



## MEMORANDUM

Comfort Lake-Forest Lake Watershed District

Date: January 17, 2023  
To: CLFLWD Board of Managers  
From: Mike Kinney, District Administrator  
Subject: EWM Management Considerations and Options



District Wide

### Background/Discussion

At the [January 12<sup>th</sup> regular board meeting](#), staff were directed to provide the board with five Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM) management options, a list of their pros and cons, and the recommended 10-year Watershed Management Plan amendments associated with each. Below is the list of five options for the board to consider when discussing the District's future involvement with EWM Management.

### Five EWM Management Options

1. **CLFLWD Does Not Manage EWM – No WMP Amendments Needed**

#### Summary of Activities

- District coordinates and pays for delineation surveys
  - Lake associations coordinate treatments (if desired)
  - CLFLWD offers no funding to lake associations for EWM management
- **Pros** – Aligned with current AIS budget, District does not get into managing AIS for recreational purposes, lake associations are free to manage EWM how they wish (within guidelines of the DNR's permits)
- **Cons** - District has limited control over management considerations and impacts to native plant health

2. **CLFLWD Manages EWM for Ecological Integrity – No WMP Amendment Needed**

#### Summary of Activities

- District coordinates and pays for surveys
- District coordinates and pays for treatments based on technical experts' recommendations and with ecological benefits dictating management needs.
- No grants available for EWM management through the District



## MEMORANDUM

Comfort Lake-Forest Lake Watershed District

---

- **Pros** – District assesses management needs and controls treatment acreage and approach based upon expert delineations and recommendations. Ecological health alone determines management needs.
  - **Cons** – Increased budget and risk of lake residents being dissatisfied with extent of plant removal (e.g., the District treated EWM in 2016, but lakeshore residents weren't satisfied with the amount of EWM that was treated)
3. **CLFLWD Manages EWM for Recreational Quality – WMP Amendment Recommended to Include Managing AIS for Recreational Quality**

### Summary of Activities

- District coordinates and pays for surveys
  - District coordinates and pays for treatments based on delineations to improve recreational quality outside of 150 ft. from shore.
  - No grants available for EWM management through the District
- **Pros** – District assesses management needs and performs treatments that balance recreational quality improvement with ecological health.
  - **Cons** – Increased budget, risk of dissatisfaction from lake residents, and setting a precedence of managing AIS for recreational quality
4. **Lake Association Grant – December 15<sup>th</sup> Approved Version – WMP Amendment Recommended to Include AIS Management for Recreational Quality**

### Summary of Activities

- District coordinates and pays for surveys
  - Lake associations select management approach and coordinate treatments
  - CLFLWD offers grants (up to max of \$15K - \$45K per waterbody depending on lake) through Lake Association Grant program and offers technical assistance to local lake associations.
- **Pros** – Encourage interactions between lake associations and District
  - **Cons** – Currently, no written limitations on treatment size and management approach. District staff can provide recommendations, but management decisions are ultimately left to the lake association.

5. **Modified Lake Association Grant Program – No WMP Amendment Needed**

### Summary of Activities

- District coordinates and pays for surveys



## MEMORANDUM

### Comfort Lake-Forest Lake Watershed District

---

- Lake associations select applicator to perform treatment on areas surveyed by the District's contracted expert (e.g., Blue Water Science)
  - CLFLWD would offer grants through the Lake Association Grant Program, but funding level would be based upon the ecological need of the treatment. Any treatment acreage beyond the recommendation of the District and its consultant would be funded by the lake association if they wish to treat more.
- **Pros** –Encourage interactions between lake associations and District, while ensuring management approaches are in the best interest of the ecological health of the waterbody.
  - **Cons** – Dissatisfaction from lake residents