

2009 February 22

Hello All,

Thank you for supporting my recent attendance at the North East Aquatic Plant Management Conference in Saratoga. Steve Stubing joined me at the conference on Tuesday, and Eagle Lake project diver Amy Jacques was there for both days. I believe that Steve and Amy would agree that the conference provided the three of us with a wealth of valuable information. There were 130 or so participants mostly from the New England states with expertise ranging from DEC and APA representatives, lake managers/applicators, product manufactures, academia researchers and a few lake association folks like us. Highest on the list of presentations for me was the one about the successful 2008 treatment results for the use of Renovate on Saratoga, Waneta and Lamoka lakes. Waneta and Lamoka lakes are in the western part of NYS and have been battling a much more extensive infestation of milfoil for as long as EL. The lake/property owners association that represents these 2 closely spaced lakes has been involved in COLAM and many other organizational efforts for milfoil control. Those involved with the study and treatments of these lakes had gathered lots of historical pre-application plant data and the comparison of this to the first post application survey was impressive. In all test site locations in the treatment zone milfoil was greatly reduced or eliminated and there was no reported negative impact on native vegetation, in fact in a few locations there was data supporting the natives as doing better. There was however evidence of Renovate drift from the target treatment zone as some of the post plant survey sampling in areas outside the target zone also showed a decline in milfoil. Those areas however did NOT show any indications of negative impact to native vegetations. (This non-target area drift is one item that the APA has great concern with).

This information reports well for Eagle Lake and others in the park with milfoil issues, it however does NOT make it a cakewalk! I personally had some very positive conversations with Glenn Sullivan as well as the DEC and APA agency staff that will be involved with our current interest in obtaining permits for the spot use of Renovate on Eagle Lake. If measuring success is done in yards we are fractions of an inch closer to our goal (to spot treat some of the 50 plus patches with an herbicide). This does not sound like a lot, but this small fraction is one of the more positive indications that I have heard in many of my dealings with these folks over a very long period of time. Events over the next few weeks/months will provide a better indication of all involved parties intentions and interest in moving this part of the eradication process forward.

There are a few items that will drive the success of this process, one being an ability to cover anticipated costs. These are driven by the need for curtaining or creating a lake with-in-a-lake for any type of herbicide treatment in the Park (per the APA requirements). This curtaining was neither a requirement nor something that was used for the three lakes above and is NOT stipulated or required in the NYS product specific Special Label requirements for use of Renovate. The general and specific requirements for the curtains, their construction, deployment, and dye testing, etc. and specific site(s) for their use are among the biggest items for discussion and ultimate cost determinations. In the Invasive Species Grant we planned/anticipated to spend in the \$40,000-\$50,000 range for any/all herbicide related control. We have spent approximately \$10,000 so far on both the required plant survey and past efforts on permit completion tasks.

In my conversation with the APA rep. he indicated that both the recent permit document to allow hand harvesting/ matting in waters between zero and 2 meters (completed by "us", the town of Ti and ELPOI summer 2008) and the Supplemental Information Request (SIR) form for the use of herbicides were generated in anticipation of OUR project. (The SIR is/was already partially completed by Allied Biological, as part of our previous attempt of getting both DEC/APA permit information together. There were several questions that could not be answered and we had proposed a joint meeting to address these in Feb 2008. This meeting was cancelled with intentions of gathering some additional plant survey data on our part and the APA making some more in-house decisions for project direction.) The APA rep. also indicated that he has been in touch with several of the "interested parties" and while he has not been able to talk specifics with them because we have not provided our specifics to him, the feed back he has gotten indicates that all are supportive/ interested based on the concepts presented in the SIR document. He feels that if all of the requested information is addressed/provided the project will be supported. The SIR asks for specifics for

how pre and post plant survey(s) will be conducted, how curtains will be set-up, tested for leakage, etc. and many other details. (Some of this is already completed)

At the moment, having spoken with Glenn Sullivan and his staff, they believe that they/we can provide the necessary information to meet the SIR requirements. In discussing some of the specifics with regard to this project Glenn and I propose/believe that the direction laid out below should be taken. The approach detailed below will have significant costs associated with it for curtains and dye testing, etc. that are not or would not normally be imposed on others outside the Blue Line. In being the first in the Park, much more will be asked and expected of us. This project will be under everyone's microscope for inspection because of our location. The APA recognizes this, but believes that the information/ procedures that they asked for/ stated in the SIR would adequately address those microscopic review concerns. At this point I have been so much as told that it is expected of us to be the first. I am frustrated by having to say that the plan described below will only cure/ treat a small localized section of Milfoil and will be at a reasonably large cost. On the positive side there are 2 items 1) is that much of the costs for this overall project are/ will be covered by State funds as a result of the grant(s) and 2) the first successful introduction of the herbicide will likely result in APA and "interested party" review and possible changes in requirements for future treatments.

Working with Glenn the proposal for now is to focus treatment on one site, and that would be the crescent area between Route 74 and the back or south side of Fox Island. This area has seen an explosion in milfoil growth in the past year or two. This site also lends itself to being curtained from the tip of Hurd Point to the Island and from the Island back to the mainland some where in front of the old bar. This would capture most if not all of the milfoil in this area. The curtain length for these two sections are approximately 360-380 feet each, with both sections having the ability to be anchored to solid shore points (unlike the center lake patch which would require open water placement, with a questionable provision for anchoring). These two sections will still require several mid section anchors to keep them in place. The area contained by this plan would be approximately 9.5 acres and would capture/treat 6 of the 2003 GPS survey patches. Placement of curtains at this location would however present a hardship to those that have need for access to this section of water. This treatment area would also create water use hardships for several properties in the treatment area as they take lake water for domestic purposes, since there are some restrictions for water use during a treatment. If the treatment can be done early enough in the season both of these hardship could be minimal, but nonetheless will need to be addressed. Sequestering time for the treatment site for Renovate to break down to a level that is acceptable to the DEC and APA is in the 1 - 2 week period. This will be sunlight and weather dependent. In addition to the break down time a 1-week dye test for leakage determination will need to precede an herbicide application. This, plus anticipated set-up time, plus any need for adjustments for curtains, along with removal time, makes the whole process until time of completion in the 4 - 5 week range. At the moment any issued permit would be pending the success of the containment of the dye test for permission to actually treat with Renovate. An acceptable leakage value % has yet to be determined. I keep asking and working to get this established, but believe it will be better spelled out in the "plan for curtaining" asked for in the SIR.

As for the curtain materials APA has suggested trying to obtain "used" materials from someone who works with turbidity containment. I may have indeed found a source for this. (They are currently using a set on Lake Champlain for construction at the Crown Point Monument, their final disposition upon project completion is not decided; also, talking to a vendor of new curtains, they indicated locating a used set would probably not be a realistic process as they were pretty much shot by the time most projects were completed and transportation cost/ logistics /cleaning would probably not make their reuse favorable) I personally would NOT recommend using used curtains, since the construction of them includes a pocket at both the top and bottom for floats and ballast. Without cutting these open and thoroughly washing the inside along with the material in them there is no way to assure that any new foreign invaders would not be introduced into Eagle Lake. I have expressed this to both Glenn and the APA and they agree. Glenn however, has some used curtains that the curtain material has deteriorated on. The ballast and floats are in what is believed to be good shape (Glenn is willing to donate this material to us if we feel that we can use it). It will need to be taken out of the pockets and could then be cleaned. It would be possible I believe for us, at a cost for curtain material and the labor to construct them, to prepare new curtains using a material that is the same as or similar to the tarp material that is currently being used for the EL mats. I have gotten a sample of a slightly more robust form of this material and believe that it would be a good choice for this

application. We also currently have DEC permission to use this type of material for mats and I don't believe there should be issues with using it for curtains. Checking with DEC and APA would of course be required. A check with SePro to see if there is any concern about break down of the material in contact with Renovate will also need to be completed. I have not at this moment seen the materials that Glenn has and my ideas for reconstruction are just that, rough ideas. He is supposed to be sending me some pictures of the material he has for further planning. I am willing to make myself available to complete a reconstruction, if I believe that my ideas for this are something that will work.

In anticipation that a reconstruction of curtains using existing materials is not feasible, I did a web search for turbidity curtains and found several vendors that supply this type of product. From this search I gathered some "pertinent to us" information, and posted it on our website so that you can get a feeling for what this curtain material looks like. The link is [Turbidity Curtain information](#) I also contacted one of the vendors for a rough planning estimate; for two 400-foot sections of curtain with water anchors and tow/shore anchor bridles the cost would be in the \$20,000 plus range. This does not include shipping or any install/removal labor.

My plan is to start working with Glenn's staff in the next few days to put together some rough cost estimates for what lies ahead as far as;

- Permit document completion, submission, revisions
- Public hearing(s) (APA indicates these will most likely be necessary), notifications etc.
- Estimates for curtain procurement, either brand new or as a reconstruction
- Estimates for hired vs. local volunteer curtain deployment/removal labor (it is recommended that 4 - 5 people, one being a diver, be available to deploy/remove the curtains)
- Estimates for providing adequate in lake and on shore markers/ notification of curtain(s) and its navigation hazard.
- Plans necessary to minimize hardships for water use restrictions by those in the affected treatment area.
- Dye introduction and weeklong testing (it still needs to be determined who will be allowed to complete the dye testing. The equipment to complete this is very specialized and only a few are available in the US. SePro has or has access to one and is willing to rent it to Glenn, but if Glenn or his staff are the only ones that can use it the cost for them to monitor the water for a 7-day period could be steep. If we or better yet DEC or APA staff can run the tests this would of course save money)
- Herbicide cost along with applicator cost and follow-up monitoring
- Post application required follow-up plant survey
- Post application reporting

If cost numbers look in line with our grant anticipated expenditures, I will move forward. If they are grossly above what we anticipated, a different plan of action will be necessary. This might include seeking funding beyond the grant to cover the additional expenses or being content with the process of hand harvesting and matting. In any case much milfoil will be left in the lake and additional plans beyond this current effort will still need to be made.

In anticipation of the additional level of costs that could be associated with the above tasks, I stopped in to see Senator Little's aid Sharon Henderson after the conference. I indicated to her the optimistic thoughts that I had gotten from the Conference toward moving the herbicide part of the project forward. She was happy to hear this. We talked specifically about the need for additional funding to cover the costs associated with the use of curtains that were not part of the Invasives Grant. Her indications were that at the moment things are very much up in the air since Senator Little is in the minority party and the State is looking at budget deficit issues. I did ask that we be given consideration for funding as budget preparations for them take place. Her indication was that it would be a shame to not be able to move the project along after all this time for a lack of sufficient funds. We will of course keep in touch with her.

At the conference I had the opportunity to speak to one of SePro reps. about our project. They personally have been to the lake and worked with Wendy D. and COLAM in the registration of Sonar and the

considerations for EL and Lake George being part of the pilot project. When I informed the rep about the APA requirement for curtains the rep unfortunately shook their head in disbelief. I did ask, as SePro had offered to donate product and some additional services to the pilot projects proposed in the past, if they would still be interested in helping us with this project. There was no commitment from them but they did say to work with Glenn and to keep in touch with them as the plans move forward.

Now that we have a clearer picture of what we will be able to propose for a treatment, asking membership for their thoughts on the use of the herbicide Renovate is better defined. This will need to take place timely and again I can/will help take care of preparing information for this.

I will be at the Lake during the February school break and hope to be able to see both Town Supervisors. It would be my request of them to be co-applicants on all herbicide use permit documents. I am also hoping to meet with Brian Houseal of the Adirondack Council to continue to enlist their support of this portion of the project.

My head is spinning with a list of tasks that will need to be completed over the next few months that are associated with obtaining permits and making a possible treatment a reality. There is a hope that a 2009 spring date can be achieved, but more realistic would be for 2010.

I recently received notification from International Paper that despite the rough economic times they are still offering, on a more limited bases, their community Paper Foundation Grants. I've scanned their letter to us and have attached it to this letter. This year's application is being completed on line only. I checked out the link IP provided and found that Rin and I are both listed as separate contacts. I worked through a couple of pages of this year's application under my name, as the information requested was readily available in electronic format from last year's application and it was just a matter of copy and paste. Access to the information is password protected and the application is far from complete. I would suggest that you/we again apply for this 2009 grant. The funds received in the past have been used to offset membership communications costs (mailings and web page hosting), water testing (both through CSLAP and lake specific not covered in CSLAP), provided the funds to purchase the GPS unit for the completion of the 2003 milfoil distribution survey as well as allowed purchase of an underwater video camera to document the extent of the milfoil distribution on the lake bottom. (This year's video can be seen at [2008 underwater milfoil video](#)) Having completed several of these grant applications in past years with the assistance of Todd and Tonya C. I am willing to help as needed.

As a closing comment, quite a few of the conference participant's had or have been involved and many are still involved in EL's many year milfoil fight. They all continue to ask about and watch what is happening on EL. They all made it a point to ask me to say hello to all those on the lake that have also been involved, and asked how several of our members were doing.

I would offer that the above information be shared with the membership as a whole so that they have the background as to where this project is headed. I would also offer that this letter could be posted to the ELPOI website to make this possible.

If there are questions please feel free to ask.

Respectfully submitted

Rolf Tiedemann