

# Comprehensive Milfoil Treatments Using Herbicides

## Cases, Research Results & Testimonials

### Michigan Questionnaire Survey Results

Dick Osgood  
OSGOOD CONSULTING

May 2007

The following questionnaire was sent to several dozen lake representatives in Michigan where SONAR was used to control Eurasian watermilfoil. The intent of this survey was to get the perspectives of local lake leaders regarding whole-lake herbicide treatment(s). These testimonials are intended to supplement other cases studies and research results and regulatory practices.

#### Survey Questions:

I understand your lake association has conducted at least one whole-lake or comprehensive herbicide treatment for milfoil control. Based on your observations and experiences, will you please answer the questions below and return your responses to me?

1. Lake Name and Size (acres):
2. Year(s) of treatment:
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:
5. Comment on any negative aspects:
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again?
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)?

All responses are provided below.

#### Responses

##### **Silver Lake, Rockford Michigan**

Dick Spoelstra

1. Silver Lake-220 acres, bowl shaped, average depth 25 ft., deepest 48 ft.
2. Treatment started in the late 50's. Professional treatments started in the late 90's. Eurasian water milfoil was first treated in 2000.
3. Lake has good clarity. Secchi Disc readings average 15.8 ft. throughout the summer months. Nuisance veg. milfoil, and curly pond weed. Mesotrophic.
4. Milfoil treatment, whole lake, removed most milfoil. Were told re-treatment would be necessary in 3 to 5 years. Have not retreated the whole lake yet and we're going on 7 years. We do spot treat the

milfoil each summer. I have the responsibility of locating patches of milfoil for spot treatment. So far we have limited the milfoil so it is not a problem.

5. Negative aspects are none. Professional Lake Management has done a fine job on the lake. But you need someone to watch over their shoulder.
6. Based on what we had before milfoil treatment and now I would definitely recommend the treatment. Native plant life is healthy and the fishing is fantastic.
7. Dick Spoelstra at spoelstrad@netscape.com or 6946 Weller Dr., Rockford Mi. 49341 or call 616-874-7732. Am retired environmental science teacher who is home most of the year. Best time to call is around 7 PM.

**Big and Little Myers Lakes, Rockford, MI**  
Eric Hune

Size: Big - 90 acres, Little - 45 acres

Years: At least the last 15 years

Problems: sometimes- Eurasian watermilfoil, algae chronic- eel grass, native plants, curly leaf pondweed

Effectiveness- treatment of exotics is very effective with chemicals (Sonar chemical used on each lake once every 3 years)

Negatives- Costly, some minor use restrictions after treatment, native plants (by law) are only contained and usually not killed

Overall- we are an all sports lake that would not survive without the use of chemicals. The boating is increased, fishing is easier, and swimming is possible because we treat our lake.

Other info.- we also encourage and sell phosphate-free lawn fertilizer in order to decrease the nutrients entering the water.

Company we use: Professional Lake Management, P.O. Box 132, Caledonia, MI 49316  
PLM's contact person: Jason Broekstra (vice-president and biologist) [jason@prolakenmgmt.com](mailto:jason@prolakenmgmt.com)  
616-891-1294

**Lake Miramichi, Ewart, MI**  
Tom Newman

Lake Miramichi, in Ewart, MI. is an area with two adjoining man-made lakes, one being approximately 200 acres and the other 25 acres.

In the spring of 2003, we completed a whole-lake Fluridone (Sonar) treatment (formulation of 6 parts per billion) and experienced a very successful result. The milfoil was eliminated with no noticeable negative effect on native vegetation, fish, or waterfowl. Since this treatment we have

had professional vegetation surveys completed each spring and fall and since the spring of 2005 the surveys have identified traces of Eurasian watermilfoil which have been spot treated (2-4-D, Reward) with reasonable success -- we expected re-growth to be an issue as our lakes are fed by two creeks which travel through numerous surrounding farms. Based on the survey results of September 2006 it is anticipated that another whole-lake Sonar treatment will be completed in the spring of 2008.

With regard to lake conditions: Because Lake Miramichi is man-made and is surrounded by fertile farm lands, the lakes are nutrient rich which results in heavy algae growth several times each summer. As a result, water clarity is generally poor. The algae problem is kept under reasonable control with periodic applications of a copper algaecide (we have not seen any adverse effects from this treatment).

In conclusion, the general consensus at Lake Miramichi was that the Fluridone treatment was successful and we would use this treatment again.

Should you have any further questions, please contact me at [annentom78@msn.com](mailto:annentom78@msn.com).

## **Sherman Lake**

John Tucci

Here are my responses to the survey:

1. Sherman Lake, 163 acres more information at [www.shermanlakemi.com](http://www.shermanlakemi.com)
2. We are entering our fifth year of treatment.
3. Lake condition:

Mesotrophic Lake, water clarity is good, however, weeds are becoming a bigger and bigger problem each year as is the rapid accumulation of organic muck. In 2007, we will be implementing a more comprehensive water quality analysis program that will include bottom sediment analysis and more in depth chemical analysis. With regard to water quality, in our lake the weeds are currently outfighting algae for nutrients so our water clarity is good. Nuisance vegetation continues to be Eurasian Water Milfoil, however, over the last three years pond weed has become a major problem in the lake. We attribute this to the fact that our treatment program for milfoil has increased the availability of nutrients in the lake for other species.

4. Effectiveness of Treatment:

The whole lake treatment (Flouridone) was part of an overall program that combines whole lake treatment every three years with annual follow-up treatments using contact herbicides in the "off years". Certainly, this program has been quite successful in reducing the milfoil levels to non-nuisance status. However, if there are nutrients available in the lake the milfoil will come back to some degree within the treatment year.

One issue with the whole lake treatment program that residents need to be aware of is that it takes a few weeks for the milfoil to die. This is a good thing, but you will need to educate residents on this so

they do not expect the milfoil to disappear immediately.

#### 5. Negative aspects:

The major negative aspect of the program is related to the amount of biomass of milfoil you have in the lake and the implications of sending that decaying material to the bottom of the lake. In our lake, I believe that the milfoil has created a cycle whereby the lake cannot maintain aerobic bottom conditions to sufficiently process the organic material from the dying plants. The result has been the rapid accumulation of organic muck on the bottom of the lake, and anoxia on the lake bottom to a sufficient degree to result in an internal loading problem - release of nutrients from the sediment into the water column.

I believe that this internal loading problem is a key driver of the explosive growth of pondweed, lily pads etc. We will be getting real data on this this year. However, the observational data is pretty compelling:

- Numerous point across the lake homeowners report a loss of 1.5 to 2 feet of depth over a five year period.
- Pond weed is now impeding boat traffic, swimming etc. on about a 30 - 40 acre portion of the lake on the shallow end. Prior to the explosion of milfoil and subsequent treatment program, pond weed was not a problem.
- lily pads have aggressively expanded their range on the shallow end of the lake in five years.

We really cannot fault the herbicide program for these effects. The herbicides have done their job. There are however, unintended consequences of associated with herbicidal treatments. On our lake, we are aggressively researching alternatives for the future of our lake. Unfortunately, as I am sure you know, there are not that many options available.

I believe that it is important to understand the nutrient and dissolved oxygen profile of the lake as you develop your treatment plan. On our lake we treated the symptom for five years not knowing that we were making the root cause worse. I have attached a briefing on the chemical treatment cycle that I developed for our water quality team.

Based on our experience my recommendation would be as follows if you are going to pursue a whole lake herbicide treatment program.

1. Aggressive harvesting to remove as much milfoil from the lake as possible prior to treatment.
2. Flouridone treatment to kill remaining milfoil.

This will at least reduce the amount of decaying material falling to the bottom. There are several lakes in Michigan now experimenting with the milfoil beetle as a management tool. This is a long-term play and a good alternative if you catch the problem early or as a follow-up strategy to the whole lake treatment in successive years. This approach may get you out of the "chemical treatment" cycle that we experienced with our lake.

**Selkirk Lake**, Wayland Township, MI  
Chris Hoffbeck

1. Lake name and size: Selkirk lake, 100 acres approx.
2. Last treatment was 2004
3. Water clarity. Generally about 10- 13 feet with the Secchi disk in late august to sept. Curly leaf pond weed, some native species. Meso or eutrotropic, don't know for sure
4. The last treatment used Sonar, same as the previous. The last treatment was very effective in reducing the milfoil population. This year we would be eligible for Sonar treatment again, but it is not necessary. We will probably have to spot treating this year.
5. Negative aspects. Using a chemical to kill the weeds and the future environmental or health concerns.
- 6 Yes. If needed, I would recommend the same treatment.

### **Little Pine Lake**

Walter Garrett

Little Pine Lake is 127 acres and about 70 feet deep.

The SONAR treatment was 7-8 years ago, when we had a serious milfoil problem.

The first year, we had remarkable success. We hired an independent consultant to oversee the treatment and monitor the results. We have had spot treatments each year for four years.

We have lily pads, which have been protected throughout our treatments.

We are very happy with the SONAR treatments and the results have been excellent. We understand this is an ongoing concern requiring ongoing treatments.

### **Sandy Pines**

Max Gibbs

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Sandy Pines
2. Year(s) of treatment: 10
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?

Watermilfoil has been our biggest problem.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:

The treatment has worked, but the state has not allowed the treatment to be at 100% of the chemical's ability

5. Comment on any negative aspects: None
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes

### **Jordan**

John Bush

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Jordan, 430 acres.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 2000, 2003, scheduled for 2007.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?

Eutrophic. I find that the year it was used, the lake residents are very happy with the way the lake looks and the clarity of the water.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:

It has worked great in all three lakes in this county.

5. Comment on any negative aspects:

In 2000, there was a big fish kill in the summer. Investigations by the DNR & DEQ decided it was not caused by the SONAR.

6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Como**

Ron Johnson

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Como, 11 acres.
2. Year(s) of treatment: Started 2000.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?

Milfoil was the primary problem. Lake depth is about 10-feet average. Water clarity with Secchi disk is always at least 90% of depth.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Good.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: Not at this time.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again?

We do on an annual basis.

7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Lake of the Woods**

Andy Broekhuizen

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Lake of the Woods.
2. Year(s) of treatment: Started 2006.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Milfoil was the primary problem. Water clarity with Secchi disk is about 8-feet.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Very good to excellent.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: None.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **North Lake Gobels**

Craig Yaple

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): North Lake Gobels, 190 acres.
2. Year(s) of treatment: Three years of a five year contract.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Water clarity is good. All nuisance vegetation under control.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: 100% effective. Even homeowners who were skeptical about treatment are very pleased and support it.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: Not at this time.  
None. Our lake is back to the condition it was 20 years ago.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? 100% yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Round Lake**

Bob Bouman

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Round, 83 acres.
2. Year(s) of treatment: Started 2005.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Eutrophic, good water clarity, caught the Eurasian watermilfoil before native plants were destroyed.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Very effective – none found in 2006.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: None.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Bass**

Manda Lippert

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Bass, 180 acres.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 7 years.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
We are a shallow lake – deepest spot is 25-feet. We test good just like the large lakes do. No problems with anything.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:  
We were studied by Michigan State University and the Army Corps of Engineers because we never use chemicals in our lake until SONAR was used to kill the milfoil. This past year we had to do weed cutting again as the native weeds were so high and then we that we have so far only needed treatment for spots of Eurasian milfoil.
5. Comment on any negative aspects:  
We are very pleased with the results. We have no negative feelings.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **George**

Roger Carey



1. Lake Name and Size (acres): George, 124 acres.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 6 years.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Eutrophic. Secchi disk 8-feet. Nuisance vegetation – Eurasian watermilfoil, curlyleaf pondweed and algae.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: I feel it's been very effective.
5. Comment on any negative aspects:
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Shingle**

Roger Carey

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Shingle, 33 acres.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 5 years.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Eutrophic. Secchi disk 12-feet. Nuisance vegetation – Eurasian watermilfoil, curlyleaf pondweed and algae.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Very effective.
5. Comment on any negative aspects:
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Bertha**

Roger Carey

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Bertha, 43 acres.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 6 years.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Eutrophic.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Very effective.
5. Comment on any negative aspects:
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

I am the Lake Director for the township, so I overlook 4 lakes. Three of them I have reported, the 4<sup>th</sup> doesn't have a treatment, although they are in the process of trying to get one.

### **Big Drower**

Joe Hesse

I am on the Water Quality Committee of the Big Brower Lake Improvement Association. Three years ago we treated our 85 acre lake with SONAR to combat widespread EM. We had small patches of EM for several years. Then, one summer the EM exploded, covering 30% of the lake. That winter, we decided to aggressively treat the EM starting in early spring. At that time there were only two options for treating EM, using beetles or using herbicides. It costs about 'a-buck-a-beetle' and we didn't have the shoreline that would support this method of treatment. So, we used the herbicides, SONAR. SONAR is used to treat the whole lake and is a systemic herbicide in that it destroys the ability of the plant to conduct photosynthesis. Over the course of a several weeks, the plants wither and die. SONAR molecules degrade over a few weeks into harmless by-products.

We employed Professional Lake Management to implement treatment. The first summer we were without EM. Then, we began seeing small patches around the lake. We treated these with a topical herbicide. This past summer we had continued EM, and again spot treated with a topical herbicide. Our water quality is very good with native plants again making up most of our aquatic plant species. Water clarity, dissolved oxygen and fish populations remain very good.

The bad news is that once your lake has EM...you've got it. If you don't treat it, your lake will become a marsh within a few years. This is one nasty weed and should not be ignored. EM weathers the cold winters better than the 'good weeds' and is ready to go in early spring. EM forms a canopy across the top of the lake blocking sunlight from reaching the plants on the bottom. Within a few years, EM will wipe out most native vegetation. In addition, your "good" fish population will decrease as there will be less oxygen in the lower layers of your lake.

I have no idea of the size of Christmas Lake...but, the sooner you treat for EM the less expensive it will be. There is no going back on treatment...and it is costly. Yet, we have already started discussions as to when we should do another SONAR treatment. The fact is, there are about 11,000 lakes in Michigan and EM is in most of them. A neighboring lake (120 acres) had EM for several years. Lake residents wouldn't use herbicides hoping it would just go away. Eventually, residents couldn't use their boats because the propellers became entangled with weeds. Finally, lake residents relented and regained control over the EM. The cost ran tens of thousands of dollars. In my opinion, it is better to be proactive when it comes to EM.

Feel free to contact me if you have further questions. Hope this helps.

### **Bella Vista**

Paul Hausler

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Bella Vista.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 1992, 94, 95, 98, 00, 03, 06
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Mesotrophic.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Sonar very effective in year if treatment.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: None.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Big Pine Island**

Paul Hausler

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Big Pine Island.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 1996, 99, 02, 06
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Mesotrophic.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Sonar very effective for 1-3 years typically.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: None.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Camp**

Paul Hausler

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Camp.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 1997, 00, 04, 07
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Mesotrophic.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Sonar very effective for 2-3 years.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: None.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Goquac**

Paul Hausler

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Goquac.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 2001, 04, 07
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Mesotrophic.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Sonar effective for 2-3 years.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: None.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Houghton**

Paul Hausler

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Houghton, about 20,000 acres.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 2002
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Eutrophic..
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Sonar effective for 2-5 years.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: None.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Lansing**

Paul Hausler

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Lansing.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 1995, 98, 01, 04, 07.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Eutrophic.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Sonar effective for 203 years.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: None.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Winfield**

Paul Hausler

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Winfield.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 2003, 07.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Mesotrophic.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness: Sonar effective for 2-3 years.
5. Comment on any negative aspects: None.
6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **St. Mary's**

John Worthington

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): St. Mary's, 120 acres.
2. Year(s) of treatment: 2002.
3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?  
Mesotrophic.
4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:

We have been very pleased with the results of treatment for all of the nuisance vegetation and algae.

5. Comment on any negative aspects:

Minor inconvenience when lake cannot be used because of treatment.

6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.

7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Brownwood Lake**

Dave Downard

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Brownwood, 160 acres.

2. Year(s) of treatment: 2003, 04, 05, 06.

3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?

Clear water.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:

Treatment very effective for weed control.

5. Comment on any negative aspects:

Misconception of some homeowners about importance of controlling vegetation.

6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.

7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Wall**

Dan Hills

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Wall, 530 acres.

2. Year(s) of treatment: Starting 6<sup>th</sup> year this spring.

3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?

Mesotrophic.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:

We have used SONAR (fluridone) to treat our milfoil. It works great.

5. Comment on any negative aspects:

None. I've lived on this lake, on and off, for over 50 years, it is in the best shape it has every been.

6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.

7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Gitchegumee**

Tom Frohaphel

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Gitchegumee, 110 acres.

2. Year(s) of treatment: Since 2001.

3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?

Very clear.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:

Fluridone treatment – very effective. Contact herbicides very effective for spot treatments.

5. Comment on any negative aspects:

6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.

7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Algonquin**

Patrick Sharp

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Algonquin.

2. Year(s) of treatment: Since 1980.

3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?

Things could be better. A sewer system would help. We realize this is called control, not weed eradication, as some would want.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:

It gives us a very livable lake for the spring, summer and fall. We are currently spending close to \$50,000 a year.

5. Comment on any negative aspects:

Probably the cost, but we have to use the lake. It's your property investment.

6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.

7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Saddle**

Don VanderBosch

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Saddle.

2. Year(s) of treatment: Four.

3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?

Water clarity: ? Major nuisance: Eurasian watermilfoil. Eutrophic.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:

Sonar (fluridone) and local treatments controlled it (milfoil) for 4 years and sonar treatment planned for the 5<sup>th</sup> year. Milfoil was not a recreational nuisance for the first 4 years of after treatment.

5. Comment on any negative aspects:

First year most native plants were killed.

6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again?

Yes. Better to apply chemical professionally than by riparians.

7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.

### **Stewart**

Ron Vander Molen

1. Lake Name and Size (acres): Stewart, 46 acres.

2. Year(s) of treatment: Two years, 2007 will be 3<sup>rd</sup> year.

3. Lake condition: List water clarity, major nuisance vegetation, mesotrophic or eutrophic?

Stewart Lake is a very clear lake. It is a no-wake lake and is spring fed.

4. Comment on treatments effectiveness:



Approximately 90% of Eurasian watermilfoil kill after first treatment. 98% after 2<sup>nd</sup> year spot treatment.

5. Comment on any negative aspects:

We found no negative aspects of this treatment. No fish kill or native weed kill.

6. Would you recommend this treatment for your lake, if needed, again? Yes.
7. Name & Contact Information (May I contact you if I have follow-up questions)? Yes.