State of Wisconsin \ DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Jim Doyle, Governor
Matthew J. Frank, Secretary
John Gozdzialski, Regional Director

Northern Region Headquarters
107 Sutliff Ave.
Rhinelander, Wisconsin 54501-3349
Telephone 715-365-8900
FAX 715-365-8932
TTY Access via relay - 711

September 10, 2010

Sandy Raby
2651 N East Shore Drive
Birchwood, WI 54817

Subject: Lake Chetac Plan Implementation (Technical Team Review)

Dear Sandy:

I had a chance to discuss the Lake Chetac project with the Lakes Technical Team this week. We reviewed the recommended management actions listed in Appendix K of your management plan. There was positive feedback on the listed recommendations and that you are on track but need to prioritize (it's a big complex problem). Many of the management actions listed are grant eligible under our grant programs, but we need to select the ones that are most feasible. We are opposed to the fluridone treatment recommendation.

The Technical Team agreed that the size and complexity of this project makes it difficult to attempt large scale management recommendations without further information. The groups recommendation was to initially implement management actions on a smaller scale to see what works (curly leaf pondweed (CLP) control), and also look into the feasibility of conducting an alum treatment in the North Basin.

The following are some recommendations/implementation options to start with:

1. Consider applying for a lake planning grant (or AIS established control grant if the cost is not too high) to complete the Bathtub Model that would provide information on the in-lake response (improvement) you would expect to achieve implementing different nutrient reduction options. For example how would the lake respond (Total Phosphorus/Chlorophyll A) if you controlled a certain amount of the CLP, or conducted an alum treatment in the North Basin? Would we achieve a desired in-lake benefit that would justify the cost?
2. We recommend early season chemical treatments (one to two sites/plots for treatment and one as a control) of CLP over a 3-5 year period. These would be smaller in scale and provide information on ability to control CLP, and evaluate native plant response. It would also require a pre/post monitoring evaluation as a component. These items along with other activities (Clean Boats/Clean Waters, Citizen Lake Monitoring, Shoreline Restoration and near shore runoff control) would be eligible under an AIS Established Control Grant.
3. We might consider harvesting as a control technique on a smaller scale. The problem is that there is a short window and that harvesting needs to be done early before turion production. We are currently evaluating a couple of other projects that conducted harvesting to see if they were successful.
4. Start conducting a feasibility analysis of an alum treatment in the North Basin.
5. Promote and implement watershed and near shore best management practices (BMP's).

I wish there were simple solutions, but this is a very large project and one that is difficult to recommend a large scale feasible solution. Please call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely

Jim Kreitlow
Lakes Biologist

Cc. Dave Blumer
Kristy Maki
Craig Roesler
Carroll Schaal
Tim Asplund