily, Not The Lake.					X					X						
Social Pinpoint		lots of milfoil										X						
Social Pinpoint		milfoil way to much and to thick										X						
Social Pinpoint		The lake was weedy and didn't catch many fish.		X								X						
Social Pinpoint		Is there going to be harvesting? Black Lake is really bad. The kayaks can't move.		X			X	X				X						
Social Pinpoint		Will there be harvesting this year? The weeds are really bad in this area.		X			X	X				X						
Social Pinpoint		Weeds are so bad. Difficult to navigate.		X								X						
Social Pinpoint		I do not want any harvesting, not even private contracts, to be allowed.					X											
Social Pinpoint		A significant amount of vegetation, both long strands and cut pieces, floating into dock area several times past couple weeks.										X						
Social Pinpoint		Vegetation growth is thick this year.										X						
Social Pinpoint		We find the lake weeds an increasing problem in Smiths Bay. We have a mix of emersed weeds on the inside of our dock area near shore, submersed weeds all around our dock, and increasing amount of floating weeds, which I believe are submersed weeds cut by boat props in the shallow bay that float towards us and get caught up all around our dock. It's really becoming a mess...		X								X						
Social Pinpoint		Looks like they've harvested! What a difference! Thank you! We are able to enjoy the lake again!					X											
Social Pinpoint		I Like LMCD									X							
Social Pinpoint		Much more milfoil than I remember running parallel to enchanted island.										X						
Social Pinpoint		Vegetation thick in the west side of Phelps Bay. Also noted vegetation growing dense in other areas as well.										X						
Social Pinpoint		Significant amounts of primarily two weed types, assumed to be milfoil and curly pondweed										X						
Social Pinpoint		a lot of vegetation in the bay										X						
Social Pinpoint		As of last weekend, there is a large tree branch that hangs over the Coffee channel. When boats are going towards Crystal Bay they try to avoid hitting the tree branch and drive too close to the center of the channel. I am not sure if the homeowner on the channel is responsible for trimming this tree. This has been a problem before 4th of July. The branch needs to be trimmed and unsure if the LMCD can help. Thank you!		X								X	X					
Social Pinpoint		Dense algal growth. 6/6/2019										X						
Social Pinpoint		The weeds this year are worse than I've ever seen them! #1-It looks terrible! #2-It has ruined our recreational water sports for the summer. We can't get our jet skis through the weeds without getting them clogged up with weeds, having to jump out into the weedy water and pull them out from underneath. Kayaking and paddle boarding are equally as difficult. Forget about swimming! The kids don't even want to tube or ski. Even the boat propeller gets all tangled up with weeds. It's a nightmare!		X								X						
Social Pinpoint		Channel off Lafayette Bay to West Point nearly impassable										X						
Social Pinpoint		Thick line of vegetation including milfoil										X						
Social Pinpoint		Thick vegetation along entire ridge across this entire bay making access to Upper Minnetonka Yacht Club and adjacent properties difficult.		X								X						
Social Pinpoint		Looks like a gator swamp										X						
Social Pinpoint		Vegetation growth is heavy- can you harvest										X						
Social Pinpoint		Eurasian Watermilfoil										X						
Social Pinpoint		Water is abnormal color and has no weeds. Is this due to chemical treatment.				X						X						
Social Pinpoint		So many weeds that my standup paddleboard rudder was getting caught		X								X						
Social Pinpoint		Worst year of weeds. We believe the decision not to harvest weeds in 2019 was a huge mistake and trust that you will consider and reverse that decision for the 2020 season.					X	X				X						
Social Pinpoint		We've spent a lot of money and time removing the lake weeds from our shore for swimming and to get our jet skis out without getting plugged up with weeds. Would like to see the bay being harvested and restored to a usable boating and swimming lake.		X			X											
Social Pinpoint		A lot of vegetation floating into shore this year.										X						
Social Pinpoint		Milfoil is bad in this area.										X						
Social Pinpoint		Football field sized weeds for 2 or 3 days. LMCD should harvest again.					X	X			X	X						
Social Pinpoint		Weeds are really bad this summer. Already removed five truckloads this past week. Not harvesting seems to have made things worse.					X	X				X						
Social Pinpoint		The weeds are usually bad in Cooks bay, but this is the worst year ever.										X						
Social Pinpoint		Harvesting this year? Vegetation is so bad that I can't get my boat out.		X			X	X				X						
Social Pinpoint		It is impossible to keep up with the floating weeds the boats produce. Lived here over 30 years and have never seen such a mess. In the past years harvesters would cut at least one time in the summer which would take care of the weeds growing above the surface in front of the docks.					X	X				X						
Social Pinpoint		Weeds should be harvested along southeastern side of Crane Island. It is a high usage area.		X			X											
Social Pinpoint		The LMCD did such a beautiful job in past years. My neighborhood and I are disappointed LMCD is not harvesting this year. I don't feel like I can even swim because it's dangerous with the weeds.					X	X			X							
Social Pinpoint		I am in favor of harvesting in Harrsions Bay					X											
Social Pinpoint		Milfoil										X						
Social Pinpoint		Milfoil yuck										X						

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Social Pinpoint		Lived here 22 years. This year was the worst build up and accumulation of floating weeds by far. I've always thought it was the water current along the point that kept weeds moving, but this summer I realized what a significant benefit LMCD harvesting provided. Please bring back the harvesters.					X	X				X						
Social Pinpoint		Weeds floating after private harvester went through.					X					X						
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Starry stonewort inspections should be all public & private boat launches	Eric Evenson		X					X								
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Need a list of all private accesses- these could be at some multiple dock permit areas	Eric Evenson		X													
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Who should take lead on AIS- MCWD makes sense but not interested, DNR is other option	Eric Evenson								X			X				
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Flowering Rush- harvesting spreads it, as evidenced in Detroit Lakes.	Eric Evenson				X											
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Need a way to have lake wide treatment of EWM	Eric Evenson			X	X											
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Need to identify where weeds are being treated and what species- plan for long term	Eric Evenson									X						
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	MCWD had a good plan for AIS- but no longer has interest in AIS	Eric Evenson								X			X				
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Federal CWA- does/should classify ZM as a pollutant. Since there are no native mussels left in the lake the ZM meets the definition as a toxic pollutant.	Eric Evenson									X						
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	State Law MN Rule 6820 states that all harvested plants must be removed- need clarification directly from DNR on this. Eric thinks harvesting is illegal. https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/6280.0250/	Eric Evenson									X						
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/6280.0350/	Eric Evenson									X						
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Channels do not need harvesting- need a definition of channel	Eric Evenson				X											
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Residents are the biggest beneficiary of harvesting- most boaters just go to open water and not mess with weedy shorelines	Eric Evenson	X			X											
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	A great role for LMCD is to collect cut and senesced plants. They need a collector, not a harvester	Eric Evenson								X							
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Minnetonka needs a Lake Manager- LMCD not currently in position to manage the lake, however it could be an LMCD staff person with the right expertise, scientific background, etc.	Eric Evenson								X	X						
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Lake Minnetonka is an huge economic engine	Eric Evenson							X								
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	See Dick Osgood's paper on watershed activities.	Eric Evenson									X		X				
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Funding base	Eric Evenson							X								
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Legislation to ask for more money	Eric Evenson							X								
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Reorganize as a JPA under 103B, 14 cities as a JPA	Eric Evenson							X								
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Lakewide LID- 2 more now 2 more coming. Is it fair for owners to pay for all lake users?	Eric Evenson							X								
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Petition projects to WD- LMCD does not need to bond- if WD says no they can just go to legislature	Eric Evenson							X								
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Is AIS control worth it? If EWM is cut the beetle cannot do its work. Bluegills also eat the beetles.	Eric Evenson											X				
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	Should we try to control invasive natives?	Eric Evenson											X				
Meeting with LMA	6/14/2019	The West Pioneer History Museum in Maple Plain has an incredible history of Lake Minnetonka. Everyone should go there.	Eric Evenson										X					
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM) was discovered in Lake Minnetonka in the late-1980s. This was a call to action for the community and its first and most enduring effort was the harvesting program. At the time, there were no feasible alternatives	Gabriel Jabbour												X			
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Harvesting is more commonly employed around the nation for invasive plant nuisances other than EWM (such as hydrilla and water hyacinth). Harvesting for EWM control is more common in the Midwest states, but only in a small percentage of EWM-infested lakes, and mostly small-to-mid-sized lakes. In this context, Lake Minnetonka stands out, so guidance based on other harvesting programs is either lacking or not applicable. A logical remedy would be to use the decades of observations and experience of Lake Minnetonka's harvesting program to focus its future program. Unfortunately, very little useful information or program metrics have been collected. Specifically, we have little or no systematic, objective information or data regarding: • How EWM or other matting plants interfere with navigation, safety, etc. • What plant species contribute to navigation problems	Gabriel Jabbour				X					X		X				
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	* Missed Opportunity – The LMCD suspended the harvesting program in 2019, which presented an opportunity to systematically evaluate how nuisance vegetation in Lake Minnetonka, especially in historically harvested areas, interfered with navigation or posed other nuisances, so an objective evaluation could have been made. The LMCD did create an 'express your concern' tool on their website. However, this largely anecdotal and, as of this writing, had received only: • One idea/suggestion concerning a fallen tree branch • Three suspected AIS sightings – all regarding EWM in known EWM areas • About 25 'excessive plant growth' notes • About 7 comments, and • One 'Something I like' – "I like LMCD" posted over the LMCD office location	Gabriel Jabbour				X	X			X				X			
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	The stated purpose of the EVALUATION includes defining aspects of a successful harvesting program, identifying the program's strengths and weaknesses, and recommend aspects of the program that should continue or be improved. As well, the EVALUATION will also identify short- and long-term quantifiable goals for the program. The EVALUATION falls far short in these regards. It is more of a program summary than an evaluation. Strengths, weaknesses and improvements are simple listings of harvesting in general rather than specific to the future needs in Lake Minnetonka. And the recommended goals are descriptive, vague and not quantifiable.	Gabriel Jabbour				X					X			X			
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	** Should the LMCD consider continuing a harvesting program with program costs projected to increase to \$358,000 per year (double current costs),	Gabriel Jabbour				X			X					X			
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	1. The LMCD's harvesting program has been in existence for three decades and this is the most substantial program evaluation to-date.	Gabriel Jabbour				X								X			

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	2. This program evaluation presumes that the harvesting program will remain in place and be substantially unchanged in scope. This is ill-advised because a) other techniques, technologies and strategies that were not practical or feasible in the early-1990s (when the harvesting program was initiated) are now available and should be evaluated for comparison, b) other nuisance plant management activities are occurring on Lake Minnetonka, so a more comprehensive management plan (which is being developed and harvesting could be an element) ought to include coordination with the harvesting program and c) in light of 'a' and 'b' above, it is likely that the harvesting program may need modifications in scope or scale.	Gabriel Jabbour				X									X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	3. The existing program's goals are to a) ensure safe navigation, b) retard the spread of AIS to other lakes (from Lake Minnetonka), c) reduce the biomass in the lake and d) provide an alternative to other AIS management methods (page 3). There are serious shortcomings with respect to evaluating the program. They are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Except for perhaps reducing biomass, the harvesting program has collected no data or provide no metrics to evaluate these goals. • There are confusing and conflicting references to whether the program focuses on milfoil, AIS-plants or nuisance native plants (or some combination). • Milfoil and other mat-forming plants are generally not unsafe for navigation, although they can and often are inconvenient. • Neither this program nor any other has evaluated whether or to what extent the harvesting program has reduced the spread of AIS (milfoil, AIS plants, AIS in general, ???) to other lakes. • If this program is providing alternatives, there is no evaluation of what alternatives are available, in what situations they are feasible, who they are available to, etc 	Gabriel Jabbour	X			X								X			
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	4. If it is intended that this evaluation is to be an element of a larger lake vegetation plan, it should be included in an evaluation of alternatives and a description of coordination with other programs. Pending that, this evaluation is incomplete or premature	Gabriel Jabbour													X		X
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	5. I assume this evaluation is intended to support a future program to manage nuisance plants (the Vegetation and AIS Master Plan). A serious flaw in the existing program as well as in this evaluation is the lack of measurable program objectives	Gabriel Jabbour													X		X
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	6. Navigation appears to be the main program goal, yet no efforts have been made to objectively or systematically evaluate whether, when, where or how nuisance plants are problematic or whether or to what extent the harvesting program has mitigated those impacts. How well has the harvesting program met a real need?	Gabriel Jabbour	X												X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	7. The existing program has been operated by non-professionals. Given the size, significance and visibility of Lake Minnetonka as well as the complexity of managing nuisance plants for multiple objectives, the future program must include a professional lake manager with day-to-day responsibility for evaluating plant populations, coordinating with permitting agencies, directing operational activities and evaluating program efficacy. The LMCD has had advisory committees, but they have had no specific authorities or critical, consistent oversight. This position should be a critical element of the future management program.	Gabriel Jabbour									X				X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Purpose 1 – talks about aspects of a 'successful' harvesting program. It is more proper to refer to an 'effective' program and program efficacy ought to be keyed to clear goals and measurable objectives.	Gabriel Jabbour				X									X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Purpose 2 – identify strengths and weaknesses – as with the comment above, strengths and weaknesses ought to be keyed to clear goals and measurable objectives as opposed to generally.	Gabriel Jabbour													X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Purpose 3 – refers to recommendations for sustaining or improving the harvesting program. I understand the Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation, is to be an element of the more comprehensive Lake Minnetonka Vegetation & AIS Master Plan. As such, an evaluation of harvesting as a tool for the overall management of AIS (plants) could include the possibility of suspending harvesting should other techniques and strategies be found to more effective at achieving the lake's overall AIS management objectives.	Gabriel Jabbour				X									X		X
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Stated program goals. Are to 'ensure safe navigation for lakeshore owners and the general public, reduce the amount of aquatic invasive species (AIS) available to spread by boaters and other means throughout the busy season, reduce biomass in the lake, and provide an alternative to other AIS management methods where they are not feasible or desired.' These goals are not evaluated.	Gabriel Jabbour	X		X	X						X			X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Section 3.3 Staffing. Nowhere in this section describes or refers to operational staff identifying EWM, curlyleaf pondweed (CLP) or nuisance native plants at or near matting conditions and thus in need of mitigation. In addition, nowhere is there reference to identifying protected plants or other AIS plants that could be spread by the harvesting.	Gabriel Jabbour				X					X				X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	The section describes staffing matters, such as equipment, training and safety. Numerous concerns have been raised – these are summarized in the appendix.	Gabriel Jabbour									X				X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Financial summary. This section provides and average cost of the harvesting program based on total acreages as provided in table 7 (\$514/acre). However, the total acreages include second cuts, thus these are double counted for a given season. For example, in 2010, 126 acres (33%) of the total 384 acres were second cuts – but the total acreage harvesting that year was 258 acres. On this basis, the average seasonal cost increases to \$765/acre.	Gabriel Jabbour				X				X					X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	The comparison between tables 7 and 8 estimates that continuing the LMCD's existing program with no changes will result in a doubling of the annual program budget. One would expect this would entail an explanation and justification, yet none are provided.	Gabriel Jabbour								X					X		

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Cost comparison. This assessment presumes that using a private contractor for harvesting operations will entail harvesting the same acreage as the LMCD's historical program. This assumption should also be evaluated in the cost comparison. This also presumes that LMCD's historical averages represent the totality of the navigation problems on Lake Minnetonka. Due to the limited harvesting season (mid-June through mid-August) it is likely there are nuisance areas where the large-sized harvesters cannot reach or there are areas where nuisances develop later in the season. Thus, this cost comparison is of limited value when expanding considerations to overall efficacy of nuisance control on Lake Minnetonka.	Gabriel Jabbour				X				X	X				X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	(Table 8) – The EVALUATION projects substantial program cost increases for the next 20 years, due largely to the need for equipment replacement. The projections assume no change in program operations. According to these projections, the average annual program cost will double to \$358,000 per year compared to current program costs (from table 7). On a per acre basis and adjusted for second cuts, the annual average projected costs will be over \$1,500/acre!	Gabriel Jabbour								X					X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	This section, Existing Program Evaluation, lists numerous program shortcomings, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program is 'reactionary' • "The LMCD does not have a clear plan ..." • The program does not use GPS – resulting in poor, imprecise operational data • There is no evaluation of post-harvesting efficacy • There is reference to areas where herbicides are prohibited, but neither the areas nor the prohibitions are detailed • It mentions that areas of frequent re-harvesting may be candidates for herbicide treatments, yet does not consider or evaluate herbicides This paints a damning portrait of a slipshod program. Worse yet, none of these shortcomings are proposed to be remedied in a meaningful, substantial manner in the EVALUATION. Instead, it is recommended the harvesting program be continued.	Gabriel Jabbour				X					X			X			
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Aspects of a successful harvesting program. This section lists 7 bullets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining realistic goals – but no meaningful program goals are included in recommendations. • Efficacy of harvesting equipment – it is unclear what this means. • Seasonality, frequency and duration of harvesting – Now much of this is keyed to seasonal staffing availability. This is not evaluated nor are recommendations included. • Distribution and abundance of plant species being harvested – This knowledge would require systematic surveys using qualified experts. No recommendations included. • Funding and community support – Agreed, but not evaluated here. • Public relations – No comment. • Accurate data on harvesting timing and location. No comment. This section as well as follow-up sections are weak and mostly lacking on specifics.	Gabriel Jabbour				X				X				X			
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Second advantage. States that herbicides allow plants to decompose in place and lowers oxygen. With the baywide herbicide program, there is an abundance of data refuting this – early treatments involve small, pre-emergent plants (so there is little biomass to decompose) and oxygen conditions are unaffected.	Gabriel Jabbour				X									X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Third advantage – For the reasons stated as well as LMCD-cited studies, nutrient removal is insignificant. So, this is not an advantage.	Gabriel Jabbour				X						X			X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Sixth advantage – Refers to 'perceived' environmental neutrality of harvesting and 'concerns' of toxicity. However, evidence supporting or refuting either is lacking, so this is an irrelevant, misleading comparison.	Gabriel Jabbour				X						X			X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Disadvantage four – Refers to by-catch, but rationalizes that a small harvested area poses minimal concern. More critically, other advantages/disadvantages make comparisons to herbicides. If herbicides have perceived impacts, the small area would be similarly of minimal concern. I am aware of no evidence of non-target impacts using herbicides.	Gabriel Jabbour				X									X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Disadvantages 7 & 8 – I am not sure these are disadvantages, rather a cost of the overall program.	Gabriel Jabbour								X					X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Effectiveness of control (#2) – The baywide herbicide program has practically immediate efficacy, as treatments are done before the plants have grown, so they are not problematic to start with.	Gabriel Jabbour				X									X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Effectiveness of control (#5) – This is accurate. However, we do not know what percentage of the harvesting program involves channels. This is a significant shortcoming of the program	Gabriel Jabbour				X									X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Effects on non-target organisms or ecosystems (#5) – States the potential for effects with herbicides. However, as herbicides are registered with the EPA and permitted by the DNR, it should be noted that any 'potential' effects are deemed acceptable by regulatory agencies.	Gabriel Jabbour				X									X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Case Studies (Positive Outcomes) Olson et al. 1998 – This study evaluated the impact of harvesting on the growth rates of bluegill and largemouth bass following mechanical weed harvesting and found a temporary increase in the growth rate of some age classes. However, it should be noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These increases were temporary. • The harvesting involved 20% of the lakes' littoral area in an aggressive and unusual pattern not used in Lake Minnetonka (see photos from the paper). This case is of limited applicability to Lake Minnetonka.	Gabriel Jabbour				X					X			X			

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Phosphorus removal by plant harvesting on Lake Minnetonka (2004) – This study found that harvested (and removed) plants accounted for 2-4% of the total phosphorus inputs to Lake Minnetonka. The study found “in the short term, removal of phosphorus through plant harvesting is not a viable water quality improvement technique” and “the long-term effect of annual plant removal on a large scale on water column phosphorus concentrations has not been determined.” Here too, a comparison with the baywide herbicide program would be illustrative. As noted above, because the baywide herbicide program aims at pre-emergent plants, they would not have had a chance to take up phosphorus and therefore do not present a potential contribution to the lake water. The study notes that phosphorus ‘mining’ from the lake sediments is a theoretical possibility, but which has not been evaluated.	Gabriel Jabbour				X							X				
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Bartodzeil et al. (2017) – This study evaluated phosphorus removal contained in plants in a small (12-acres), shallow (max depth = 3.6-feet) lake containing no EWM or CLP. This case has minimal applicability to Lake Minnetonka.	Gabriel Jabbour											X				
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Lake Noquebay Rehabilitation District (2009) – This is a section of a management plan’s goals, but it contains no evaluation of outcomes.	Gabriel Jabbour											X				
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	EWM as a Fisheries Management Tool (1995) – The link is to an abstract of an article in the Journal, Fisheries. The gist of the article is that EWM can be beneficial to fisheries in some lakes lacking abundant or diverse native plants. The article refers to cases where EWM infestations could be beneficial to fisheries and has no reference to or evaluation of harvesting or any other EWM controls.	Gabriel Jabbour											X				
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Overall – the positive case studies provide poor support for possible positive outcomes as applicable to lake Minnetonka.	Gabriel Jabbour											X				
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Case Studies (Negative Outcomes) Three cases are listed. Overall, they provide documentation of possible negative impacts of harvesting. On balance, while credible, these cases and concerns do not tip the scale against harvesting in Lake Minnetonka Three cases are listed. Overall, they provide documentation of possible negative impacts of harvesting. On balance, while credible, these cases and concerns do not tip the scale against harvesting in Lake Minnetonka.	Gabriel Jabbour											X				
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	Check the math – 346 of 5,850 acres is about 6% of the littoral area of Lake Minnetonka. The paragraph on this page also recommends identifying and protecting critical areas from harvesting. Areas with Flowering rush should also be included (see additional comments below).	Gabriel Jabbour				X							X				
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	The intro paragraphs recommend the harvesting program should continue and be evaluated as part of a comprehensive integrated management approach. This is self-contradictory. A future-oriented evaluation of an integrated plant management program should include, consider and evaluate all control elements first, then it can evaluate the aptness, efficacy and feasibility of individual elements next. For example, I can think of feasible and effective alternatives to controlling nuisance plants in 346 acres of Lake Minnetonka using contact herbicides, just as many lakeshore owners now do. At about \$150-200/acre per season, this is far cheaper (total cost: \$51,900 - 69,200 vs. \$173,430 – 2008-2018 average; or \$358,114 – projected 20-year average), has season-long control (vs. partial season), has minimal off target impacts (in the same way as possible negative impacts of harvesting), and involves no staff or capital equipment. This possibility has even been presented to LMCD staff by MN DNR staff.	Gabriel Jabbour				X				X					X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	On a more practical note, why would the LMCD consider retaining the harvesting program, including a planned purchase of a replacement harvester in 2020, when the projected annual costs will double (20-year projection from Table 8) but funding commitments to support this program do not appear to have been secured? This is especially noteworthy as the actual program costs have steadily fallen for the past 20 years or so. Goal 1 – Increase Transparency – I have no criticism of transparency, however this does not address the EVALUATION’s purpose and is not quantifiable. Goal 2 – Define and prioritize harvesting priorities – this makes sense. Let’s see them.	Gabriel Jabbour				X				X					X		

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>Targeted areas for harvesting, comments keyed to each of the 7 bullets in the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas where vegetation impeded navigation – ought to have a quantifiable metric to objectively determine. [Side note: there is confusion throughout regarding whether harvesting targets nuisance vegetation, EWM or ???] • Areas where herbicides are not effective. This requires additional evaluation into the underlying assumptions. There also may be alternatives other than herbicides (for example, hand-pulling or bottom barriers for which variances can be granted). • Areas where herbicides may be undesirable – again, re-check underlying assumptions. Herbicides are allowed and can be effective in swimming areas. Also, there may be other alternatives. • Areas with dense natives (plants) – Makes sense. Where are these areas? • Areas where there may be EWM hybridity and herbicide resistance – This would be more applicable to 'selective' as opposed to 'contact' herbicide. See previous comments on contact herbicides. • Areas where plants accumulate and can be collected – Makes sense, although there may be other feasible options. The final paragraph of the section on short-term goals recommends an individual with aquatic plant experience should supervise the harvesting operations. Further, it suggests that AIS detector training is sufficient to meet this qualification. I disagree. AIS detector training is not adequate training for this task. 	Gabriel Jabbour			X	X									X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>Native Plant Community Restoration is offered as the sole long-term goal. Again, this is descriptive and not quantifiable. While the sentiment is laudable, if it only applies to harvested areas (6% of the littoral area) its positive impact is 'minimal' in the same way as possible negative impacts of harvesting. To be meaningful, this goal should be applicable to the entire lake and weed management program (with quantifiable, measurable objectives).</p>	Gabriel Jabbour													X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>Flowering Rush</p> <p>Flowering rush (FR) has been in lake Minnetonka for a decade or so. It appears to be relatively slow spreading, but it is spreading nonetheless. There are two concerns with FR: 1) the possibility that mechanical harvesting can facilitate its spread and 2) an imprecise or incomplete knowledge of its locations.</p> <p>Regarding its spread, FR is a perennial plant that grows largely submersed until later in the season. While it reproduces by a number of mechanisms, dislodging and fragmentation of its rhizomes can occur due to mechanical actions, such as harvester cutter bars or paddlewheels. FR is practically impossible to identify in its submersed form, which exists at the time harvesting operations are occurring. It should be noted that other mechanical agitation (such as boat props) may also facilitate the spreading of FR. It is prudent to avoid known areas of FR in all cases.</p> <p>Precisely identifying areas where FR is growing requires intensive monitoring. As a recent example illustrates, a broad scale survey is likely to miss what a more intensive survey picks up. The two illustrations below provide a useful comparison. The first figure is a screen shot from LMCD's website of FR occurrences around Big Island based on "all documented locations (FR locations are indicated with pink stars)."</p> <p>Compare this with a more detailed survey conducted on September 26, 2019. Here FR, indicated by green dots, is seen to be distributed in additional areas around Big Island.</p> <p>Future harvesting operations, to most effectively avoid FR areas, should conduct comprehensive, more intensive pre-season surveys to have the best knowledge of FR locations and avoid harvesting in these areas (plus a reasonable buffer).</p> <p>There is evidence that harvested areas have overlapped with known FR areas. FR maps, copied from 2009, 2012, 2015 & 2016 are shown below:</p> <p>Here is the LMCD harvesting map from 2018:</p> <p>By comparing these maps, there are areas of overlap between the harvesting and areas of known FR, especially in Browns, Crystal, Lafayette and Smith Bays and around Big Island (harvesting maps from several earlier years show similar overlap with FR). As noted in the 2018 harvesting map legend, areas with FR were not harvested. However, fragments</p>	Gabriel Jabbour													X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>Floating plant fragments are generated by the harvesting operations. To my knowledge, no systematic study has been done to accurately know how or how effectively various mitigation efforts have been. Such an assessment should be included in future harvesting operations, and if found to remain problematic, effective mitigations methods should be identified and implemented.</p>	Gabriel Jabbour													X		

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHINCAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>Short Season</p> <p>The harvesting program has historically operated from mid-June through mid-August, sometimes with holiday breaks. However, EWM (and other mat-forming weeds) continue to grow and be problematic for navigation through September. Thus, harvesting operations miss about 40% of the boating season while navigation impediments are still occurring. In addition, due to the sequential nature of the harvesting operation, approximately half the seasonal treatment areas are unharvested until midsummer (about mid-July).</p> <p>In addition, curlyleaf pondweed (CLP), an identified nuisance within the harvesting program, often forms mats as early as late-April. So, it is possible that CLP matting and therefore navigational impediments occur for significant parts of the boating season prior to the initiation of harvesting.</p>	Gabriel Jabbour													X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>Large Scale Inefficiencies</p> <p>Due to the large size and complexity of Lake Minnetonka, logistics of harvesting are inefficient compared to other programs. For comparison, Lake Minnetonka's harvesting program cuts and average of 346 acres per season, including about 1/3 as second cuts. Thus, total acreage treated is about 231-acres. This represents an intensity of 77 acres per harvester per season.</p> <p>For comparison, the Minneapolis Park Board harvests about 180-acres in 4 lakes (Bde Maka Ska, Cedar, Harriet and Isles) using 2 harvesters, representing an intensity of 90 acres per harvester per season. However, the Minneapolis program operates from late-May through August and performs second and third (sometimes) cuts per season (compared to LMCD's 1.3 cuts per season), so they are achieving about 50- to 230% more control.</p> <p>Lake Minnetonka's size and complexity, which obviously will not change, renders the harvesting program inefficient compared to other programs on smaller lakes.</p>	Gabriel Jabbour									X				X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>New Invasive Plants and Spreading</p> <p>The Minnesota Aquatic Invasive Species Research Center lists 9 species of invasive plants not yet in most Minnesota waters in two categories:</p> <p>Species localized in MN but that have spread and caused high impacts nearby:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brittle naiad • European common reed • Flowering rush (now in Lake Minnetonka) • Starry stonewort <p>Species not yet in MN but arrival is likely imminent and impacts likely to be very high:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydrilla <p>Species not likely to be in MN but have spread and caused impacts in inland waters of other cold- temperate regions (likelihood of establishment in MN uncertain):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water chestnut • Yellow-floating heart • Cabomba • European frog-bit <p>If/when any of these (or perhaps others not now on the radar) should be introduced and become established in Lake Minnetonka, there is a possibility for harvesting to facilitate or accelerate their spread. This 'disadvantage' should be recognized in the EVALUATION as well as in future harvesting operations.</p>	Gabriel Jabbour													X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>Program Inflexibility</p> <p>The harvesting program has, and proposes to continue, with three harvesters operating on a truncated season over a large lake. This situation is not necessarily a critical limitation, assuming the harvesting needs are relative constant from year-to-year and these needs have been met over the years. However, neither has been objectively evaluated, so harvesting is done to the limits of the equipment within the prescribed season. Unless the program is evaluated and found to be a near-perfect match to the needs or if the needs change, the program will risk being inefficient, insufficient or not be well able to accommodate future needs.</p>	Gabriel Jabbour				X									X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>1) Your title "AIS Master plan" is misleading. The average uninformed person would think the only problems we have confronting us are milfoil and possibly starry stonewort. Equally as disturbing is the total lack of addressing prevention in the master plan.</p>	Gabriel Jabbour															X
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>2)The vast knowledge available to the LMCD from other agencies was not used, either to input, or in formulating this report. Having so-called committees such as TAG that met only once without any chance to assist the consultant in formulating their opinions.</p>	Gabriel Jabbour											X		X		
Letter to LMCD (Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation)	10/18/2019	<p>3) The issue of implementing the program and the qualification of the staff was to be addressed. There was not even an attempt to do so. As a matter of fact, that has a profound effect on the financial projection. Thus, making the financial projection greatly underestimated if the LMCD decides, as former Chair Green indicated, to run a professional program.</p>	Gabriel Jabbour													X		

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The Lake Minnetonka Association (LMA) feels the Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation lacks any useful information or meaningful guidance on how to implement a "professionally run" harvesting program.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The most glaring omissions of the evaluation include its failure to: - Define how it fits within the "Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and AIS Master Plan," - Provide measurable goals and objectives of the harvesting program, - Address the role that harvesting has on the spread of invasive plants, - Include a quantifiable assessment of the impact that almost 40 years of harvesting has had on navigation, - Define the parameters of where, how often, and when harvesting should be done, and - Explain why significantly less costly options are not recommended.	Eric Evenson				X							X		X		X
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan is lacking in specifics and thoughtful analysis of the existing program and is absent of any useful recommendations on how to improve the program. As such, we are lead to the conclusion that this was simply a multi thousand dollar effort by the LMCD to justify an existing, poorly conceived, and badly operated harvesting program.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The planning process excluded any meaningful opportunities for experts in AIS and lake management, stakeholders, the LMA, or agency staff to deliberate recommendations or to share insights or concerns about the LMCD's harvesting program. As a result, the LMCD has lost an opportunity to create a program with broad stakeholder and community support and which addresses concerns of lake residents and resource managers.	Eric Evenson				X						X	X		X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The LMA believes the Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation recommendations are not in the best interest of the Lake Minnetonka, its users, or its residents and should not be accepted until the enclosed concerns are adequately addressed.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan fails to demonstrate how the harvesting plan fits within an overall AIS management strategy for Lake Minnetonka. As noted at the beginning of this process by stakeholders, aquatic plant specialists, and LMCD Board members, the overall AIS management plan should drive the harvesting plan. Without first knowing the LMCD goals and strategies to control the spread of AIS it is unclear if the harvesting program would complement or confound those goals. This is clearly the cart in front of the horse.	Eric Evenson				X						X			X		X
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan fails to contain any guidance on where, why, and when the LMCD should harvest Eurasian water milfoil (EWM). Without this information the cost analysis, operations, and program effectiveness cannot be determined. It is unclear why the LMCD ignored the very basis of why this program was originally proposed. Neither does the plan evaluate where, or if harvesting has made a measurable positive impact on navigation on Lake Minnetonka.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan fails to address the impact the LMCD's harvesting program has on the spread of AIS and what steps are needed to prevent this from continuing. Early in this process, stakeholders and agencies expressed concern of the potential for the LMCD's harvesting program to spread AIS such as starry stonewort and flowering rush. The plan does not have any recommendations for harvester training or operational changes needed to prevent the spread of AIS.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan fails to identify lower cost and more effective options to harvesting. The plan states that harvesting is often higher than herbicides treatment. This has been confirmed by MnDNR and industry experts. The cost of treatment is half of the cost of harvesting and decreases over time. Additionally, MAISRC researchers and others have found that native plants are being restored in areas that have been treated.	Eric Evenson			X	X				X					X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan fails to give any guidance on ways to reduce the amount of Eurasian water milfoil and other plant fragments that are left behind after harvesting. It is acknowledged by LMCD staff, professional harvesters, and others that it is not possible to pick up all of the fragmentation caused by harvesting. It is well documented that fragmentation is the primary way of EWM and other AIS are spread. There is also good evidence showing the harvesting program contributed to the spread of flowering rush in Lake Minnetonka and concern that harvesting has a high risk of spreading starry stonewort across Lake Minnetonka.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plans fails to provide any direction on how harvesting areas will be determined from one year to the next. It is unclear why the costs and procedures to evaluate program performance and to determine where EWM should be harvested from year to year are not included in this plan.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan fails to provide an adequate discussion of personnel qualifications and cost, training, safety procedures, and equipment needs as requested by the LMCD Board in their 12/12/2018 resolution. The LMCD was provided an operations manual of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board's (MPRB) harvesting program. Given that this is likely the only comprehensive harvesting plan available in the state, it is unclear why it was not referenced in the LMCD's plan.	Eric Evenson				X					X				X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan fails to include any recommendations on staffing needs. It is unclear if the LMCD feels the program is understaffed or overstaffed or if staff has adequate training. It is surprising the LMCD feels experience with watercraft and watercraft operator permits are "preferred" rather than "required" job qualifications. The plan indicates the harvesting supervisor and seasonal help have "lake service provider permits." There is no evidence that harvesting staff have ever been permitted. While the aquatic plant specialists recommend harvesting be done later in the season when EWM is closer to the surface, the plan seems to support the practice of hiring seasonal help early in the season and ending the program in mid-summer. The LMCD has expressed interest in hiring AIS expertise. The plan gives the board an opportunity evaluate if the current staffing structure has the skills they need in AIS.	Eric Evenson				X				X					X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan fails to provide an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the current LMCD harvesting program. Rather, the majority of the material provided is a summary of the existing harvesting program or citations of research with limited applicability for Lake Minnetonka.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan fails to justify the expenditure of \$690,000 for new harvesting equipment when much less expensive, science based options are available that provide better short term and long term results.	Eric Evenson				X			X						X		

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation references studies that show the effects of harvesting lasts somewhere between 3-6 weeks and have found later season harvesting may have more beneficial long-term effects. It is unclear why the program evaluation does not develop recommendations based on this research.	Eric Evenson				X							X				
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The financial analysis of the harvesting program is based on an average of 346 acres harvested per year at a cost of \$512/acre. However, because the plan fails to address where or how much should be harvested, it is not possible to determine if it is cost effective to continue the program in house. Further, these costs assume the LMCD will continue to hire untrained, seasonal help. By first determining how many acres will be harvested and how often, the LMCD could more easily staff time and trucking and operational costs. A better understanding of the amount of acreage that will be harvested.	Eric Evenson				X			X						X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The cost comparison does not consider other options nor if it continues to make sense for harvesters to cut in the same areas as in the past or at all. As written, the plan is defining a problem to fit a solution.	Eric Evenson				X			X						X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	It is unclear why the plan does not recommend herbicide treatment. The cost of herbicide treatment is \$150-200 per acre – 1/2-2/3rd less than what the LMCD is currently spending. It would also reduce the amount of day-to-day management needed.	Eric Evenson			X	X			X						X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan referenced "boater safety" as a reason to continue harvesting. While EWM can hinder boating, it is unclear what safety issues are resolved by cutting. Concerns about harvesting spreading AIS, operator safety, and homeowner costs association with clean-up after harvesting were raised by several stakeholders. They should be added to this last and further discussed in this plan.	Eric Evenson	X			X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	Defining realistic goals So what are the goals? A thoughtful planning process should describe the goals, strategies, and costs for program implementation – this document does none of these.	Eric Evenson				X							X		X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	Efficacy of harvesting equipment The plan recognizes all of the equipment with the exception on one harvester needs to be replaced. It seems it is an ideal time for the LMCD to redefine program goals and determine if such a large public expenditure is warranted. Equipment is only as good as its operators. It is unclear why the LMCD does not list trained, professional operators as an aspect of a successful harvesting program.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	Seasonality, frequency and duration of harvesting Agreed, but the LMCD schedule of harvesting is related to when seasonal help are available rather than when harvesting makes the most sense.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	Distribution and abundance of plant species being harvested How often will this be done and at what cost	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	Funding and community support This should be done as part of the evaluation of the program. The LMCD has called stakeholders "bullies" and have been adversarial rather than working with those critical of the harvesting.	Eric Evenson				X						X			X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The following statements are misleading: "Harvesting takes the plant material out of the water so the plants do not decompose slowly in the water column as they do with herbicide treatment." Herbicide treatment will kill plants, preventing regrowth. Cutting encourages regrowth, leaving as much (or more) plant material to "slowly decompose in the water column." Arguably, treatments prevent plants from growing or returning the following year – so plant decomposition is moot. "Mechanical harvesting is perceived to be environmentally neutral by the public whereas concerns over the safety and long-term toxicology of herbicide applications remain despite widespread research and registration requirements that are enforced by regulatory agencies." So an uninformed public is cited as an advantage to the harvesting program? There are also public who feel the relative risk and benefits associated with herbicide treatments outweigh perceived concerns. There are also public who view the harvesting program very negatively. It's not clear why this statement is included in the plan.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The following should be added to the list of disadvantages of harvesting: - Potential to spread AIS. - Significantly higher cost as compared to herbicide treatment. - Fragmentation of EWM will continue to spread new plants in beaches and other into areas where homeowners are spending thousands of dollars to control plants though hand weeding or herbicide treatment.	Eric Evenson			X	X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan recommends that the LMCD continue its harvesting program. Yet, the plan does not specify in what form. Without an understanding of why, where and when harvesting should be done, it is not possible to determine if this should be done in-house, contracted, or if done at all.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from LMA	10/25/2019	The plan itself makes a better argument for a very limited harvesting program and makes a strong case that herbicide treatments have longer positive impacts and are more cost effective.	Eric Evenson				X									X		
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	The Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD or District) supports the LMCD's intention, as outlined in the agency's May 24, 2019 press release, to cultivate a "holistic and scientific approach to effectively address the current and future health of Lake Minnetonka", by developing "a dynamic and comprehensive plan."	James Wisker													X		
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	The MCWD wishes to again express significant concerns with the lack of clarity regarding LMCD's overarching goals with regards to its Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Master Plan (Plan), the process being used to develop the Plan, the role of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG), and the lack of coordination with agencies such as CWD that the LMCD has now written into its draft documents.	James Wisker										X	X	X	X	X	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	During the only TAG meeting, kicking-off this process on July 15, 2019, the LMCD received universal feedback from the members of the advisory group regarding the ambiguity and inconsistencies surrounding the Plan goals and process. This feedback was subsequently echoed in writing, by multiple members of the TAG.	James Wisker										X		X	X		

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	In response, the LMCD committed to providing clarity on these terms at a subsequent meeting of the TAG. However, leading up to the October 11, 2019 distribution of the Harvesting Evaluation and Starry Stonewort Plan, no additional meetings were held to provide the overarching clarity needed to effectively and meaningfully engage the LMCD's Technical Advisory Group. Moreover, the LMCD did not effectively communicate its intent to develop and release the Harvesting Evaluation or Starry Stonewort Plan prior to meeting again with the TAG.	James Wisker											X	X	X	X	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	The LMCD has been encouraged by the TAG to take a strategic planning approach to successfully map its involvement in AIS, by: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clearly stating its vision and mission related to AIS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gathering and analyzing all available information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Framing a range of strategic options <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Objectively evaluating those options with clearly established criteria <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transparently confronting the tradeoffs associated with the available strategic choices <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Making a decision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measuring, evaluating, and adjusting in a mode of continuous improvement	James Wisker											X	X	X	X	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	Both documents would be strengthened by the LMCD first clarifying its overarching strategic approach to AIS, clearly defining its objectives, and then using data and scientific method to evaluate options, before determining how individual elements might actually align within a "Master Plan".	James Wisker													X	X	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	For example, the Harvesting Evaluation notes that, "mechanical harvesting should be evaluated as one component of a comprehensive, integrated aquatic plant management approach." However, the document does not clearly outline how the LMCD's evaluation of harvesting fits within such an integrated framework.	James Wisker				X										X	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	More specifically, it is unclear how information was analyzed to support the resulting conclusions. Page 16 of 30 of the Harvesting Evaluation acknowledges that "the LMCD does not have a clear plan in place that clearly defines where and when harvesting should take place on a bay by bay basis", that, "previous harvesting efforts by the LMCD have not used GPS technology to map the path of harvesters", and that, "this has resulted in a lack of data showing acreage harvested in comparison with expended effort."	James Wisker				X					X					X	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	The document also outlines a compilation of issues with current harvesting as identified by stakeholders and the LMCD, which the report does not address, and notes that the contracted consultant has not reviewed or verified the issues.	James Wisker				X										X	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	Despite these statements the Harvesting Evaluation subsequently concludes that, "based on LMCD harvesting data, literature review, and financial analysis and comparison of the existing harvesting program, it is recommended harvesting continue on Lake Minnetonka." It is unclear how this conclusion was drawn, and no clear action plan is presented outlining how a forward facing harvesting program will address historic issues.	James Wisker				X										X	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	MCWD has no preconceived position on whether the LMCD should continue harvesting. However, this evaluation appears incomplete and lacks a broader strategic context.	James Wisker				X										X	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	While the District supports the overall intention of the LMCD in using a holistic and science based approach to developing a Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and AIS Master Plan, significant concerns have been repeatedly raised by the TAG regarding the ambiguity surrounding LMCD's overarching goals and the process it is running. These concerns have not been adequately addressed.	James Wisker												X			X
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	With that said it was a surprise, and of significant concern, to see that the LMCD has prescribed roles for the MCWD without meeting with the District or the TAG to discuss.	James Wisker										X		X		X	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	The MCWD urges the Lake Minnetonka Conservation District to take immediate steps to more directly address the feedback raised by the TAG, and to engage with the TAG to clarify its process moving forward. The District also requests that, due to the concerns raised in this letter, the LMCD remove reference to MCWD from the draft documents.	James Wisker											X			X	
Public survey to LMCD	10/12/2019	I am glad to hear that the LMCD plans to resume to harvesting in 2020. This year, when no harvesting was done, I saw the most cut weeds blown to shore, ever, and I have lived on the lake 30 years. By harvesting channels parallel to shore the LMCD will drastically reduce the AIS cut by boats, thereby improving boat navigation and reducing the biomass left to rot in the lake. I recommend that cutting be done twice during the season. I live on the lake at 4601 Island View. This is a busy boating area that spans from the outlet of Spring Park Bay to Phelps Bay. This area must be on the list to be harvested. It is heavily used by boats. I am retired, so if you need someone to report on vegetation growth in this area, I could be trained to do that.	Roger Stephanson	X			X	X									X	
Public survey to LMCD	10/23/2019	The draft Harvesting Program Evaluation includes very helpful comparisons of harvesting versus chemical controls and financial data for the harvester operations. The report states and its comparisons show that there is not a one size fits all solution for a lake as diverse as Lake Minnetonka.	Tom Fletcher			X	X										X	

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT			
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan	
Public survey to LMCD	10/23/2019	The Final Harvesting Program Evaluation should include a discounted cash flow analysis and use this as the basis for its per acre costs throughout the report. In its introduction the harvesting report incorrectly compares LMCD operated harvester costs of \$514 per acre to \$787 per acre based on a quote from one contractor. This is based on a historical analysis of 10 years of data with the only equipment expenditure being in 2012 for the noninsured portion of the replacement cost of a harvester that flipped over on the lake. The projected financial analysis notes that major equipment investments will be required in 2020 and provides projected and estimated costs for 5, 10, and 20 year periods. It is not appropriate to simply add cash flows in a scenario such as this. A discounted cash flow or Net Present Value analysis should be used instead to compare in house and contracted harvesting costs. For example over 10 years, which is most likely the appropriate time period for this analysis, the 2020 discounted expense using a 3% annual rate of return shows a nominal 2% savings at \$2,606,579 (\$753 cost per acre on a net present value basis) for LMCD operated harvesters as compared to \$2,654,361 (\$767 per acre) for contracted harvesters assuming the same harvest volumes. Over 20 years the discounted expense using LMCD operated harvesters is \$5,190,124 or \$750 per acre as compared to \$5,575,088 or \$806 per acre for contracted harvesters. Having a financially accurate comparison is important because the contracted option will clearly have relatively lower costs if the harvested acres are reduced significantly and provides much greater flexibility for prioritizing future uses of LMCD funds.	Tom Fletcher				X										X		
Public survey to LMCD	10/23/2019	The draft Harvesting Program Evaluation includes a Long-Term Goal of Native Aquatic Plant Community Restoration on pages 26 and 27 including discussions strategies to achieve this goal. It is suggested that this section of the final report include information on the experience on St Albans Bay where the substitution of chemical treatments for harvesting since 2011 has resulted in significant native plant restoration without any of the interventions that are discussed in the report.	Tom Fletcher			X							X				X		
TRPD response to LMCD	11/6/2019	Three Rivers Park District (TRPD) agrees that there is a need for developing these two draft plans. However, we are concerned with the lack of transparency and clarity throughout this process of the development of the draft plans. At the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) meeting on July 15, 2019, the LMCD received overwhelming feedback from the TAG members regarding the lack of planning and partner engagement. LMCD committed to clarify and improve communication, which was never completed prior to these draft plans going out for public review and comment.	Boe R. Carlson										X	X		X			
TRPD response to LMCD	11/6/2019	The ambiguity surrounding the goals and the lack of process makes it difficult for TRPD to provide meaningful comments. We are concerned the . TRPD is mentioned as a public partner to "collaborate ... to protect land and water for current and future generations" without our involvement ever having been discussed between our organizations. TRPD is committed to partner collaboration and the protection of our natural resources, but meaningful dialog must occur between partners to develop coordinated goals, effective processes, and to achieve success now and into the future.	Boe R. Carlson									X	X		X				
TRPD response to LMCD	11/6/2019	TRPD supports the overall intention of LMCD to use a science-based approach in developing a holistic Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and AIS Master Plan. However, TRPD leadership and staff have significant concerns regarding the direction and ambiguity surrounding LMCD's process, goals and strategies. The concerns raised by the TAG members have not been adequately addressed and TRPD is uncomfortable with the "Roles and Responsibilities" that LMCD has developed for TRPD without meeting to discuss further.	Boe R. Carlson									X		X	X				
TRPD response to LMCD	11/6/2019	TRPD urges LMCD to address the feedback raised by the TAG members and to better clarify its process moving forward. TRPD also requests that, due to the concerns raised in this letter, LMCD remove reference to TRPD from the draft documents until further dialog can occur.	Boe R. Carlson									X		X	X				
Greenwood Letter to the LMCD	11/6/2019	The Draft Harvesting Program Evaluation includes very helpful comparisons of harvesting versus chemical controls and financial data for the harvester operations. The report states and its comparisons show that there is not a one-size-fits-all solution for a lake as diverse as Lake Minnetonka.	Mayor Debra J. Kind			X	X									X			
Greenwood Letter to the LMCD	11/6/2019	The Final Harvesting Program Evaluation should include a discounted cash-flow analysis and use this as the basis for its peracre costs throughout the report. In its introduction, the harvesting report incorrectly compares LMCD operated harvester costs of \$514 per acre to \$787 per acre based on a quote from one contractor. This is based on a historical analysis of 10 years of data with the only equipment expenditure being in 2012 for the noninsured portion of the replacement cost of a harvester that flipped over on the lake. The projected financial analysis notes that major equipment investments will be required in 2020 and provides projected and estimated costs for 5-, 10-, and 20-year periods. It is not appropriate to simply add cash-flows in a scenario such as this. A discounted cash-flow or Net Present Value analysis should be used instead to compare in-house and contracted harvesting costs. For example, over 10 years (which is most likely the appropriate time period for this analysis), the 2020 discounted expense using a 3% annual rate of return shows a nominal 2% savings at \$2,606,579 (\$753 cost per acre on a net present value basis) for LMCD operated harvesters compared to \$2,654,361 (\$767 per acre) for contracted harvesters assuming the same harvest volumes. Over 20 years the discounted expense using LMCD operated harvesters is \$5,190,124 or \$750 per acre as compared to \$5,575,088 or \$806 per acre for contracted harvesters. Having a financially accurate comparison is important because the contracted option will clearly have relatively lower costs if the harvested acres are reduced significantly and provides much greater flexibility for prioritizing future uses of LMCD funds.'	Mayor Debra J. Kind				X									X			
Greenwood Letter to the LMCD	11/6/2019	The Draft Harvesting Program Evaluation includes a Long-Term Goal of Native Aquatic Plant Community Restoration on pages 26 and 27 and includes discussions and strategies to achieve this goal. Greenwood suggests that this section of the Final report include information on the experience on St. Alban's Bay where the substitution of chemical treatments for harvesting since 2011 has resulted in significant native plant restoration without any of the interventions that are discussed in the report.	Mayor Debra J. Kind				X									X			
Greenwood Letter to the LMCD	11/6/2019	If the LMCD elects to support milfoil and curly leaf pondweed control at its current level, it should not continue to make harvesting its exclusive strategy, since many portions of the lake are more suited to chemical controls.	Mayor Debra J. Kind			X	X									X			

Minnnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHINCAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Greenwood Letter to the LMCD	11/6/2019	The LMCD should be focusing its limited dollars on long-term strategies that have the potential for greater general lake-wide benefit. For example, page 5-10 of the Draft Starry Stonewort Report shows high probabilities of preventing starry stonewort introduction on Lake Minnetonka with a Preemptive Pilot Study and Bi-Weekly Surveys at priority boat accesses.	Mayor Debra J. Kind							X	X					X		
Greenwood Letter to the LMCD	11/6/2019	If the LMCD continues a mechanical harvesting program, it should be done in the most cost-effective, safe, and efficient manner possible. Evaluation of in-house vs contracted services should include all of the costs. And harvesting should only be done where necessary.	Mayor Debra J. Kind				X				X					X		
Greenwood Letter to the LMCD	11/6/2019	The LMCD should consider that operating its own harvesters with the associated supervision and staffing makes them into a substantial fixed cost each season with the tendency to operate them as much as possible regardless of whether they are the most effective option or best use of LMCD funds.	Mayor Debra J. Kind				X				X					X		
Greenwood Letter to the LMCD	11/6/2019	On page 13 of the Draft Harvester Program Evaluation it states that, "the cost for the LMCD to continue the existing weed harvesting program will incur substantial expenses in year 2020 due to the need to replace most of the existing harvesting equipment." Therefore, the LMCD should make a decision regarding in-house vs contracting for harvesting before the start of the 2020 harvesting season.	Mayor Debra J. Kind				X				X					X		
Greenwood Letter to the LMCD	11/6/2019	The LMCD should support and fund scientific understanding of Lake Minnetonka and everything that happens on and in the lake – including any AIS prevention / management program.	Mayor Debra J. Kind									X				X		
Letter from Orono LMCD	10/23/2019	The City of Orono recently revised the "Aquatic Vegetation Harvesting Program Evaluation Report," and disagrees with the recommendation of continuing harvesting. The report lacks scope related to how effective the mechanical harvesting has been at limiting or eliminating AIS weeds. The City of Orono's understanding of the reasons for harvesting are to reduce/eliminate invasive weed species, however this study focused on the effectiveness of organizational operations and LMCD Harvesting Program expenditures. The report has shown nothing related to scientific data surrounding actual quantities of AIS weeds pre and post treatment and from year to year, or whether or not there has been expansion or contraction of the AIS issues in Lake Minnetonka. Your priorities are clearly organizational focused and not mission focused. Even your LMCD strategic plan 2019-2020 is organizational and image focused with little emphasis on mission. The City of Orono is requesting a continuation of the harvesting moratorium.	Mayor Dennis Walsh				X							X		X		
Letter from DNR to LMCD	11/13/2019	1. Identify LMCD's current organizational goals pertaining to AIS management on Lake Minnetonka.	Keegan Lund												X	X		
Letter from DNR to LMCD	11/13/2019	2. Engage relevant stakeholders and identify their roles concerning AIS prevention and management.	Keegan Lund											X		X		
Letter from DNR to LMCD	11/13/2019	3. Review the existing AIS management plan that DNR helped draft with other LMCD AIS Task Force members in 2012 and identify the benefits and shortcomings of the previous plan, implementation problems and how it aligns with current AIS goals for stakeholders.	Keegan Lund									X				X		
Letter from DNR to LMCD	11/13/2019	4. Identify gaps in AIS prevention and management and resources currently available. Engage stakeholders in a more collaborative planning process to achieve agreed upon future goals.	Keegan Lund											X		X		
Letter from DNR to LMCD	11/13/2019	5. With clear and continued feedback from the Technical Advisory Group - plan, evaluate and refine your AIS Master Plan through an adaptive management framework.	Keegan Lund									X	X			X		
Letter from DNR to LMCD	11/13/2019	Strong relationships, clear understanding of roles and responsibilities, and excellent communication will be needed to produce an acceptable, long lasting and effective AIS Master Plan for Lake Minnetonka.	Keegan Lund										X	X				X
Letter from DNR to LMCD	11/13/2019	DNR would like to host a meeting to clarify the above concerns in relation to the creation of an AIS Master Plan. We would be happy to meet with the LMCD to provide a number of suggestions to support a coordinated and collaborative process and look forward to your response.	Keegan Lund											X				X
Letter from DNR to LMCD	11/13/2019	Concerning the Harvesting Evaluation and the Starry Stonewort Plan, we view these plans as complimentary to a broad set of lakewide AIS prevention and management goals. Therefore, we recommend pausing these supporting plans until the AIS Master Plan is developed. We feel there has also been limited transparency and coordination in the development of the aforementioned plans, causing potential weaknesses or gaps moving forward. DNR strongly suggests you engage stakeholders more effectively to share resources and responsibilities in both plan development and execution.	Keegan Lund											X	X	X		
Letter to LMCD (Lake minnetonka Starry Stonewort Protection & Emergency Action Plan)	10/18/2019	No one wants Starry stonewort (SSW) or any other aquatic invasive species (AIS). Unfortunately, the experience in Minnesota and elsewhere has been, despite the collective best efforts, AIS continue to spread. Sadly, the most practical management questions boil down to not 'if' but 'when' will an introduction occur, then what (if anything) can or should be done to eradicate, contain or minimize its spread and impacts?	Gabriel Jabbour								X						X	
Letter to LMCD (Lake minnetonka Starry Stonewort Protection & Emergency Action Plan)	10/18/2019	The PLAN is peppered with qualifying words and phrases, like 'speculative,' 'uncertainty,' 'difficult to predict,' 'unknown,' 'experimental,' 'theoretically,' – diminishing confidence in the assessment.	Gabriel Jabbour														X	
Letter to LMCD (Lake minnetonka Starry Stonewort Protection & Emergency Action Plan)	10/18/2019	In the introduction, the PLAN states, "However, it is important to recognize that these practices are based on limited information and experience on how SSW might spread in Lake Minnetonka's aquatic community."	Gabriel Jabbour														X	

Minnnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT			
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan	
Letter to LMCD (Lake minnetonka Starry Stonewort Protection & Emergency Action Plan)	10/18/2019	The two-prong prevention plan relies on: 1. Exit inspections on lakes with known SSW infestations 2. Incoming inspections on Lake Minnetonka Serious and significant shortcomings include: o The PLAN assumes knowledge of all SSW infested lakes – it is likely there are some lakes where infestations have not yet been discovered and it is likely more will be infested. o What about SSW-infested lakes in nearby Wisconsin? o The PLAN assumes inspections lower the risk of SSW (and other AIS) movement, yet we lack knowledge of how much lower is the risk (if any). Perhaps more troubling, data are presented in the PLAN showing Eurasian watermilfoil, zebra mussel and SSW infested lakes in MN and WI continue increasing despite increasing boat inspections. o The PLAN states a ‘likelihood’ of SSW being introduced into Lake Minnetonka and proposes an enhanced inspection schedule that still leaves many holes (in addition to the demonstrated lack of efficacy of boat inspections in the first place).	Gabriel Jabbour		X													X	
Letter to LMCD (Lake minnetonka Starry Stonewort Protection & Emergency Action Plan)	10/18/2019	Pre-emptive and Early Detection Options This section starts out by stating there are numerous prevention strategies available, but “few are practical and implementable.” Thus, to enhance the prevention steps from the prevention strategy, the PLAN proposes pre-emptive copper sulfate treatments at public access sites (2-4 times per season) at the 13 known SSW lakes. Serious and significant shortcomings include: o The PLAN assumes knowledge of all SSW infested lakes – it is likely there are some lakes where infestations have not yet been discovered and it is likely more will be infested. o What about SSW-infested lakes in nearby Wisconsin? o 11 copper sulfate treatments over 3 years have not eradicated SSW in Lake Sylvia, so will the proposed pre-emptive treatments eradicate SSW in the public access areas of the known SSW lakes? o AND – who will be responsible for and fund these treatments? The PLAN offers two additional methods – chemical/mechanical decontamination for incoming (to Lake Minnetonka) and outgoing (from SSW lakes) – but does not endorse either. Finally, this section presents a table (table 5) of various prevention methods and ranks their respective probability of preventing a SSW introduction as high, moderate or low, but provides no method or rationale as to how these probabilities are determined.	Gabriel Jabbour																X
Letter to LMCD (Lake minnetonka Starry Stonewort Protection & Emergency Action Plan)	10/18/2019	Rapid Response This element describes a generic approach and offers few critical specifics relative to Lake Minnetonka.	Gabriel Jabbour																X
Letter to LMCD (Lake minnetonka Starry Stonewort Protection & Emergency Action Plan)	10/18/2019	A single table with not description, analysis or supporting documentation is presented. The PLAN lacks an implementation element.	Gabriel Jabbour																X
Letter to LMCD (Lake minnetonka Starry Stonewort Protection & Emergency Action Plan)	10/18/2019	Again, a table with a descriptive paragraph that includes the statement – “Funding a comprehensive incoming boat inspection program will be challenging.” It contains neither provisions for nor funding estimates, authorities, responsible parties, etc. for funding amounts and sources for proposed programs on SSW infested lakes, a major program element.	Gabriel Jabbour		X														X
Letter to LMCD (Lake minnetonka Starry Stonewort Protection & Emergency Action Plan)	10/18/2019	This is not a plan that can be implement or will be effective.	Gabriel Jabbour																X
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	Similarly, the Starry Stonewort Plan contains a number of apparent contradictions that create ambiguity surrounding the objectives, and how this Plan fits into the LMCD’s broader strategic approach to AIS.	James Wisker																X
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	For example, the Starry Stonewort Plan identifies a primary goal of “preventing the introduction of SSW into Lake Minnetonka”, and identifies watercraft inspections as a significant strategy. However, the document then proceeds to outline that “inspection and prevention programs have not demonstrated a capacity to prevent the spread of AIS”, and that “watercraft inspections have to be effective to delay a potential new introduction.”	James Wisker		X														X
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	In parallel, the Starry Stonewort Plan notes that preemptive copper sulfate dosing at select Lake Minnetonka accesses is not a prevention strategy. Then Table 5, with minimal evidence or analysis, concludes that preemptive copper sulfate dosing at select Lake Minnetonka accesses provides a high probability of preventing Starry Stonewort introduction. It is unclear what data was analyzed to support this conclusion.	James Wisker			X													X
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	Again, understanding the broader strategic approach of the LMCD, and clarifying its goals, would help strengthen this document. Determining if the objective is prevention, delay, control, or public education, will drive what an effective strategic approach looks like and will guide tactical methods and resource allocation.	James Wisker																X
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	Most concerning with the Starry Stonewort Plan is that, without discussing with the MCWD first, the LMCD has defined MCWD’s role with regards to technical assistance, management and funding.	James Wisker									X							X
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	While the District supports the overall intention of the LMCD in using a holistic and science based approach to developing a Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and AIS Master Plan, significant concerns have been repeatedly raised by the TAG regarding the ambiguity surrounding LMCD’s overarching goals and the process it is running. These concerns have not been adequately addressed.	James Wisker										X	X					X
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	With that said it was a surprise, and of significant concern, to see that the LMCD has prescribed roles for the MCWD without meeting with the District or the TAG to discuss.	James Wisker									X	X						X

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS						COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT				
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan	
Letter from MCWD	10/25/2019	The MCWD urges the Lake Minnetonka Conservation District to take immediate steps to more directly address the feedback raised by the TAG, and to engage with the TAG to clarify its process moving forward. The District also requests that, due to the concerns raised in this letter, the LMCD remove reference to MCWD from the draft documents.	James Wisker										X		X	X		X	
TRPD response to LMCD	11/6/2019	Three Rivers Park District (TRPD) agrees that there is a need for developing these two draft plans. However, we are concerned with the lack of transparency and clarity throughout this process of the development of the draft plans. At the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) meeting on July 15, 2019, the LMCD received overwhelming feedback from the TAG members regarding the lack of planning and partner engagement. LMCD committed to clarify and improve communication, which was never completed prior to these draft plans going out for public review and comment.	Boe R. Carlson											X		X		X	
TRPD response to LMCD	11/6/2019	The ambiguity surrounding the goals and the lack of process makes it difficult for TRPD to provide meaningful comments. We are concerned the TRPD is mentioned as a public partner to "collaborate ... to protect land and water for current and future generations" without our involvement ever having been discussed between our organizations. TRPD is committed to partner collaboration and the protection of our natural resources, but meaningful dialog must occur between partners to develop coordinated goals, effective processes, and to achieve success now and into the future.	Boe R. Carlson											X		X		X	
TRPD response to LMCD	11/6/2019	TRPD supports the overall intention of LMCD to use a science-based approach in developing a holistic Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and AIS Master Plan. However, TRPD leadership and staff have significant concerns regarding the direction and ambiguity surrounding LMCD's process, goals and strategies. The concerns raised by the TAG members have not been adequately addressed and TRPD is uncomfortable with the "Roles and Responsibilities" that LMCD has developed for TRPD without meeting to discuss further.	Boe R. Carlson											X		X		X	
TRPD response to LMCD	11/6/2019	TRPD urges LMCD to address the feedback raised by the TAG members and to better clarify its process moving forward. TRPD also requests that, due to the concerns raised in this letter, LMCD remove reference to TRPD from the draft documents until further dialog can occur.	Boe R. Carlson											X		X		X	
TRPD response to LMCD	11/6/2019	We would be happy to reengage with LMCD in the near term to discuss future opportunities and develop a more holistic approach to this process. Staff have reviewed the draft plans and have specific comments on both and believe it would be better served to reengage the TAG to discuss these concerns and opportunities in more depth.	Boe R. Carlson												X			X	
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey		Q5 The Lake Minnetonka Conservation District (LMCD) has historically harvested (cut and removed) aquatic vegetation for navigation and safety. How would you rate the past harvesting?					X							X					
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	9/23/2019	2019 is a disaster. Horrible decision to not harvest this year!					X	X						X					
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	9/16/2019	2019 has been the worst					X	X						X					
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/31/2019	This year Phelps Bay was not harvested and difficult near our home on Tuxedo,					X							X					
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/6/2019	2019 no harvesting. Prior years very good.					X	X						X					
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/5/2019	Detrimental to the fishery					X							X					
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Seems like they harvest to much					X							X					
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	A joke. Very poor job. Ineffective because of the way they carried the weed to a truck. A lake barge would have been more effective incurring the weeds.					X							X					
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Waste of time					X							X					
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Making the weeds worse year after year!!!!					X							X					
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Ineffective at best, detrimental by creating more plants at worst					X							X					

Minnnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHINCAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/3/2019	Don't need to cut or spray. Horrible for the eco system				X	X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/3/2019	Haven't seen them in Black Lake this year					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey		Q6 How could the harvesting be improved?					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	9/26/2019	Use more effective harvesting machines. Current effort leaves & distributes 30%-40% (?) of wat they harvest					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	9/26/2019	do not do it!!!					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	9/2/2019	Root removal, cutting is making it spread!					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/12/2019	end it					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/5/2019	Less frequent					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/5/2019	Minimal benefits, spreads floaters)					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Utilize herbicides				X	X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Harvesters are terrible tat picking up what they cut. Instead the vast majority of what they cut washes up on homeowners shorelines for them to deal with.					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Don't use the weed harvesters.					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	More bays					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Dont do it at all . Just spreads the weeds that float to shore.					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	You could stop ruining the lake by over harvesting					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Remove and not just cut milfoil.					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Use a barge we're the weeds are cut to take large volumes from the lake vs driving small amounts of weeds to the truck					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Stop the harvesting. You are killing fish and their habitat.					X							X				

Minnnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHINCAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Quit					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Find a better method!! Stop DESTROYING our fisherys!!!					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	combine with chemical treatments				X	X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	After watching hundreds of juvenile fish go up the ramp in the harvester and no one sort them out and put them back there should not be any more harvesting!					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	By being combined with a herbicide or something similar to eradicate the invasive plants				X	X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/3/2019	Less.					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/3/2019	Pull weeds at the root					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/3/2019	Better clean up					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/3/2019	Keep channels open but I believe cutting machine spread invasive species and send uncollected weeds to shoreline.					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	7/16/2019	Pick up the plants you harvest					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	7/14/2019	Only harvest in channels if necessary it spreads the weeds and makes shorelines a mess					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	7/11/2019	Use all means available to manage beyond just mechanical harvesting					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	7/11/2019	use machines that actually PULL weeds from the bottom					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey		Q7 Are you aware that the Lake Minnetonka Conservation District (LMCD) has suspended the aquatic vegetation harvesting program for 2019?					X	X						X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	It seems this organization has ruined the biodiversity of the lake by over harvest of aquatic vegetation					X	X						X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Good					X	X						X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/3/2019	Yes. But have still seen harvesters					X	X						X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey		Q8 What type of lake vegetation control method would you prefer?				X	X							X				

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHINICAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	9/16/2019	Harvesting with follow-up.					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	9/2/2019	Prohibition of motorized boats would decrease further risk of destroying this ecosystem.		X			X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/5/2019	Diving/vacuum					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Magic					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Combo of chemical and mechanical				X	X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Get smarter					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	7/16/2019	Use of harvesters with herbicide treatments				X	X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	7/11/2019	Harvesting, biological, and lake depth manipulation (dam)					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	7/11/2019	mechanical, but by pulling roots from bottom					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	10/12/2019	Just to give a thank you to all those of you who not only recognize the extraordinary gift of our beautiful Lake Minnetonka but work to preserve it.												X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	9/26/2019	We really need a plan that works for AIS! Harvesting isn't the answer. It actually spreads it more.					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	9/23/2019	As noted above, the decision to not harvest this year was a big mistake, not only because of unsightly above surface emergent weeds in places where they've never been before, but also because of the time and expense associated with cleaning up floating weeds chopped up by boat traffic on our shoreline.					X	X						X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	9/2/2019	Please consider how good it would be for the ecosystem of Lake Minnetonka if we prohibited use of gas powered motorboats. Not only would it slow the spread of invasive species, it would also slow the pollution going into the lake. With less boats on the lake we can give the ecosystem a fighting chance to return to its natural balance. Thank you.		X										X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/5/2019	I am concerned with the private/service use of chemicals.				X								X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	I live in st alban's bay and the water has gone from an "A" to "C" this summer. Rumor is your are doing zebra mussel management testing. Is this true?												X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	The weeds on the lake are getting out of control. They get stuck in motors. I support safe chemicals to eliminate the weeds.		X		X								X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Too many wasted labor hours with 2 or more workers sitting at landings during non peak hours (call in help if needed). Wastfull spending on oververeach programs against homeowners. Don't for who pays the bills!					X							X				
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Wake board boat ballast tanks & Ducks and geese. Do not ruin this lake with poison sprays. Your harvesters do enough damage.		X		X	X							X				

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHINCAL CONTENT		
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Thanks for doing this important work																
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	All the poisoning and cutting has not done anything the lake is still full of weeds they are just different kinds of weed species Quit poisoning and cutting it is a waste of money The huge pleasure boats cut up tons of weeds when they are cruzin close to shore through the weed beds then they float which ever way the wind blows spreading weeds randomly based on the wind Ducks geese and other birds than eat weeds spread them naturally So many factors that can not be controlled				X	X											
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Allowing marinas to have unlimited boats in dry dock storage is a bad idea. Don't let Gabe bring you down!		X														
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	DNR has been TERRIBLE for Minnesota lakes!!! Blaming boaters for years!!! Chemicals, fertilizers and birds transporting from lake to lake make WAY more sense!!!!!!!! PLEASE FIND A BETTER WAY!!!!				X												
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	8/4/2019	Lake Minnetonka has always had weeds in it. Before it was dammed it had wild rice. The massive dumping of chemicals into a natural water supply is shameful and in the long run will have more negative effects than invasive species.				X												
Lake Minnetonka Vegetation and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Survey	7/11/2019	I've always wondered why there's so much emphasis on boat inspections at launches when water inside the water pump impeller and fairings can house aquatic invasive species. There's no quick way to inspect those elements at a launch so I don't see how those inspections can be completely effective.			X													
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	TAG Structure TAG's active members should be identified and have the authority to represent their organization.	Gabriel Jabbour									X		X				
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Jabbour noted that the data was incomplete, as many boaters – especially fisherman – avoided inspections.	Gabriel Jabbour										X					
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Data should be characterized to identify what types of lake users are typically represented by the MN DNR watercraft inspection data.	Bill Cook										X					
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Lakes with a constant inspector presence can still become infested with SSW	Keegan Lund						X									
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	In the early 2000s LMCD analyzed the different pathways of AIS transportation	Tony Brough										X					
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Starry Stonewort Plan should clarify whether all possible pathways of SSW transport are being considered, or primarily the pathway of boats entering via public launches.	Tony Brough							X								
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Plan should look at more kinds of AIS than just SSW.	Tom Frahm							X								X
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Periodic early detection surveys for SSW would still be needed.	Eric Evenson							X								
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Agencies pool money and invite private contributions to the fund to raise money for research on algaecides for SSW	Tony Brough							X	X							
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Include an analysis of the risks and potential impact of a SSW infestation in Lake Minnetonka, and compare those findings with LMCD goals for the Lake.	James Wisker							X							X	
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Once the table of roles and responsibilities was filled out, the LMCD could review where any gaps lay and what future roles an organization might take to address said gaps.	James Wisker								X							
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	LMCD should define the purpose for the program prior to review.	Eric Evenson								X						X	
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	If the LMCD hires harvesting operators, the LMCD should raise its standards for employee training.	Gabriel Jabbour				X										X	
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Training standards for maintenance personnel should be included	Eric Evenson				X										X	
Lake Mtka Veg AIS Master Plan TAG 1 mtg minutes	7/15/2019	Funding opportunities should be identified	Eric Evenson							X							X	
LMCD-Harvesting Program Review (LMCD)	11/18/2019	1. I was surprised to find out that we need to replace two harvesters, one transport barge, one trailer and the shore conveyor. Total amount about \$676K. I believe these replacement dates are based on the manufacture's desire to sell new equipment. I doubt our equipment needs to be replaced based on the small amount of maintenance required to get them running each year. But with these replacement dates provided in an independent report, this probably is the death knell of the harvesting program. Since we have about \$120K in our equipment replacement fund, we need to fund \$556K to replace and about \$50K per year for replacement. Report strongly suggests that when all costs are included, contracting harvesting is the way to go.	Bill Cook				X				X						X	
LMCD-Harvesting Program Review (LMCD)	11/19/2019	2. There is little in the report to help the Board decide on future program direction.	Bill Cook														X	
LMCD-Harvesting Program Review (LMCD)	11/20/2019	1. Is harvesting more effective at short term milfoil management than just letting boats traffic through and cut up the weeds? The LMCD harvesting program complaints suggest that harvesting cuts and fragments lots of weeds and then transports those weeds to remote unloading sites. this narrative suggests that harvesting is not as effective as the do nothing alternative	Bill Cook				X										X	
LMCD-Harvesting Program Review (LMCD)	11/21/2019	2. Harvesting removes some nutrients from the lake system, however the report dismisses this number without any calculations or science.	Bill Cook				X										X	
LMCD-Harvesting Program Review (LMCD)	11/22/2019	3. The anecdotal reports from the lake suggest that milfoil has reached equilibrium in a number of bays.	Bill Cook														X	

Minnetonka AIS/Lake Management Plan - Comments as of November 20, 2019

Compiled by EOR

Source	Date	Comment	Commenter	COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS							COMMENTS RELATED TO PROCESS					COMMENTS RELATED TO TECHNICAL CONTENT			
				Recreation	Watercraft Inspection	Chemical Treatment	Harvesting	Lack of Harvesting 2019	SSW	Funding	LMCD Role	Partner Roles	Data Collection/ Analysis	Stakeholder Engagement	Process	Harvesting Plan	SSW Plan	AIS Master Plan	
LMCD-Harvesting Program Review (LMCD)	11/23/2019	4. Have the chemical treatments affected the milfoil in down current bays?	Bill Cook			X											X		
LMCD-Harvesting Program Review (LMCD)	11/24/2019	5. A successful program should include the commitment of resources to provide about a level of 1/2 time manager/lake scientist role to manage the lake program and provide future direction	Bill Cook														X		
Meeting with Gabe Jabbour	6/4/2019	LMCD is not qualified for harvesting	Gabriel Jabbour									X							
LMCD AIS Task Force Meeting	5/11/2019	Waste of time and money, should leverage partnerships to get endorsements from locals	Gabriel Jabbour								X		X						
LMCD AIS Task Force Meeting	5/12/2019	Private contributions are key	Gabriel Jabbour								X								
LMCD AIS Task Force Meeting	2/8/2019	Others have said that LMCD needs its own AIS expert	Bill Cook									X							
LMCD AIS Task Force Meeting	2/8/2019	Concern is that LMCD lacks crucial information. The LMCD has developed an AIS management plan before, with the assistance of staff from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the USGS, among other organizations. Suggest LMCD seek the assistance of these organizations in developing the RFP and Master Plan	Gabriel Jabbour									X	X			X			
LMCD AIS Task Force Meeting	2/8/2019	Lund stated that he believed the MnDNR and the MCWD and other agencies lack the capacity to manage an AIS master plan for Lake Minnetonka. He underscored that the LMCD should hire a permanent staff person to fill this role.	Keegan Lund									X	X			X			
LMCD AIS Task Force Meeting	2/8/2019	Lund said that he was concerned that the consultant the LMCD hires will lack crucial background on Lake Minnetonka. He added that he was worried the LMCD would spend on an unnecessary plan.	Keegan Lund													X			
LMCD AIS Task Force Meeting	2/8/2019	Frahm noted that the exoerts for management of AIS and prevention of AIS introduction may well be mutually exclusive He said that prevention efforts without total control of private and public lake access would likely not succeed.	Tom Frahm													X			
LMCD AIS Task Force Meeting	2/8/2019	Lund stated that the LMCD needs to secure permanent capacity to coordinate AIS maangement efforts around the lake. He said that the LMCD should look at how other organizations fill this capacity. Lund added that it may not have to be a full-time position, but a long-term permanent position is necessary.	Keegan Lund									X							
LMCD AIS Task Force Meeting	2/8/2019	Jabbour stated that LMCD is short-staffed, and needs long-term capacity to coordinate implementation of an AIS master plan.	Keegan Lund									X							
LMCD AIS Task Force Meeting	2/9/2019	Evenson stated that the LMA has submitted applications to Hennepin County for a grant to fund starry stonewort inspections at boat ramps on Lake Minnetonka. He added that even if the grant is not awarded, the LMA board has already pledged to fund the inspections in full.	Eric Evenson							X	X								