

AMSTON LAKE DISTRICT
Weed Committee Meeting Minutes
March 25, 2024 7:00 P.M.
Zoom

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: F. Hoisl, B. Pelegano, T. Angelucci, B. Lederer, J. Waleszczyk, D. Keith, K. Rustico

Absent: J. Caines

C. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes (February 19)

- a. Meeting minutes approved as written with additional comments under the discussion portion of the motion. These additional comments will become part of the March 25 meeting minutes to be considered. (Brandon/Barbara)
- b. Discussion on Feb 19 minutes
 - b.i. Duncan questioned the referenced estimated growth rate of weeds 1ft/year in 2002 lake report. Could not find that reference within the report asked for more specifics.
 - b.ii. Duncan wanted to clarify the statement made that nothing had been done to address the weed growth in Lollipop cove. In August 2003 there was extensive hydro-raking in lollipop cove, 2007 there was hand pulling by resident volunteers of water shield and water lilies. Results were short lived. In Sept 2008, liquid glyphosate (Rodeo) was applied to lollipop and Francis cove and again in 2010. In Nov 2010, Northeast cove was dredged with 140 yards of sediment removed. In all these cases the plants returned and it was not successful.
 - b.iii. Duncan referenced the minutes comment made that “20 years latter you can see how the prediction has become reality” (that lollipop cove is overcome with weeds) The annual reports of 2017-2023 do not mention the cove weeds being an area of concern. 2024 report indicates aquatic plant community impressive in its composition and diversity and is an ecological asset to the lake likely contributes to favorable water conditions enjoyed by residents and recreational users.
 - b.iv. Duncan referenced, “...the fact that leaves and lake debris tend to be blown into them(coves)causing “perfect” growing conditions”. In Duncan’s review of the annual reports they consistently indicated that stormwater runoff is primary cause of high phosphorus and nitrogen.
 - b.v. Duncan referenced minutes sections: “how do we recover navigable waters in the coves where the shoreline is no longer available”. “DASH, hydro-raking and hand pulling have been suggested as low impact options to weed removal by lake limnologists, how do we investigate if those tools are suitable for our concerns”. Duncan references in the 2005 annual report page 23, indicated that after the 2003 hydro-raking of the cove the water shield has expanded covering most of the western side of the cove, under this water shield was found many beneficial aquatic plants including robins pond weed and carpet arrowhead the presence of these beneficial weeds indicate hydro raking is not an option for water shed control or weed

removal in this area.

- b.vi. Duncan referenced that in the 2024 Milfoil report indicated that health diverse aquatic native plants are key to pushing milfoil out and have most likely slowed the spread so far. Invasive aquatic plants are quicker to colonize than native plants so it is important to keep native aquatic plants intact in as much of the lake as possible to crowd out the milfoil.

D. Review of Cove Weed Status

a. Review questions received

The following questions were received from the committee member and they were reviewed during this meeting. It was agreed to have each committee member vote for their top 3-4 questions and then provide that information back to Frank. He will consolidate the voting and provide the final questions to the committee. Goal is to send the final consolidated questions to GZA within the next week and request that they provide an estimate to answer. Please vote on your questions and get back to Frank by Friday.

1. At the current rate of weed growth around the Duck Pond dam and the cove areas is the lake in danger of becoming a marsh and or land?
2. What have other lakes done to irradiate some of their weeds and some best practices.
3. As we approach the nice weather what can we do right now to cut down on the weed impact?
4. What are the risks and benefits of these certain strategies or methods?
5. Who is the biggest competitor of yours and can we get a second opinion?
6. Does the state of the aquatic plant community in Lollipop cove present a current or anticipated threat to Amston Lake and if so, to quantify the threat and propose solutions.
7. If we were to address weed growth on our lakes, what are the 2 best techniques or approaches to not harm the health of the lake and who would you suggest we reach out to?
8. As it relates to Lollipop cove bend and Duck Pond, we see land encroaching into the water what is the best technique to reclaim our water body?
 1. As it relates to the lollipop cove bend and the Duck Pond with land encroaching, since it is technically an inlet for three water sources into the lake, and the outlet on the other end, could land mass growing wider into the lake create issues with additional dirt and debris to keep flowing into the lake filling that area in (lollipop) and could the water ultimately get dammed up and spill over the roadway onto Deepwood Drive or referring to the other side of the lake onto the beach parking lot or surrounding streets at Duckpond?
9. As it relate to nuisance weeds what is the most effective and safe way to reduce some but not eradicate them?
10. The LH committee indicated 10 to 20% weeds is acceptable in the lake, with a water body of 180 acres and the shallow depth is it GZA's professional opinion that we could allow 36 acres of weed growth and not be considered an issue?
 1. If prior question is "yes" what is the cost impact to then begin removing weeds when we hit that limit and what would their recommendations be at that time to do so?
11. Has GZA ever worked with any other lake association to reduce weeds and if so, which lakes and what If we were to ask them to assist with the reduction of nuisance weeds and maintain health of lake, what would they suggest? What was the cost and outcome and details?
12. Could the pond weed coverage ultimately aid in the hiding of milfoil and other problematic weeds?

Discussion:

Suggested to remove question 5 from voting.

The committee is not requesting a removal of all the weeds from the lake, we understand that would be detrimental to lake health.

The committee is just trying to understand what could be done in particular areas within the lake that residents have found the weeds to be detrimental in lake enjoyment, swimming, boating, etc.

Healthy plant population is attributed to keeping the milfoil and hydrilla at bay within the lake, disrupting that could create opportunity for invasive species to take hold.

Is there a healthy balance to what this committee is asking within their charter and maintain without impacting lake health?

What is specifically impinging on the recreational use of this lake by committee members?

- Access to shoreline in lollipop cove, landmass encroaching
- Boating enjoyment within particular coves
- Concerns that cove base is filling in
- Dock in lollipop cove not accessible
- Weeds along the lollipop beach encroaching into swim area

What are next steps after these questions are submitted?

- Submit questions to GZA, request proposal
- Make questions as specific as possible to GZA

The increased use of the lake has changed over the years, for one there are more boats and propellers on the waters; could they be churning more weeds as a result? Nothing against boaters but this does indicate at least one outside of mother nature activity that has increased over time. Are there increases in other lake uses that have a cause and effect?

Can we upgrade storm drains around the lake with sumps to contain and ultimately remove contaminates from flowing into the lake?

Summary: There is an unlimited number of reasons residents use the lake. The charter of this committee is to investigate what options there may be to maximize all the residents use of the lake without creating an unhealthy lake.

The residents on this committee have witnessed over time change within the lake that they would like to understand if any of their concerns can be addressed. It's not up to the members of this committee to make the changes, that has to come from the BOD with inputs collected by this committee as they investigate the options.

E. Discussion of Deep grant money

- a. Pushed to next meeting, how can it be used to address our concerns? What are the options we could use the grant money on?
- b. Volunteer hours count towards matching funds.

- c. Grants are gifts and not guaranteed to be there forever, if there is no need there will be no money available.

F. New Business

- a. None

G. Prepare agenda for Next Meeting

- a. Uncertain as to date for our next meeting at this time

H. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned 8:19. Brandon/Duncan

Respectfully submitted by,
Frank Hoisl
Committee Chair

Please refer to subsequent meeting minutes for approval of these minutes and any corrections h