

APM/AIS Activities by Organization

QUESTION	Organization										
	Black Dog WMO	Nine Mile Creek WD	Valley Branch WD	Ramsey-Washington Metro WD	Minneapolis Park and Rec Board	Three Rivers Park District	City of Plymouth	Minnehaha Creek WD	Comfort Lake-Forest Lake WD	Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD	Hennepin County
Has your organization been involved in the management of AIS?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes- Only with new management methods with a research focus, testing a new control method, or focused on ecological improvements.	Yes	Yes	Yes – With State funding, provides assistance and grants to local partners to implement projects and programs. Mostly to prevent spread of AIS.
What AIS species have you managed?	NA	CLP	EWM (Purple loosestrife, and yellow iris – limited)	EWM CLP Carp	EWM CLP Purple loosestrife Flowering rush Yellow iris Egeria Densa	EWM CLP	EWM CLP Purple loosestrife	CLP Flowering rush Zebra mussels Carp	CLP EWM Carp Flowering rush Purple loosestrife	EWM CLP Carp	All
What management methods were used?	NA	Drawdown and herbicide treatments	EWM = herbicides PL, YI = manual harvesting	EWM and CLP = Whole lake and partial lake herbicide treatment Carp = barriers and harvesting	EWM = mechanical harvesting, hand harvesting (including in Wirth Lake). Plus, research of biocontrol PL = some hand harvesting Egeria Densa = Chemicals	EWM = some herbicides or harvesting but only for beaches, landings, fishing piers. CLP = some whole lake herbicide treatments, some drawdowns, some spot treatments. CLP in Medicine Lk = whole lake treatment 2004 - 2006; little or no effect on water quality or natives	Harvesting Herbicides Biological control	CLP = Research on whole lake herbicide treatment Flowering rush = Tested the efficacy of hand removal to reduce population Zebra Mussels = Rapid response effort in Christmas Lake Carp = Will be managing in the near future with winter seining and barriers	Herbicides Hand harvesting Fish barriers Carp trapnet harvesting Biocontrol of purple loosestrife	Harvesting (done in the past but no longer do) Partial lake herbicide treatment and "lake-wide" herbicide treatment Carp barriers, carp removal	Develop a concept plan for a permanent regional boat washing station Enhance public access inspections Support innovative education efforts Research milfoil genetics for possible control strategies Train residents on AIS detection Fund projects of local partners Analysis of alternative pathways and risk of infestation from pet stores and nurseries
What were the results of the AIS management effort?	NA	Effective long-term reduction	Whole lake treatments yielded significant, long-term reduction of EWM. Partial lake treatment resulted in seasonal relief.	Effective long-term reduction for AIS species. Carp contained and numbers reduced.	EWM controls make beaches safer, allows for boating access. PL biocontrol very effective Egeria Densa eradicated from lake	EWM control provides use of recreation areas. CLP control works well in some lakes and can be used to improve natives.	Chemical control of CLP is effective. Harvesting of EWM not effective. Biocontrol of PL is effective.	CLP whole lake treatment = reduced CLP population in the lake, some improvements in water quality. Hand removal of Flowering Rush = reduced size of some	Plant management success varies by lake and year. Working with contractors to better understand when, how, and where management is most effective.	Carp contained and numbers reduced - we manage the population. Herbicide treatments reduced EWM and CLP presence in problem areas to help with native plant	Effectiveness of many programs still being evaluated. Alternative pathways analysis: No Minnesota prohibited species were found in the stores inspected.

QUESTION	Organization										
	Black Dog WMO	Nine Mile Creek WD	Valley Branch WD	Ramsey-Washington Metro WD	Minneapolis Park and Rec Board	Three Rivers Park District	City of Plymouth	Minnehaha Creek WD	Comfort Lake-Forest Lake WD	Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD	Hennepin County
								of the larger patches but eradication not possible and smaller areas did not see further reduction. Zebra mussel control in Christmas Lake killed mussels in the contained areas treated, but they were found outside the treatment area later in the year.	Carp control is generally effective.	establishment especially prior to alum. We are in early stage of a quick response project for EWM on Staring Lake and results are on the positive side. Management is not a short-term program.	Although 94% of the retailers carry Minnesota regulated aquatic plant species. Early detection training results: two new AIS were identified and reported to MDNR.
What was your organization's role?	Perform aquatic plant monitoring if the cities do not perform the aquatic plant survey	Monitoring, plan/design, implementation and reporting.	Technical support (e.g. , develop plans, treatment design, monitoring & reporting).	All components: monitoring, design, implementation, reporting, funding	All components: monitoring (including early detection), design, implementation, reporting, funding	All components: Monitoring, implementation, contracting, reporting, funding	Funding Project management	All components: Monitoring, implementation, contracting, reporting, funding	All components: Monitoring, implementation, contracting, reporting, funding	All components: Monitoring, design, implementation, reporting, funding We do have a grant out with the U of M in helping us out with plant management and restoration on a few of our lakes post-carp	Technical and financial support, research
Were other entities involved in the management effort? If Yes, who was involved and what was their role?	Cities perform aquatic plant monitoring	Only as stakeholders	Yes. Lake associations paid for the herbicide treatment and assisted in monitoring. Cities have contributed funding.	Only assistance with communications from other entities.	DNR is permitting authority, led effort to eradicate Egeria Densa, provides technical assistance. MCWD provides technical assistance. MAISRC leads research.	Some funding from cities and cooperation from lake organizations.	DNR grants for CLP control in Medicine Lake and was coordinating PL biocontrol program. BCWMC provided funding for Medicine Lake CLP control 2005-2008	Utilize consultants and contractors to perform or assist with the work (treatment, monitoring, etc.).		No (other than communications) nowadays. We do have a summit once a year where we bring DNR, consultants that we work with and city reps to discuss next steps for the upcoming year. We directly link this too with water quality projects like alum treatment. We still work with the University of Minnesota for plant management. In the past we worked with the U of M also in regards to carp management - we have brought this program in-house.	County partners with local entities such as watershed organizations, cities, lake associations

QUESTION	Organization										
	Black Dog WMO	Nine Mile Creek WD	Valley Branch WD	Ramsey-Washington Metro WD	Minneapolis Park and Rec Board	Three Rivers Park District	City of Plymouth	Minnehaha Creek WD	Comfort Lake-Forest Lake WD	Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD	Hennepin County
How much do you spend in a typical year on management measures and where does the funding come from?	NA	Varies by project. Budget established by project (versus ongoing program).	Varies by number of lakes and extent of actively; about \$10K per year/per lake in technical support; about \$10K per year in reporting; organization costs for herbicide treatments vary with area treated; total costs of about \$70,000 in 2014, \$130,000 in 2015 and about \$40,000 planned for 2016.	From 2008-2013, the District spent about \$35K/year on plant management. The 2017 Draft Plan estimates about \$100K/year related to APM and AIS	Approximately \$100,000 per year.	Unknown for EWM and CLP control – project specific and varies.	\$35,000 CLP control on Medicine Lake. No longer fund EWM harvesting.	~\$30,000/year on the Flowering Rush work, ~\$35,000 on Christmas Lake zebra mussel work	\$230,000 includes AIS management and prevention activities. Some grant funding from Washington Co. and in-kind support from Chisago Co. SWCD. Mostly from levy on residents.	Approx. \$50K/year for AIS inspection, \$25K for Rapid Response and Education and outreach, \$15K for aeration unit (birth control for carp in Riley chain of lakes), \$60K for plant management, \$75K grant to U of M for plant restoration and management projects (some monitoring is within data collection) from the District's levy.	State funded program \$325,000 per year. County funding provides program staff.
Has your organization been involved with preventing the spread of AIS? What methods are used?	Only via monitoring (see above)	Yes via education program	Only through reduction/mgmt of populations present; possibly indirectly through educational efforts of education program.	Yes. Through reduction of populations present and construction of Carp barriers.	Yes. Boat inspectors at 3 launches. Closed Wirth Lk launch. AIS education at landings and events. Limiting flow from certain waterbodies. Zebra Mussel Action Plan implemented. Training required for MPRB staff, contractors, partnering orgs and businesses using lakes AIS prevention written into permits for organizations and groups.	Yes. Boat launch inspections Training inspectors Use of one decontamination unit (Lake Independence) AIS education at landings and events Monitoring Early detection monitoring	No.	Yes. We offer financial and technical resources to our partners who operate watercraft inspection programs. We also put out education and awareness materials on AIS.	Yes. Boat launch inspections Training inspectors Use of decontamination unit AIS education at landings and events Monitoring Early detection monitoring	Yes. Through reduction of populations present, sponsoring of inspections, construction of Carp barriers, and education (Adopt a Dock, AIS Jr Inspector Program, Pull the plug and wipe it clean).	Yes – see above.
What is your organization's role in AIS prevention?	NA	Develop programming & cooperate with other WMOs	NA	All components: monitoring, design, implementation, reporting, funding	All components: program coordination and implementation, early detection monitoring, funding, education	All components: program coordination and implementation, early detection monitoring, funding, education	NA	Financial and technical role on the inspections Lead or supporting role on the education and awareness.	All components: program coordination and implementation, early detection monitoring, funding, education	All components: monitoring, design, implementation, reporting, funding	See above.

QUESTION	Organization										
	Black Dog WMO	Nine Mile Creek WD	Valley Branch WD	Ramsey-Washington Metro WD	Minneapolis Park and Rec Board	Three Rivers Park District	City of Plymouth	Minnehaha Creek WD	Comfort Lake-Forest Lake WD	Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD	Hennepin County
What other entities are involved in AIS prevention?	NA	Other watershed management organizations	NA	NA	DNR provides training. MCWD provides some funding. Some lake groups help with monitoring	Some funding from DNR grants, city contributions, MCWD. Some help from lake organizations	NA	Other local government agencies (park districts, cities, counties, etc.)	DNR provides training. Counties supply some funding and support. Lake associations and cities assist as they can.	U of M, Three Rivers Park District, City of Eden Prairie, City of Chanhassen	See above.
How much do you spend in a typical year on prevention measures and where does the funding come from?	NA	Funding provided through District's education program, but no specific dollar amount assigned to AIS.	NA (amount of District educational funding related to AIS is not tracked)	Part of overall \$100K/year for AIS programs.	Estimated at \$196,000 in 2016.	\$80,000 per year	NA	~\$230,000 in 2016 which included cost-share grants to our partners who operate watercraft inspection programs, contracted services for watercraft inspections where our partners do not perform inspections, and other education efforts. Reduced spending likely in 2017. Funds come from District levy.	\$230,000 includes AIS management and prevention activities. Some grant funding from Washington Co. and in-kind support from Chisago Co. Mostly from levy on residents.	See above.	See above.
What is your organization's policy regarding management of or preventing spread of AIS?	No Policy in 2012-2022 Plan. 2015 BDWMO annual report "recommends management of aquatic invasive species."	2007 Plan: Cooperate with regulatory agencies to manage invasive species. 2017 Plan (draft): - Conduct AIS inventory of District waterbodies. - Develop a targeted AIS management strategy. - Work with agencies and local stakeholders to manage invasive species.	- Provide technical support to other organizations (e.g., cities, lake associations) for AIS reduction. - VBWD may fund treatment if AIS are demonstrated to have negative impact on water quality.	Collaboratively manage invasive species that threaten water resources and associated upland habitats.	MPRB adopts resolution each year with rules of operation including inspection location, hours, required permits, etc. Background on resolution acknowledges threat and impact of AIS and indicates prevention of spread is better than management after infestation.	Multiple draft goals, objectives, and policies (<i>see attached Three Rivers Park District goals/policies document</i>)	Support watershed organizations that have AIS programs.	No formal policy, but we typically work on the notion of preventing the spread of AIS while not impeding use of lakes.	Unknown	DRAFT policies: 1. The District will continue to manage aquatic invasive macrophytes in accordance with an approved lake vegetation management plan or as part of a rapid response control project. 2. The District will implement measures to manage carp populations in District-managed resources.	Hennepin County Board of Commissioners designates oversight of the Hennepin County Aquatic Invasive Species Prevention Aid program to the Co. Administrator and also delegates to the Co. Administrator the responsibility to prepare and implement guidelines for use of the proceeds each year for the aid received for the prevention of aquatic invasive species; and that the Co. Administrator is authorized to submit the guidelines and all related reports to the MDNR as required by statute.

QUESTION	Organization										
	Black Dog WMO	Nine Mile Creek WD	Valley Branch WD	Ramsey-Washington Metro WD	Minneapolis Park and Rec Board	Three Rivers Park District	City of Plymouth	Minnehaha Creek WD	Comfort Lake-Forest Lake WD	Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek WD	Hennepin County
Do you anticipate any changes to these policies in the future?	Anticipate that the next WMO Plan will be more specific regarding AIS management roles.	Draft 2017 Plan policies may change.	No	No	None anticipated unless new AIS are discovered.	Still in draft form.	No	No.	NA	No	Unknown
Has your organization been involved in the management of native aquatic plants? What methods are used?	Habitat monitoring on rotating schedule and aquatic plant surveys as part of lake water quality and habitat monitoring, if the cities do not perform the survey	No	No	Experimental removal of phosphorus via harvesting of native and invasive species in Kohlman Lake	Actively managing and planting native shoreline. Some on-going management of cattails to encourage natives.	Only in swimming areas and at fishing piers to minimize nuisance levels.	Promoting and providing funding and technical assistance for native shoreline plantings.	No.	No.	No	No.
Does your organization have a policy regarding future management of native aquatic plants?	No	No	No	No	Not fully determined policy	Draft policy: Manage for diverse rooted macrophyte community dominated by native species.	City code includes sections on vegetation management and natural preserves.	No policy, but would be unlikely as native plants are important to the ecological integrity of our lakes, and are not likely providing any ecological impacts.	Unknown.	No, unless for restoration. No policy specifically addressing native species, but the District has policies promoting habitat protection and restoration, which would include native vegetation.	Unknown.
If no, does your organization anticipate having a role in the future management of native aquatic plants	Unknown	2017 Plan (draft): Work with natural resource agencies to manage invasive species and restore native species.	Unknown	Possibly, pending results of efforts in Kohlman Lake.	Native shoreline restoration and establishment will continue. Definitions of "native" may change.	NA	No	Unlikely.	NA	Not any more specific than the above general policies to support/perform habitat protection and restoration.	Unknown.

CLP = curly leaf pondweed
EWM = Eurasian watermilfoil
PL = Purple loosestrife
YI = Yellow iris