

Pilot Projects to control curly-leaf pondweed or Eurasian watermilfoil on a lake-wide basis for ecological benefits during 2011

Criteria for evaluation of applications for grants

29 November 2010

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) is offering grants for pilot projects to control curly-leaf pondweed and/or milfoil on a lake-wide or bay-wide (partial lake) basis for ecological benefits as well as to provide relief from the nuisances caused by the plants. In this document is a list of criteria to be considered by the MnDNR in evaluation of applications for these grants. The grant review committee will include Invasive Species Specialists, DNR Fisheries staff, and other staff from the Division of Ecological Resources.

A. Previously funded projects

1. To the extent that funds are available, projects that received grant funds in previous years for the control of curly-leaf pondweed and milfoil or for the control of curly-leaf pondweed alone will continue to be funded unless:
 - a. Lake-wide treatment appears to be causing more harm than good;
 - b. The percent frequency of curly-leaf pondweed or milfoil or both in the treated lake or bay falls below 10 percent during the most recent survey of 2010; or
 - c. The lake has already received funding for lake-wide treatment for five years.
2. If funds are limited, higher priority will be assigned to projects based on the numbers and quality of samples or observations of Secchi disk transparency, concentrations of total phosphorus, concentrations of chl *a*, and concentrations of herbicide following treatment of the lake.

B. New Projects - Requirements that must be met to be offered a grant

3. The lake must have at least one public water access.
4. Acceptable proposals must have the following goals:
 - a. To reduce curly-leaf pondweed or milfoil or both lake – wide (or bay-wide) in the year of treatment
 - b. To provide long –term reduction in curly-leaf pondweed or milfoil or both in the lake
 - c. To increase native submersed plants
 - d. In the case of curly-leaf pondweed control projects, to reduce levels of phosphorus and algae, and to increase water clarity
5. Results of at least one point-intercept pre-treatment aquatic vegetation survey done within the past three years must be available.
6. Eurasian watermilfoil, curly-leaf pondweed, or both must occur at a frequency of at least a 25%. Alternately, a survey or mapping or delineation of milfoil or curly-leaf could show 25% or more of the littoral zone occupied by milfoil, curly-leaf, or both based on acreage.
7. The lake cannot be a natural environment lake (M.R. 6280.0250, Subp. 4, E).
8. The proposed treatment will not do more harm than good, based on the plant community, fish community, and water quality data. We are interested in funding projects on lakes that have native plant communities that are anticipated to increase following treatment. In addition, we would like to avoid funding projects where the removal of milfoil or curly-leaf pondweed would be likely to lead to an increase in algae and a reduction in the distribution of native vegetation or negatively affect the fish community. Evaluation of these criteria will be made based on available information on aquatic

Criteria for evaluation of applications for grants in 2011

plants, fisheries, and water quality, as well as the proposed method of treatment.

9. The plant community cannot include endangered, threatened, or special concern species that are likely to be negatively affected by the proposed treatment.
10. Cooperators must agree to do treatments following DNR guidelines.
11. Cooperators must agree to monitor the water clarity for at least two years following treatment.
12. Lakeshore owners must be willing to do a minimal amount of other treatment of native aquatic vegetation for nuisance control, so that the effects of the lake-wide treatment can be determined.
13. If the grantee is a non-governmental agency and if the grant is for more than \$25,000 the grantee must show that they are financially stable enough to carry out the purpose of the grant.

C. Other Criteria:

Primary

14. Applicants report and document that Eurasian watermilfoil or curly-leaf pondweed cause problems for users of the lake.
15. There are high quality pre-treatment data on the vegetation of the lake. Priority will be given to lakes which have better, in terms of both quantity and quality, pre-treatment aquatic plant survey data (e.g. more survey dates, surveys done at times when the effects of herbicide treatments did not confound the survey, more sample points rather than less, smaller grid spacing rather than larger).
16. There is support from the Section of Fisheries:
17. Priority will be given to lakes based on the numbers and quality of samples or observations of Secchi disk transparency, concentrations of total phosphorus, concentrations of chl a, and concentrations of herbicide following treatment of the lake collected previously and the ability and commitment to collect such during years when treatments are done, and for three years post treatment.

Secondary:

18. Cooperators should be willing to continue treatments for at least two additional years regardless of whether funding will be available in subsequent years or not (for curly-leaf pondweed treatments), unless the results of the initial treatment indicate significant negative impacts to native plants or water clarity.
19. There is already an approved Lake Vegetation Management Plan that allows lake-wide control of curly-leaf pondweed or Eurasian watermilfoil or both.
20. There should be public support from lake users and lakeshore homeowners for the treatment.
21. Cooperators should provide a reliable map of the proposed treatment area.
22. Priority will be given to lakes that are smaller, e.g., less than 200 acres, rather than larger.
23. We will attempt to fund lakes located in different areas of Minnesota.
24. The applicants past performance as a recipient of a grant from the DNR.