

PLIB Special Meeting Minutes – 2/23/11

1. All members present minus Arden Bawkey
2. Legal opinion in regards to acceptance of the late proposal recorded.
 - The proposal from ECT/LSSU will be allowed based on the opinion forwarded by Bzdok and Howard.
3. Presentations by lake treatment candidates begins. Note that each point along with accompanying questions and answers below have been paraphrased.

Firm #1 – ECT/LSSU

- Introductions and background of team members
- Brief discussion on various treatment possibilities which are dependent on what the Board wishes to achieve
- Explanation on how samples would be collected and analyzed (lake scan, survey method). Discussion on their methodology and why their system not only surveys current issues but also can act as a preventative against any other potential invasive lake species.
- Spoke about the necessity of a lake feasibility study in order to move forward with the SAD and treatment.
- This firm feels they are best suited for this project due to their years of experience, local staff support, science based solutions and personal commitment to our project's success.
 - i. Question (Chairman) – When can I water ski across the lake? Answer: Not this summer. The engineering study needs to be completed before the SAD can be created and implemented.
 - ii. Question (Chairman) – Can you guarantee success? Answer: Yes, for certain controls.
 - iii. Question (Paul) – Does the Board have input on the SAD? Answer: Yes
 - iv. Question (Cathy) – Will you work on the SAD first so we can make sure to get it into this years' taxes? Answer: It could be sooner than what was stated in our proposal. It depends on the Boards intent and plans.
 - v. Question (Elaine) – Is the grand total laid out in your proposal for the 3-5 year timeframe discussed or is it an annual fee? Answer: The cost is to the end of the study.
 - vi. Question (Elaine) – Two townships are involved with this lake but one has opted out of the treatment and the expense involved. Is that a problem? Answer: No, we have come across these situations before.
 - vii. Question (Cathy) – Do we need a certified limnologist? Answer: No, a certified limnologist simply paid a few dollars to acquire the certification. It does not really mean anything.
- The Board thanked ECT for their time and presentation.

Firm #2 – Lakeshore Environmental

- Brief introduction of team members
- Discussion on recommendations and solutions for Paradise Lake with a comparison from other lakes utilized.
 - 2,4-D is very short term
 - Weevils not given a fair assessment in terms of their growth.
 - No magic bullet as far as solutions
- Discussion on what will work for us and why
- Short presentation on the Laminar Flow Aeration concept.

- o Data shows a 1 or 2 time herbicide treatment will not provide more than a 1 or 2 year benefit in terms of reducing milfoil growth. Herbicides treat the symptom but it actually accelerates the deterioration of the health of the lake over time by building a compost pile at the lake bottom that feeds algae growth.
- Discussion in regards to biological augmentation.
 - i. Question (Elaine) – The wording “not to exceed” was not included in your proposal, does this apply? Answer: yes, it is not to exceed the initial budget
 - ii. Question (Elaine) – You had said that a chemical treatment did not work in Round Lake. Why? Answer: Bad weather and sediment absorption.
 - iii. Question (Elaine) - Is the cost for the laminar flow aeration system for the whole lake per year? Answer: Yes but the cost goes down after 10 years.
 - iv. Question (Chairman) – Between what dates does the aeration system work? Answer: April 1 to November 30
 - v. Question (Cathy) – Can fewer diffusers be used? Answer: Yes, a pilot area can be worked with.
 - vi. Question (Elaine) – If chemicals are used, how are fish, pond mussels and native plants protected? Answer Unclear
 - vii. Question (Elaine) - If it is determined that sediment loading is a large part of the problem on our lake, how do we handle that? Answer: Annual septic pump outs and community programs to help with sediment.
 - viii. Question (Cathy) - Is the fact that the Hebron Township side of the lake cannot be treated a problem? Answer: No, we would just need to know where the boundaries are.
 - ix. Question (Cathy) – How does laminar flow technology affect native plants? Answer: It will reduce native plants also.
 - x. Question (Elaine) – Are chemicals, weevils or laminar flow technology the only treatments you would suggest for our lake? Answer: Yes
 - xi. Question (Rosemary Consani) – What happens to the muck? Answer: It is dissipated through movement.
- The Board thanked Lakeshore for their time and presentation

Firm #3 – Enviroscience/Savin Lake Services

- Short intro
- Presentation started with history of weevils in our lake.
- Touched on lessons learned since 1998
- Discussion on the how they determined their proposal and that they understood it to mean treatment only, no studies. A treatment plan with a 5 year cost projection was submitted in response.
- Enviroscience will be in charge of all contractual obligations. Savin would then take on the role of treatment applicator and surveyor as well as assist with the SAD determination, permits, water quality analysis and sediment studies.
- Discussion on treatment timeline and overall proposal timeline in general.
- Discussion on the use of weevils as a long term solution
- Shared references such as Lake Isabella and Fife Lake
 - i. Question (Elaine): There is a new law on chemical application taking effect in April, what (if anything) will that do to your treatment plans? Answer: It will not affect treatment because Savin already follows the new proposed changes. We want to treat in the spring because water temperature and other factors optimize treatment.
 - ii. Question (Elaine): I understand that you guarantee your work, but for how long? Answer: 2 years

- iii. Question (Elaine): Have you ever had an instance where chemical treatment has failed? Answer: Not when applied at the correct rate
 - iv. Question (Elaine): What are the odds of EWM re-growth after chemical treatment? Answer: 100%. They will definitely return.
 - v. Question (Bob Roll): What is the application rate? Answer: 150 lbs per acre
- The board thanked Savin and Enviroscience for their time and presentation.

Firm #4 Progressive AE

- Short intro
- Discussion on feasibility study which they feel is an integral part of the process.
- Noted that decisions will be costly so it is imperative that the best information possible is utilized.
- The first step would be to compile existing studies, map the lake bottom and do a watershed study to determine the health of the lake.
- Discussion on how a vegetation study is done
- Spoke about an integrated treatment approach.
- Talked about the SAD process and how it is set up. Also commented on how the public hearings should be held at a time when most residents are here.
 - i. Question (Elaine) – Is the total cost in your proposal a “not to exceed” bid? Answer: Yes
 - ii. Question (Elaine) – Do we have the ability to decide which segment of the population will be apart of the SAD and is it possible to do a township wide tax? Answer: Yes to both and that is one of several options
 - iii. Question (Cathy) – How long from start to finish does it take to complete a SAD? Answer – It could be as soon as mid-summer
 - iv. Question (Elaine) – How will you proceed in treating only one of two townships? Answer: We can only treat the part of the lake that we can control.
 - v. Question (Elaine) – Would you consider any other biological controls aside of weevils for our lake? Answer: None that are commercially available.
 - vi. Question (Elaine) – Does the concept of a laminar flow aerator work in your opinion? Answer: Not well for rooted plants
 - vii. Question (Chairman) – Some people want to move fast, is that wise? Answer: There is a higher chance of being derailed if the process is challenged. If you move at a slower pace, there will be less mistakes.
 - viii. Question (Elaine) – When chemicals are used, where do you post the warning signs? Answer: The state requires every 100 ft of treatment area. Also a 7 day notice would be mailed to residents and there would be a 24 hour “no swim” restriction.
 - ix. Question (Elaine) – Can you tell me what chemical treatment would do to Eastern Pond Mussels if anything? Answer: The state would restrict what we can use if they are present.
 - x. Question (Chairman) – How long in the process would it take for us to discover what endangered species have been located in the lake? Answer: That would be addressed in the study.
 - xi. Question: (Cathy) – It has been rumored that you would recommend a whole lake Floridone treatment for our lake, is that true? Answer: False, this form of treatment would not be recommended for Paradise Lake.
 - xii. Question: (Cathy) – Have you ever worked with LIB’s to address septic problems? Answer: We work with LIB’s to get information out about proper septic system maintenance.

xiii. Question: (Elaine) – Is septic systems are deemed to be a large part of the issue, does the Board have any course of action? Answer: Very little, this is controlled by the State.

- The Board thanked Progressive AE for their time and presentation.

4. Public Comment

- Ann Hayes – We have had 1 year to work on this problem and I think you should move more quickly.
- Bob Smith – ECT and Progressive say we need studies before the SAD and I am proud that the work the PLA has accomplished over the years would assist them if chosen.
- Bob Roll – Nice job
- Chairman – In response to a letter the board received from Rosemary Consani and John Beeson, Jim stated that he never said that chemicals caused autism but rather there are environmental links to autism.
- Cathy Freebairn – Thanks to the PLA and FOPL for the snacks and help to make the presentations run smoothly.

5. Next meeting will focus on which lake treatment firm to hire; adjourned at 4:50 pm.