

**Lyme - Old Lyme Rogers Lake Weeds Committee  
Special Meeting  
Tuesday, 31 March 2015  
American Legion Room**

The Rogers Lake Weeds Committee held a special meeting at 6:00 PM on Tuesday, 31 March 2015 in the American Legion Room of the Old Lyme Memorial Town Hall. Dick Smith, Clayton Penniman, Paul Armond, Lyme First Selectman Ralph Eno and Old Lyme First Selectwoman Bonnie Reemsnyder were present. Also present was Selectwoman Mary Jo Nosal of Old Lyme.

Guests: Dr. Mark June-Wells, Aquatic Ecosystem Research; Scott Fisher, NEE, Inc.; Janelle Smith James; Mike Sicord; Robert Secor; Dennis Overfield, Tom Sherer, Conservation Commission; Maureen Plumleigh; Linda Clough

1. **Approval of Minutes of Apr. 8 Meeting:** Motion by Ralph Eno to approve the minutes as submitted. Seconded by Clayton Penniman. **So Voted**
2. **Presentation of the Rogers Lake Weed Study report:** The final report was summarized by Scott Fisher who noted that it is based on several independent studies, including Water Quality Study, Vegetation Assessment, Wildlife assessment, Impact to human health, toxicology study, and domestic well study. They used all the information to come to a recommended approach for management of weeds in Rogers Lake. The purpose of the report was to come up with a management matrix to deal with the two invasive species, as well as native species (lily) that are considered a nuisance. The options were reviewed based on three criteria ranked from highest priority to as follows: human health and risk, effectiveness and cost. Based on those criteria, the recommendation is to use hydroraking for the lily species. The invasive species are more difficult and based on the human health concerns, the recommendation is an application of the herbicide Flumioxacin if the desire is to treat the milfoil and fanwort. Flumioxacin is considered the least impactful on human health, though nothing is a "silver bullet". Applications will need to be reapplied in future, and this particular herbicide would likely impact the plants during one growing season. It is possible that over time, the impact of the herbicide may affect the root, but it is considered more of a management for the season rather than permanently killing the plant. The hope is to have a diminished need for applications in future, though it can only be determined over time. There is the ability to target areas of need. There is also a recommendation to continue doing the water quality monitoring. Both Scott and Dr. June-Wells recommend an integrated approach, such as herbicides, hydro raking and benthic mats to get the best results. There was a discussion about the limitation of the water quality monitoring tests, as it only occurred from May through October, when the water did not have an opportunity to change, though the water testing does give a baseline for future monitoring. Scott reviewed all of the options that are available and the pros and cons of each

option, which are articulated in the report. Dr. Mark June-Wells commented that lake management could include both mechanical and chemical options for best results in areas targeted as nuisance to recreation and safety.

There were questions about the chemical flumioxazone. What do you know about the metabolites 4A2ha and a second metabolite for ? Effects of neither are known, and Scott Fisher and Dr. Mark June-Wells said that they would research if there is any other information available and send it to the committee.

Discussions about a Lyme Old Lyme public informational meeting was discussed, though no date was set.

It was noted that the STEAP grant application was denied.

3. **Other business:** Members of the audience asked questions or made comments about the report. **Maureen Plumleigh** questioned why education plans were not part of the plan. It was not part of the charge for NEE, but it was noted that education would be an asset to improving the issue. **Mary Jo Nosal** questioned if the metabolites were active.

A motion was made by Ralph Eno, seconded by Dick Smith, to accept the recommendation as presented and move to the next step of the plan to have a public presentation on the recommendation as soon as possible. **So voted.** Four were in favor, one voted against the motion.

4. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 PM