

Milfoil Meeting Minutes – December 4, 2025

Attendees: Jamie Stewart, Joanne Stewart, Barry Cahoon, Joe Hebert, Sue Bouchard, Jim Bernotas, Christy Burns, Scott Burns, Rob Stewart

Barry called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm on a zoom call hosted by Jamie Stewart and after 40 minutes, by Rob Stewart.

Post treatment survey: Discussion started by Barry regarding the Arrowwood post treatment plant survey. See report on the website. It appears there was more damage to other species of plants in the target area. Barry commented that at the FOVLAP meeting it was stated that Joe's Pond has a robust native plant species compared to other Vermont Lakes. The required plant survey in June or July 2026 will determine the recovery. The treatment of ProcellorCor was effective. The 2026 survey is not a necessary step for any treatment plan in 2026. Barry has asked for feedback from Olin Reed on the survey with no feedback.

Boat Wash: Barry has received no response to his email to Mike Wichrowski and the Commissioner of the Fish & Wildlife. He has called and left messages with no response. What are the next steps - call Julie Moore (ANR Secretary) which Barry hates to do. A suggestion was made to call Scott Peck (area state rep) who is on the Senate Natural Resources Committee. Joe Hebert offered to write a letter to Scott Peck and Julie Moore and say we have had no response. This was felt to be appropriate and Joe said he would have a draft by Monday 12/8.

Annual Report to the ANR - Barry has been working on the required annual report to the ANR. His hang up is a treatment plan for 2026. Rob has expressed his concern in his 11/19 email to the committee. Barry asked Rob to give us a summary of his concerns and recommendations going forward. Rob stated that the discovery of the growth in the 1st and 2nd pond is a conundrum. It is shallow, has too many native plants, and the milfoil is difficult to harvest out. This suggests we'll have to rely on chemicals to manage EWM in those two ponds (and no lake has been able to eradicate milfoil through chemical means). Therefore, is the battle lost? When do we know the battle is lost? All the data suggests that no lake in Vt (except one) has gotten rid of milfoil. We have to be realistic. To continue the use of PC (ProcelloCOR) will not rid the lake of milfoil - but it might introduce negative impacts to human health. We may gain a year or more and the long term use of this chemical and its effects are not known. Lake George is finding chemical residuals in the lake sediment a year after they applied it. Granted their PPB use was much larger than our PPB. Are we taking unnecessary risks? We could buy a couple of years and spend lots of

money. The potential impacts to human risks and the cumulative impact of using the PC is not known.

Barry asked if the EWMMC accepts this concern - how do we proceed forward with the membership. Discussion occurred that we need to give a presentation of all sides to this issue to inform the membership and get an informed vote. The membership expects us to keep milfoil out of the lake. The mission of the EWMMC is to preserve the health of the lake. Milfoil is a threat to the lake. A vote by informed members is needed and the committee needs to give their positions.

Joe Hebert has a different perspective. He is personally encouraged by the success in the main pond. He is encouraged by the 1st and 2nd pond activities but totally understands Rob's concern. There was just one study by the Lake George people. They looked for and found residuals of the PC in the muck. Currently there is no way to determine if it is a known threat. The concern is for the microorganisms impact on the food chain and the probability of plant resistance to the chemical. Also, the dosage at Joe's Pond was 30% less than Lake George. Rob felt we were taking unnecessary risks and we can never be certain of deleterious effects.

Barry reminded us all that in the Fall JPA meeting of 2024, the members voted to get rid of the milfoil. The scope of the committee charge is to contain and control the milfoil in the best interests of the lake. At the time we were not blindly thinking of using a PC. After a year of effort, we need to be cognizant that we will never eliminate the milfoil.

Rob said, sadly; we likely have lost the battle. We can extend a few more years but at what point do we say enough - given that the chemical will persist in the soils and its unknown impact on human health down the road. Barry, referring to the FOVLAP, said that other lakes have not thrown in the towel and have been able to maintain a relationship of the growth being tolerable. Have these lakes examined the same issues as Lake George - probably. Other lakes treat with PC every now and then and thus keep the milfoil from taking over the lake. At the same time they are harvesting with non-chemical means.

Chris Burns asked if we can treat both the 1st and 2nd ponds? Yes, if the area treated is less than 40% of the littoral zone.

Jim Bernotas reminded everyone that compared to other lakes, Joe's Pond was able to chemically treat the lake 3 years before any other lake due to the change of heart with the ANR. Do we have a chance due to this? Joe's Pond had a less established infestation. This is good for us. The plants found in the 1st and 2nd pond were first year plants. The 2nd pond had 2 spots. First was along Route 2 shoreline. The plants were individual and not a forest and widely dispersed. In the lower end of the 2nd pond there is a nasty patch that he

and Josie worked on in their last dive. That patch is borderline out of control and there was a lack of other vegetation. Their ability to harvest was limited due to the cold water conditions. Maybe in 2026 we have this area be suction harvested and place benthic barriers. Route 2 shoreline was too widely scattered to bother with DASH. Jim felt that in the 2nd pond at the “LaPerle” fill can be kept under control.

In the 1st pond; once through the narrows with a consistent depth of 12 feet there is a ton of other vegetation. Harvesting there will be difficult. DASH would kill much more of the native vegetation. There would be a lot of salad on the barge grate. The 1st pond is a good candidate for a PC treatment.

Barry said we need extensive discussion at the Spring meeting giving all sides so that we give informed information and vote. There would be a lot of educational aspects. Rob said he would provide information on his perspective and work. What path do we go forward with? Barry asked Sue if she could take the lead on this education. Sue said yes. Rob said that we should make a case of the 2 sides with objective facts. An outline of the perspectives in a healthy way.

Other Topics. Barry is preparing the Annual Report to the ANR on the PC treatment. He requested maps in a 11/18 email. Discussion centered around what maps and what colors for the overlays required. We need a map for both the chemically treated area and a map for the non-chemical treated area, for 2025 and 2026. Considerable discussion centered on this topic Rob said he would get the maps this weekend to Barry.

The meeting adjourned at 4:16 pm.

Respectively submitted,

Jamie Stewart