

Summary of action taken by the CLPO Board regarding the weed condition during May, 2014.

The CLPO along with Princeton Hydro and Aquatic Technologies continue to monitor and address the necessary treatment of weeds in the lake.

On May 19th, it was observed that minor growth of the Curly Leaf Pond weed existed near the beaches and in a few areas of the lake. The lake had then been treated on the 21st and then again on the 28th of May to control the Curly Leaf pond weed utilizing contact herbicides. This treatment will take full effect in approximately 4-5 days after treatment and the weeds will yellow and drop out. As a result of the decaying weeds, you may notice “spaghetti like” stalks of the weeds wash up on the shorelines around the lake. Utilizing the Contact Herbicide method of treatment, we cannot treat more than 33% of the lake at one time. This is to prevent the possibility of reducing oxygen in the lake to dangerous levels for the fish from the decomposing of the plants. After approximately 2 weeks, as needed, we can treat the lake again with more herbicides and in more areas.

The management team will continue to monitor the situation and treat appropriately.

To put the weed issue into perspective, Stephen Souza, President of Princeton Hydro, CLPO lake management consultant wrote in a memorandum to the Board:

Princeton Hydro conducted our second shoreline survey of Cedar Lake on 29 May 2014. In keeping with our approved work plan, the purpose of this inspection was to assess the amount of weed and algae growth present in the lake. This inspection was conducted following the first and second round of weed and algae treatments, which were implemented by Aquatic Technologies on 21 May and 28 May 2014. As taken directly from the Aquatic Technologies service report supplied to Princeton Hydro, the following weed and algae treatments were conducted on 21 May and then on 28 May:

May 21 –

- Applied contact herbicide and algaecide to the beach areas and swim lanes to control the growth of nuisance vegetation.

May 28 -

- Applied contact herbicides to the entire shoreline areas of the lake, sailing buoys, swim docks and spot areas of mid lake.
- Applied to the areas per the request of the POA.
- Applied to control the growth of Curly Leaf Pondweed.
- Growth heavy/moderate throughout the treatment areas.
- Approximately less than one percent of populations has reached surface and has topped out.

In addition to Curly Leaf Pondweed, the 28 May Aquatic Technologies service report also noted the presence of the following plant and algae species in the lake:

- Bladderwort
- Bushy Pondweed
- Eurasian Milfoil
- Large-Leaf Pondweed
- Small Pondweed
- Sago Pondweed
- Watershield (water lily)
- Filamentous algae

As per Aquatic Technologies, on both 21 May and 28 May the lake's dissolved oxygen was 10.0 mg/L, its pH was 8, and Secchi clarity was 8 feet (all parameters measured at the surface of the lake).

I made my observations from five shoreline, publically accessible sites around the lake. It should be noted that in keeping with our approved scope of work I did not make any observations from a boat. As such, my comments apply to areas that could be inspected from the shoreline or from the swim lane docks, but not from any open water, central lake areas.

Overall I observed very sparse submerged weed growth at each of the five inspected areas, which included the western beach area, the swim lanes, the south-end boat storage area and locations along the south shore and north shore. I saw random clumps of Curly Leaf Pondweed, but these clumps were very small, scattered and very patchy. Some Curly Leaf Pondweed fragments had accumulated on the shoreline close to the western beach area, but all of these plants were detached. I observed four small stands of Large-Leaf Pondweed near the causeway, adjacent to the swim lanes, but these plants were well below the surface and of very low density. I also observed a minor amount of Elodea growth along the southwest shoreline. These plants were hugging the bottom and were not interfering with lake use in any manner. I did not observe any Eurasian watermilfoil (*M. spicatum*) in the lake.

Scattered patches of the Water Lilly, each approximately 10-15' in diameter were observed near the southern shoreline. These stands were mid-point between the southern island and the southern shoreline. Although not very large, these stands could affect swimming and perhaps boating, although it would be easy to maneuver a row-boat, electric powered boat or paddle boat around the clumps.

Filamentous algae was practically non-existent in any of the surveyed areas. The greatest densities of the mat algae were noted along the southwestern shoreline. But even in this area the mats were scattered and limited to within 2' of the shoreline. I did not observe any floating mats in any of the open water areas that I

could see from any of the access points. There was a substantial amount of pollen on the water's surface; at times people may confuse the bright green-yellow wind-rows of pollen for planktonic algae growth.

The cattail (*Typha*) stand growing along of the lake's northern shoreline was about the same size as I observed at the beginning of the month. As previously noted, this growth occurs along the segment of the northern shoreline that was treated last year.

I measured Secchi clarity to the bottom in at least 8' of water. The lake was clear but dark, with no evidence of any planktonic algae bloom. My overall assessment of the lake was that it was aesthetically pleasing and was not supporting any observable problem densities of weeds or mat algae. I did observe a significant amount of bass and sunfish activity along all of the inspected shorelines, with the sunfish actively patrolling their nests. Overall, with the exception of the Water Lily stands at the southern end of the lake, weed and algae growth in the areas that I inspected on 29 May were minimal.