Dewart Lake Aquatic Vegetation Management Plan 2016 Update

Kosciusko County, Indiana



Prepared for:

The Dewart Lake Protective Association P.O. Box 152 Syracuse IN, 46567

March 1, 2017

Prepared by:

Aquatic Weed Control P. O. Box 325 Syracuse, IN 46567



Executive Summary

Dewart Lake, located in Kosciusko County, Indiana has 551 surface acres with a maximum depth of 82 feet and an average depth of 16.3 feet. Eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*), spiny naiad (*Najas marina*) and curly-leaf pondweed (*Potamogeton crispus*) are exotic plant species present in many areas of the lake where depths are less than 15 feet. The following report summarizes Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM) control practices implemented on Dewart Lake through the Lake and River Enhancement Program (LARE). It also outlines future exotic plant management options.

The Dewart Lake Protective Association has been controlling EWM both privately and with assistance from LARE since 2006. The entire lake was treated with Sonar herbicide on May 26, 2006. This treatment effectively controlled all the EWM in the lake in 2006 and gave good residual control of EWM for the next 3 years. Native plants showed short term declines which was expected. Native diversity would appear to have recovered completely from the Sonar treatment based on the available tier II data although it should be noted that tier II plant sampling protocol has changed since 2005.

By 2010, EWM was once again very abundant in Dewart Lake. The Dewart Lake Protective Association decided to explore plant management options other than just herbicide treatment alone. In 2012, the Dewart Lake Protective Association contracted with EnviroScience Incorporated of Stow, Ohio to initiate a EWM weevil stocking program. In 2012, EnviroScience stocked 25,000 weevils (*Euhrychiopsis lecontei*) at three different locations in Dewart Lake. This was the beginning of a three year stocking program designed to gradually reduce the abundance and severity of EWM in Dewart Lake. In 2013, 23,500 weevils were stocked at four locations, and in 2014, 11,000 weevils were stocked at one location.

During the three years of the weevil stocking program the IDNR conducted tier II vegetation surveys each summer to monitor both native and invasive plant populations. Aquatic Weed control conducted both a spring and a summer tier II vegetation survey in 2015. In 2016, a visual plant survey was conducted in spring and a tier II plant survey was conducted in summer.

Summer EWM frequency had increased each year from 2007 to 2012 as it recovered following the Sonar treatments. Summer EWM site frequency from 2007 to 2012 was 0.0, 7.8, 26.7, 45.6, 52.2, and 62.2 respectively. Summer tier II EWM frequencies from 2013 to 2016 were 32.2, 37.9, 30.0, and 50.0 percent respectively.

In 2016 EWM was abundant is spring and dominated the plant community in approximately 145 acres of the lake. The most dense 12.71 acres were treated selectively with 2, 4-D on June 22, 2016.

For 2017, a spring visual survey should give an idea of EWM severity and acreage. The map produced from this survey can be used as a treatment map if needed. It was generally decided at the permit meeting on September 19, 2016 that EWM treatments should only be conducted in areas where EWM infestation is severe and nearing the surface of the lake. The IDNR will permit treatment for up to a total 25 acres on the main lake (including private treatments).



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Problem Statement	
Aquatic Vegetation Management History	
2016 Vegetation Treatments	
Tier II Survey Results	6
Tier II Data Analysis	9
Water Clarity and Water Quality	
Dissolved Oxygen and Temperature Profiles	
Tier II Discussion	
Action Plan	
Public Involvement	
References Cited	
Appendix	
Common and Scientific Names of Aquatic Plants in Dewart Lake	
Data Sheets and GPS Coordinates	
Tier II Sample Site GPS Coordinates.	
2017 LARE Treatment Permit	

List of Tables

Table 1: Dewart Lake Plant Management History	4
Table 2: Dewart Lake 2015 EWM Treatment Details	5
Table 3: Dewart Lake 2016 Tier II Data Analysis	10
Table 4: Dewart Lake Historical Tier II Data - Spring Surveys	12
Table 5: Dewart Lake Historical Tier II Data - Summer Surveys	14
Table 6: Dewart Lake Secchi History	16

List of Figures

Figure 1: Dewart Lake 2016 Eurasian Watermilfoil Treatment Areas	5
Figure 2: Dewart Lake Tier II Sample Locations	6
Figure 3: Dewart Lake Summer 2016 EWM Locations	7
Figure 4: Dewart Lake Summer 2016 Curly-Leaf Pondweed Locations	8
Figure 5: Dewart Lake Summer 2016 Spiny Naiad Locations	9
Figure 6: Dewart Lake 2016 Dissolved Oxygen Profile	17
Figure 7: Dewart Lake 2016 Temperature Profile	17
Figure 8: Dewart Lake 2017 Potential EWM Treatment Areas	19
Figure 9: Dewart Lake 2016 Public Questionnaire	21
-	



Problem Statement

Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM) is impacting Dewart Lake in many areas. The milfoil can form dense mats in shallow areas, which can inhibit fishing, swimming, and boating. Dense milfoil beds may also prevent the growth of beneficial native species which often provide less recreational interference and more desirable fish habitat. Many of these beds are offshore in open water, although EWM also becomes dense in near shore areas of the southeast and northwest corners of the lake.

Objectives:

The following specific, quantifiable objectives are recommended to evaluate the success of EWM management activities in Dewart Lake.

- 1. Strive to reduce Eurasian watermilfoil to less than 10% site frequency each year in summer tier II surveys.
- 2. Maintain at least 12 native plant species collected each year in the summer tier II survey and native species diversity of 0.80 in summer tier II surveys (IDNR, 2016).
- 3. Maintain native coverage of 85% each year in the summer tier II survey (IDNR, 2016).

Treating EWM will not eradicate it from Dewart Lake. However, if these objectives are met each year, the indication would be that EWM is being controlled effectively on a seasonal basis without causing significant damage to the native plant community.

Aquatic Vegetation Management History

Table 1 summarizes the treatment history of EWM at Dewart Lake from 2006 until the present. The Dewart Lake Association has always been very committed to managing EWM infestations. The acreages of EWM treatments in Dewart Lake vary from year to year based on funding availability and EWM abundance. All of the weevil stockings by EnviroScience are listed in this table as well.

Year	Management Activity
Prior to 2006	Sporadic private treatments for EWM/natives
2006*	Whole lake Sonar Treatment for EWM (May 26,2006)
2007	No Herbicide Treatments needed
2008*	13 total acres of EWM treated with 2, 4-D at 2.0 ppm
2009*	45 total acres of EWM treated with 2, 4-D at 2.0 ppm
2010	20.83 acres of EWM treated with 2, 4-D at 2.0 ppm
2011	20.83 acres of EWM treated with 2, 4-D at 2.0 ppm
2012	14.54 acres of EWM treated with 2, 4-D at 2.0 ppm
2012*	25,000 Weevils stocked in 3 areas (sites S1,S2,S3)
2013	12.64 acres of EWM treated with 2, 4-D at 2.0 ppm
2013*	23,500 Weevils stocked in 3 areas (sites S1, S3, S4, S5)
2014	12.64 acres of EWM treated with 2, 4-D at 2.0 ppm
2014*	11,000 Weevils stocked (site S6)
2015*	14.54 acres of EWM treated with 2, 4-D at 2.0 ppm
2016*	12.71 acres of EWM treated with 2, 4-D at 2.0 ppm

Table 1: Dewart Lake Plant Management History

*Completed at least partially with LARE funding



2016 Vegetation Treatments

On June 22, 2016, 12.71 acres of Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM) beds in Dewart Lake were treated with 2, 4-D at a rate of 2.0 ppm. This treatment was funded with a 50/50 cost share by both the Dewart Lake Protective Association and the IDNR through the LARE program. The 2016 EWM are shaded red in Figure 1. The descriptions of treatment areas in Table 2 correspond to the areas in Figure 1 as well.

Area	Acres	Avg. Depth	Herbicide	Rate
3	5.60	5 feet	DMA-4	2.0 ppm
4	2.79	5 feet	DMA-4	2.0 ppm
5	4.32	5 feet	DMA-4	2.0 ppm

 Table 2: Dewart Lake 2015 EWM Treatment Details





5



Tier II Survey Results

Aquatic plant sampling methods used for surveys on Dewart Lake are outlined in the Tier II Aquatic Vegetation Survey Protocol (IDNR 2014). The sample locations used by Aquatic Weed Control in 2016 were obtained from the IDNR. This was done to ensure consistency in the sampling process from year to year. These same locations will continue to be used in the future to help maintain consistency. Common and scientific names of all plants collected are listed in the appendix to this report. Figure 2 shows rake sample locations for the Dewart Lake tier II surveys. Ninety sample sites are spaced randomly throughout each five foot depth contour of the lake's littoral zone.

DELORME XMap® 6 **Dewart Lake Tier II Sample Locations**

Figure 2: Dewart Lake Tier II Sample Locations

Data use subject to license. © DeLorme. XMap® 6. www.delorme.com







Exotic Plant Distribution

Eurasian Watermilfoil Abundance

The 2016 tier II survey was conducted on August 3rd. EWM frequency in the spring survey was 50.0. This is up from 30.0 percent in summer of 2015. All tier II sample locations where EWM was collected in the summer 2016 tier II survey are shown in Figure 3. As shown, EWM is abundant throughout the lake, especially in depths of 5 to 10 feet where its site frequency was 81.5 percent.

<figure>





Curly-Leaf Pondweed Abundance

Curly-leaf pondweed (CLP) was found at just 2 sample locations in the summer 2016 tier II survey. However, spring surveys provide a better picture of CLP abundance. CLP is always most abundant in spring and dies off naturally as water temperatures rise in summer. The last spring tier II survey was conducted in 2015 and found CLP frequency to be 16.0 percent. The two tier II sites where CLP was collected in the summer 2016 tier II survey are described in Figure 4.

<complex-block><image>





Spiny Naiad Abundance

Spiny naiad was collected at just one 1 sample location in the summer 2016 tier II survey. In the past few years spiny naiad has been found in very low abundance and it does not appear that spiny naiad is causing any significant problems in Dewart Lake. The one site where spiny naiad was collected in summer of 2016 is shown in Figure 5.



Figure 5: Dewart Lake Summer 2016 Spiny Naiad Locations

Tier II Data Analysis

Results from the August 3, 2016 tier II survey on Dewart Lake is summarized in Table 3. Site frequency, dominance, diversity, and other metrics are shown for the entire survey (overall) and also for each 5 foot depth contour where plants were present. In this, no plants were found deeper than 19.5 feet.



Occurrence and Abundance of Submersed Aquatic Plants in Dewart Lake									
County:	Kosciusko	Secchi (ft):	11	<u>q</u>	Mean sp	ecies/site	2 14		
Date:	8/3/2016	Sites with plants:	80	S	E Mean sp	ecies/site:	0.15		
Littoral Depth (ft):	19.5	Sites with native plants:	68	Mea	n native sp	ecies/site:	1.61		
Littoral Sites:	90	Number of species:	16		SF Mean n	atives/site:	0.13		
Total Sites:	90	Number of native species:	13		Species	s diversity:	0.86		
		Maximum species/site:	6	Na	tive species	s diversity:	0.84		
							0.0.		
All Depths		Frequency of	Rake	score free	uency per	species	Plant		
Species		Occurrence	0	1	3	5	Dominance		
Eurasian watermilfoil		50.0	50.0	18.9	16.7	14.4	28.2		
Chara		40.0	60.0	12.2	14.4	13.3	24.4		
Coontail		31.1	68.9	14.4	11.1	5.6	15.1		
Slender naiad		26.7	73.3	23.3	3.3	0.0	6.7		
Illinois pondweed		22.2	77.8	13.3	8.9	0.0	8.0		
Sago pondweed		11.1	88.9	8.9	2.2	0.0	3.1		
Canada waterweed		5.6	94.4	4.4	1.1	0.0	1.6		
Flat-stemmed pondwe	ed	5.6	94.4	5.6	0.0	0.0	1.1		
Small pondweed		5.6	94.4	3.3	2.2	0.0	2.0		
Water stargrass		5.6	94.4	4.4	1.1	0.0	1.6		
Large-leaved pondwe	ed	3.3	96.7	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.7		
Curly-leaf pondweed		2.2	97.8	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.9		
Nitella		2.2	97.8	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.8		
American pondweed		1.1	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.2		
Eel grass		1.1	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.2		
Spiny naiad		1.1	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.2		
Filamentous Algae		7.8							
Occurren	ce and A	bundance of Submer	sed A	quatic Pl	ants in D	Dewart L	ake		
County:	Kosciusko	Secchi (ft):	11		Mean sp	ecies/site:	2.10		
Date:	8/3/2016	Sites with plants:	27	S	E Mean sp	ecies/site:	0.22		
Littoral Depth (ft):	19.5	Sites with native plants:	26	Mea	n native sp	ecies/site:	1.93		
Littoral Sites:	29	Number of species:	11	:	SE Mean n	n natives/site: 0.21			
Total Sites:	29	Number of native species:	umber of native species: 10						
		Maximum species/site:	5	Na	0.73				
Depths: 0 to 5 ft		Frequency of	Rake	score free	quency per	species	Plant		
Species		Occurrence	0	1	3	5	Dominance		
Chara		82.8	17.2	17.2	34.5	31.0	55.2		
Illinois pondweed		48.3	51.7	27.6	20.7	0.0	17.9		
Slender naiad		20.7	79.3	17.2	3.4	0.0	5.5		
Eurasian watermilfoil		17.2	82.8	17.2	0.0	0.0	3.4		
Sago pondweed		13.8	86.2	10.3	3.4	0.0	4.1		
Coontail		6.9	93.1	3.4	0.0	3.4	4.1		
Flat-stemmed pondwe	ed	6.9	93.1	6.9	0.0	0.0	1.4		
American pondweed		3.4	96.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.7		
Canada waterweed		3.4	96.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.7		
Eel grass		3.4	96.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.7		
Large-leaved pondwe	ed	3.4	96.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.7		
Filamentous Algae		6.9	L	L					
Occurren	ce and A	bundance of Submer	sed A	quatic P	ants in D	Dewart L	ake		
County:	Kosciusko	Secchi (ft):	11		Mean sp	ecies/site:	2.59		
Date:	8/3/2016	Sites with plants:	26	S	E Mean sp	ecies/site:	0.27		
Littoral Depth (ft):	19.5	Sites with native plants:	21	Mea	in native sp	ecies/site:	1.70		
Littoral Sites:	27	Number of species:	13		SE Mean n	atives/site:	0.23		
Total Sites:	27	Number of native species:	10		Species	s diversity:	0.84		
	1	Maximum species/site:	5	Na	tive species	s diversity:	0.87		
Depths: 5 to 10 ft	-	Frequency of	Rake	score frec	uency per	species	Plant		
Species		Occurrence	0	1	3	5	Dominance		
Eurasian watermilfoil		81.5	18.5	22.2	22.2	37.0	54.8		
Coontail		33.3	66.7	18.5	14.8	0.0	12.6		
Chara		29.6	70.4	14.8	7.4	7.4	14.8		
Siender nalad		29.6	/0.4	25.9	3.1	0.0	1.4		
Illinois pondweed		18.5	81.5	11.1	1.4	0.0	6.7		
Sago pondweed		14.8	85.2	14.8	0.0	0.0	3.0		
vvater stargrass		14.8	85.2	11.1	3.7	0.0	4.4		
Flat-stemmed pondwe	ea	11.1	88.9	11.1	0.0	0.0	2.2		
Canada waterweed		1.4	92.6	3./	3.7	0.0	3.0		
Small pondweed		1.4	92.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.5		
Curiy-leat pondweed		3.7	96.3	0.0	3.7	0.0	2.2		
Large-leaved pondwe	ea	3.7	96.3	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.7		
Spiny haiad		3./	96.3	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.7		
Filamentous Algaé		11.1							

Table 3: Dewart Lake 2016 Tier II Data Analysis



Table 3 continued

Occurren	Occurrence and Abundance of Submersed Aquatic Plants in Dewart Lake								
County:	Kosciusko	Secchi (ft):	11		Mean sp	ecies/site:	2.29		
Date:	8/3/2016	Sites with plants:	23	S	E Mean sp	ecies/site:	0.32		
Littoral Depth (ft):	19.5	Sites with native plants:	17	Mea	n native sp	ecies/site:	1.58		
Littoral Sites:	24	Number of species:	12	ę	SE Mean n	atives/site:	0.31		
Total Sites:	24	Number of native species:	10		Species	s diversity:	0.81		
		Maximum species/site:	6	Nat	ive species	s diversity:	0.77		
Depths: 10 to 15 ft		Frequency of	Rake	score freq	uency per	species	Plant		
Species		Occurrence	0	1	3	5	Dominance		
Eurasian watermilfoil		66.7	33.3	20.8	33.3	12.5	36.7		
Coontail		58.3	41.7	25.0	16.7	16.7	31.7		
Slender naiad		41.7	58.3	37.5	4.2	0.0	10.0		
Chara		16.7	83.3	8.3	4.2	4.2	8.3		
Canada waterweed		8.3	91.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	1.7		
Sago pondweed		8.3	91.7	4.2	4.2	0.0	3.3		
Small pondweed		8.3	91.7	4.2	4.2	0.0	3.3		
Curly-leaf pondweed		4.2	95.8	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.8		
Illinois pondweed		4.2	95.8	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.8		
Large-leaved pondwe	ed	4.2	95.8	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.8		
Nitella		4.2	95.8	0.0	0.0	4.2	4.2		
Water stargrass		4.2	95.8	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.8		
Filamentous Algae		8.3							
Occurren	ce and A	bundance of Submer	sed A	quatic Pl	ants in D	Dewart L	ake		
County:	Kosciusko	Secchi (ft):	11		Mean sp	ecies/site:	0.70		
Date:	8/3/2016	Sites with plants:	4	S	E Mean sp	ecies/site:	0.30		
Littoral Depth (ft):	19.5	Sites with native plants:	4	Mea	n native sp	ecies/site:	0.50		
Littoral Sites:	10	Number of species:	0.22						
Total Sites:	10	Number of native species: 3 Species diversity: 0.6							
		Maximum species/site: 2 Native species diversity: 0.4							
Depths: 15 to 20 ft		Frequency of Ra		ake score frequency per species		species	Plant		
Species		Occurrence	0	1	3	5	Dominance		
Coontail		30.0	70.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	14.0		
Eurasian watermilfoil		20.0	80.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	8.0		
Nitella		10.0	90.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	6.0		
Small pondweed		10.0	90.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	6.0		

Multi-Year Data Presentations

Data from recent tier II surveys of Dewart Lake is summarized in Table 4 and Table 5. These summaries help track long term trends in species abundance and frequency, along with overall plant metrics. All historical spring tier II surveys are described in Table 4 while all historical summer tier II data is described in Table 5.



Dewart	Lake Multi-Yea	ar Data Present	ation- Spring S	urveys	
Date:	5/23/2006	5/23/2007	5/22/2008	5/27/2010	5/26/2015
Total Sites:	90	90	90	90	90
Secchi (ft):	22	13	17.5	10.4	8.3
Number of Species:	11	9	12	14	10
Sites with Plants	83	79	79	85	86
Sites with Native Plants	68	50	66	81	81
Maximum Plant Depth (ft)	19	20	20	19	18
Species Diversity:	0.79	0.73	0.78	0.85	0.85
Native Species Diversity:	0.73	0.72	0.73	0.79	0.81
Mean Native Species/Site:	0.94	0.69	0.81	1.31	1.54
Surveying Organization	IDNR	IDNR	IDNR	AWC	AWC
S	pecies Frequen	cy of Occurren	ce - All Depths		
Chara	23.3	30.0	38.9	41.1	41.1
	0.0	0.0	3.3	43.3	7.8
Sago pondweed	10.0	17.8	5.6	12.2	34.4
Eel grass	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.2
Coontail	41.1	5.6	11.1	37.8	36.7
Slender naiad	2.2	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.2
Nitella	1.1	3.3	3.3	2.2	2.2
Bladderwort	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
American pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0
Whorled watermilfoil	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0
Flat-stemmed pondweed	2.2	1.1	5.6	14.4	1.1
Small pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4
Canada waterweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0
	35.6	1.1	0.0 12.2	23.3	7.8
Eloating-leaf pondweed	0.0	48.9	42.2	0.0	0.0
Southern naiad	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Leafy pondweed	0.0	0.0	3.3	7.8	0.0
Water stargrass	5.6	5.6	8.9	4.4	5.6
Large-leaved pondweed	2.2	4.4	2.2	1.1	6.7
Filamentous Algae	12.2	34.4	31.1	0.0	7.8
	Species Freque	ncy of Occurrer	nce - 0 to 5 ft	I	
Chara	65.5	65.5	69.0	79.3	86.2
Illinois pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	17.2
Eurasian watermilfoil	27.6	0.0	3.4	27.6	27.6
Sago ponoweed	10.3	6.9	0.0	3.4	31.0
Fel grass	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
American pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0
Flat-stemmed pondweed	0.0	3.4	0.0	10.3	0.0
Coontail	6.9	0.0	3.4	20.7	10.3
Canada waterweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
Variable pondweed	20.7	3.4	0.0	0.0	20.7
Curly-leaf pondweed	6.9	13.8	13.8	20.7	3.4
Leafy pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.3	0.0
Small pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Water stargrass	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.4
Southern haiad	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4 13.9
	5.4 24 1	0.9 79.2	5.4 58.6	0.0	13.8 13.8
	pecies Frequer	ncy of Occurren	ce - 5 to 10 ft	0.0	13.0
Chara	7.4	29.6	48.1	44.4	33.3
Eurasian watermilfoil	96.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	85.2
Sago pondweed	14.8	48.1	11.1	14.8	74.1
Eel grass	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7
Illinois pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	7.4
Coontail	29.6	11.1	3.7	37.0	25.9
Slender naiad	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7
Small pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1
Bladderwort	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
Canada waterweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	3./	0.0
riat-stemmed pondweed	3.7	0.0	3./	22.2	3./
Variable pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
Water stargrass	18 5	14.8	14.8	0.0	3.7
Large-leaved pondweed	3.7	7.4	3.7	3.7	7.4
Leafy pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0
Whorled watermilfoil	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0
Curly-leaf pondweed	29.6	51.9	33.3	40.7	3.7
Filamentous Algae	7.4	18.5	40.7	0.0	3.7

Table 4: Dewart Lake Historical Tier II Data - Spring Surveys



Table 4 continued

Species Frequency of Occurrence - 10 to 15 ft											
Eurasian watermilfoil	95.8	0.0	8.3	54.2	58.3						
Chara	0.0	0.0	8.3	4.2	12.5						
Coontail	87.5	8.3	25.0	54.2	75.0						
Sago pondweed	8.3	4.2	8.3	25.0	8.3						
Slender naiad	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0						
Nitella	0.0	0.0	4.2	4.2	0.0						
Water stargrass	0.0	4.2	16.7	0.0	8.3						
Leafy pondweed	0.0	0.0	12.5	4.2	0.0						
Flat-stemmed pondweed	4.2	0.0	12.5	16.7	0.0						
Small pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2						
Curly-leaf pondweed	66.7	87.5	79.2 41.7		41.7						
Filamentous Algae	4.2	12.5	0.0	0.0	4.2						
Species Frequency of Occurrence - 15 to 20 ft											
Nitella	10.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	10.0						
Coontail	60.0	0.0	20.0	50.0	50.0						
Chara	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0						
Slender naiad	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0						
Eurasian watermilfoil	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0						
Curly-leaf pondweed	60.0	50.0	60.0	30.0	30.0						
Water stargrass	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0						
Flat-stemmed pondweed	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0						
Filamentous Algae	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0						



	Table 5: Dewart Lake	Historical	Tier II Data	- Summer	Surveys
--	----------------------	------------	---------------------	----------	---------

			Dewart	Lake Multi-Y	ear Data Pres	entation- Su	immer Surve	/S			-	
Date:	8/1/2005	7/31/2006	8/1/2007	7/29/2008	7/30/2009	8/11/2010	8/17/2011	8/16/2012	8/8/2013	8/7/2014	7/31/2015	8/3/2016
Total Sites:	103	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Secchi (ft):	7.5	11	9	7.5	8.5	-	12	-	-	7.5	9.2	11
Number of Species:	17	10	12	15	16	12	15	14	16	17	16	16
Number of Native Species:	15	9	10	12	14	10	13	12	14	14	14	13
Sites with Plants	103	80	77	79	86	85	87	88	84	86	82	80
Sites with Native Plants	100	80	75	79	85	84	80	86	84	86	82	68
Maximum Plant Depth (ft)	20	20	17	19.5	20	20	18	20	20	18	18	19.5
Species Diversity:	0.85	0.72	0.79	0.83	0.88	0.86	0.83	0.8	0.85	0.86	0.86	0.86
Native Species Diversity:	0.84	0.71	0.73	0.8	0.86	0.83	0.8	0.78	0.81	0.83	0.84	0.84
Mean Native Species/Site:	1.86	1.12	1.36	1.43	1.84	1.79	1.49	1.47	1.66	2.07	1.79	1.61
Surveying Organization	IDNR	IDNR	IDNR	IDNR	IDNR	IDNR	IDNR	IDNR	IDNR	IDNR	AWC	AWC
				Species Frequ	iency of Occi	rrence - All	Depths					
Chara	50.5	37.8	56.7	43.3	35.6	47.8	45.6	37.8	34.4	75.9	38.9	40.0
Eurasian watermilfoil	60.2	0.0	0.0	7.8	26.7	45.6	52.2	62.2	32.2	37.9	30.0	50.0
Illinois pondweed	11.7	0.0	11	11	22	10.0	4.4	14.4	11 1	17.2	16.7	22.2
Sago pondweed	12.6	0.0	35.6	31.1	30.0	25.6	15.6	15.6	33.3	48.3	31.1	11 1
Fel grass	1.0	1 1	0.0	11	1 1	4.4	1 1	1 1	2.2	0.0	22	1 1
Coontail	43.7	43.3	12.2	20.0	37.8	37.8	42.2	52.2	50.0	17.2	43.3	31.1
Slender najad	18.4	22	5.6	6.7	13.3	14.4	12.2	4.4	2.2	17.2	20.0	26.7
Nitella	0.0	1 1	1.1	2.2	11.1	14.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	20.7
Riaddenwort	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Spiny paiad	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.2	1.1	0.0	6.0	2.0	1.1
Amorican pondwood	0.0	0.0	4.4	2.2	5.5	2.2	5.5	1.1	4.4	0.9	1.1	1.1
Elat stommod popdwood	2.0	0.0 E.6	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	1.1	1.1
Small nondwood	2.9	3.0	0.0	1.1	10.0	5.0	5.5	0.0	1.1	0.9	7.0	5.0
Small pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	5.0
	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	3.4	1.1	5.0
variable pondweed	13.6	2.2	2.2	4.4	2.2	0.0	12.2	12.2	6.7	37.9	0.0	0.0
Curly-lear pondweed	1.9	2.2	24.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
Couth any nation	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.2	12.2	3.4	0.0	0.0
Southern halad	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.2	37.9	4.4	0.0
Leary pondweed	1.0	0.0	1.1	3.3	5.6	0.0	3.3	1.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Northern watermilitoil	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Water stargrass	18.4	16.7	16.7	27.8	23.3	22.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	6.9	4.4	5.6
Large-leaved pondweed	5.8	2.2	3.3	1.1	6.7	6.7	3.3	3.3	1.1	6.9	1.1	3.3
Filamentous Algae	9.7	12.2	12.2	4.4	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	3.3	10.3	3.3	7.8
				Species Frec	quency of Occ	currence - U	to 5 ft					
Chara	88.6	80.0	83.9	89.7	89.7	86.2	82.8	82.8	82.8	/5.9	89.7	82.8
Illinois pondweed	20.5	0.0	3.2	0.0	3.4	24.1	6.9	41.4	27.6	17.2	48.3	48.3
Eurasian watermilfoil	29.5	0.0	0.0	3.4	10.3	17.2	31.0	37.9	27.6	37.9	17.2	17.2
Sago pondweed	4.5	0.0	16.1	3.4	13.8	6.9	0.0	20.7	17.2	48.3	24.1	13.8
Slender nalad	29.5	3.3	0.0	0.0	10.3	17.2	27.6	0.0	6.9	17.2	13.8	20.7
Eel grass	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	3.4	3.4	6.9	0.0	0.0	3.4
Bladderwort	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
American pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.4
Flat-stemmed pondweed	4.5	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0	3.4	6.9	6.9	6.9
Spiny naiad	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.4	6.9	6.9	3.4	0.0
Richardson's pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Coontail	13.6	10.0	3.2	6.9	13.8	6.9	10.3	17.2	13.8	17.2	17.2	6.9
Canada waterweed	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4
Variable pondweed	27.3	3.3	6.5	6.9	3.4	0.0	27.6	31.0	13.8	37.9	0.0	0.0
Curly-leaf pondweed	0.0	0.0	3.2	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Leafy pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Water stargrass	11.4	10.0	9.7	6.9	3.4	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0
Floating-leaf pondweed	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	6.9	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0
Southern naiad	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.8	37.9	3.4	0.0
Northern watermilfoil	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nitella	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Large-leaved pondweed	4.5	3.3	3.2	0.0	10.3	13.8	10.3	10.3	3.4	6.9	3.4	3.4
Filamentous Algae	2.3	13.3	12.9	3.4	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	3.4	10.3	3.4	6.9



Table 5 continued

				Species Freq	uency of Occ	urrence - 5 te	o 10 ft					
Chara	36.4	30.8	68.0	40.7	22.2	55.6	51.9	32.1	25.9	14.8	33.3	29.6
Eurasian watermilfoil	78.8	0.0	0.0	7.4	33.3	70.4	70.4	96.4	55.6	85.2	55.6	81.5
Sago pondweed	27.3	0.0	72.0	51.9	59.3	40.7	37.0	21.4	70.4	74.1	63.0	14.8
Eel grass	3.0	3.8	0.0	3.7	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	7.4	0.0
Illinois pondweed	9.1	0.0	0.0	3.7	3.7	7.4	3.7	0.0	7.4	0.0	3.7	18.5
Coontail	45.5	38.5	8.0	22.2	29.6	44.4	37.0	53.6	59.3	63.0	37.0	33.3
Slender naiad	18.2	0.0	20.0	11.1	22.2	7.4	11.1	3.6	0.0	0.0	14.8	29.6
Richardson's pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Small pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4
Canada waterweed	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	7.4
Spiny naiad	0.0	0.0	8.0	7.4	11.1	3.7	7.4	0.0	7.4	7.4	3.7	3.7
Flat-stemmed pondweed	3.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	18.5	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1
Nitella	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.5	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Variable pondweed	6.1	3.8	0.0	7.4	3.7	0.0	11.1	7.1	7.4	14.8	0.0	0.0
Water stargrass	36.4	23.1	28.0	29.6	37.0	40.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	7.4	11.1	14.8
Large-leaved pondweed	12.1	0.0	4.0	3.7	11.1	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
Southern naiad	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.9	37.0	7.4	0.0
Leafy pondweed	3.0	0.0	4.0	3.7	3.7	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Northern watermilfoil	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Curly-leaf pondweed	0.0	0.0	32.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7
Filamentous Algae	21.2	15.4	12.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	7.4	3.7	7.4	11.1
				Species Frequ	iency of Occu	urrence - 10 t	to 15 ft					
Eurasian watermilfoil	84.6	0.0	0.0	12.5	45.8	70.8	66.7	60.9	20.8	50.0	29.2	66.7
Chara	7.7	8.3	29.2	8.3	0.0	12.5	8.3	4.3	0.0	4.2	0.0	16.7
Coontail	84.6	75.0	25.0	25.0	66.7	66.7	83.3	82.6	83.3	91.7	87.5	58.3
Eel grass	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sago pondweed	15.4	0.0	33.3	41.7	29.2	33.3	16.7	8.7	20.8	20.8	16.7	8.3
Spiny naiad	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Illinois pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
Southern naiad	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.8	4.2	0.0
Slender naiad	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	20.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	41.7
Nitella	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	12.5	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	4.2
Bladderwort	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Water stargrass	15.4	20.8	20.8	54.2	37.5	29.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	4.2	4.2
Canada waterweed	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3
Large-leaved pondweed	0.0	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
Leafy pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	12.5	0.0	0.0	4.3	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Flat-stemmed pondweed	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.2	16.7	4.2	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0
Small pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	8.3
Variable pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0
Curly-leaf pondweed	15.4	8.3	50.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
Northern watermilfoil	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Filamentous Algae	7.7	8.3	12.5	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	8.3
			9	Species Frequ	ency of Occu	irrence - 15	to 20 ft					
Nitella	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	10.0
Coontail	100.0	80.0	20.0	40.0	60.0	40.0	50.0	80.0	50.0	50.0	30.0	30.0
Chara	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Slender naiad	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
Sago pondweed	0.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Eurasian watermilfoil	92.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	30.0	40.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	20.0
Curly-leaf pondweed	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Water stargrass	0.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Small pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
Flat-stemmed pondweed	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Canada waterweed	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Leafy pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Variable pondweed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
Filamentous Algae	7.7	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0

Table 6 summarizes the Secchi readings taken in each tier II survey on Dewart Lake since 2005. Water clarity can fluctuate greatly based on weather, rain events, and algal blooms. It appears that water clarity in Dewart Lake is moderate to good when compared to many other lakes in the area. Water clarity appears to have changed very little since 2005.

Tuble of Dewalt	Luke beechi mb
Date	Secchi (ft.):
8/1/2005	7.5
5/23/2006	22
7/31/2006	11
5/23/2007	13
8/1/2007	9
5/22/2008	17.5
7/29/2008	7.5
7/30/2009	8.5
5/27/2010	10.4
8/11/2010	-
8/17/2011	12
8/16/2012	-
8/8/2013	-
8/7/2014	7.5
5/26/2015	8.3
7/31/2015	9.2
8/3/2016	11.0

Table 6: Dewart Lake Secchi History

Dissolved Oxygen and Temperature Profiles

During the summer 2016 tier II survey, Aquatic Weed Control collected data to construct dissolved oxygen and temperature profiles for Dewart Lake. These profiles are described in Figure 6 and Figure 7. Dissolved oxygen in Dewart Lake is moderate. Adequate oxygen to support fish life was present down to about 15 feet in August of 2016. Data from the temperature profile indicated weak thermal stratification beginning at a depth of around 10 feet. The surface temperature was 85.9 degrees and dropped to a temperature of 56.0 degrees at a depth of 30 feet.





Figure 7: Dewart Lake 2016 Temperature Profile







Tier II Discussion

In the Dewart Lake Summer 2016 tier II survey, three exotic plant species were collected along with 13 native plant species.

Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM), spiny naiad, and curly-leaf pondweed (CLP) were the three exotic plants collected in Dewart Lake in 2016. In the summer 2016 tier II survey, spiny naiad site frequency was 1.1 percent. Curly leaf pondweed frequency was 2.2 percent and EWM frequency was 50.0 percent. At this time, it does not appear that either CLP or spiny naiad is causing major lake use problems in Dewart Lake. EWM does become dense in many areas and is currently the most significant management concern.

EWM frequency had increased each year from 2007 to 2012 as it recovered following the Sonar treatment in 2006. Summer EWM site frequency from 2007 to 2012 was 0.0, 7.8, 26.7, 45.6, 52.2, and 62.2 respectively. In the summer of 2013, EWM frequency was down to 32.2 percent and stayed relatively stable with summer frequencies of 37.9 in 2014 and 30.0 in 2015. Tier II data from 2016 showed an increase in EWM abundance with a site frequency of 50.0 percent.

The tier II data from the years of the weevil stocking could indicate that the weevils are having an impact on the EWM population by reducing frequency from spring to summer. However, it is difficult to say for sure as natural reductions in EWM from spring to fall can also occur. It is unknown if the weevils are still having an impact on EWM density. While EWM frequency was quite high in 2016, that is not to say that weevils could not be preventing some EWM from reaching the surface of the lake.

The summary and results of the weevil stockings is available online: <u>http://www.in.gov/dnr/fishwild/files/fw-</u> 1163 Dewart Lake 2015 Weevil Survey Kosciusko County Oct 2015.pdf

Native Plant Trends

The 2016 tier II survey collected 13 native plant species which is very comparable to past years. Native plant diversity was good in summer of 2016 at 0.84. This is as high as native plant diversity has been since 2009. It appears that native plant diversity has remained very stable since 2005. Native vegetation is somewhat dense in many areas of Dewart Lake and diversity is high compared to many other area lakes. However, the native population should continue to be monitored to verify that species richness and diversity do not decline significantly in the future.

The plant management objectives outlined in this report include reducing annual EWM site frequency to 10% or less, while maintaining 12 native species collected each year. The IDNR also established the objectives of maintaining a native plant diversity of 0.80 each year while also maintaining 85% plant coverage in tier II surveys. The native objectives were met in 2016 while the EWM control objective was not. Given EWM abundance in Dewart Lake and the limited amount of treatment, it is not likely that the EWM control objective of 10% frequency will be met in the near future. Currently the IDNR will allow up to 28 acres to be treated annually.



Chara and coontail are the two most dominant native plants in summer surveys on Dewart Lake. On August 3, 2016, Chara and Coontail were found at 40.0 and 31.1 percent of sample sites respectively. Both of these plants offer beneficial habitat for fish and invertebrates. Helping to keep invasive plants under control should help to foster more favorable conditions for native plants to flourish.

Action Plan

For 2017, a spring visual survey should give an idea of EWM severity and acreage. The map produced from this survey can be used as a treatment map if needed. It was generally decided at the permit meeting in September of 2016 that EWM treatments should only be conducted in areas where EWM infestation is severe and nearing the surface of the lake. The IDNR will permit treatment for up to a total of 28 acres on the main lake (including private treatments).

LARE staff along with the DLPA would like to continue to protect areas where EWM weevils have been stocked and EWM treatments are not likely to be allowed in historical weevil stocking sites. The following map shows potential treatment areas for 2017 although actual areas will depend upon the results of a visual survey in spring of 2017. A map will be submitted to the IDNR for approval prior to any herbicide treatments.



MN (5.3° W)

Figure 8: Dewart Lake 2017 Potential EWM Treatment Areas



Data Zoom 14-3

Surveys and Planning

A visual survey should be sufficient in the spring of 2017 to verify EWM abundance and locations prior to any herbicide treatments. A summer (post treatment) tier II survey should be used to monitor both EWM and native plant populations and update the AVMP. It is also possible that the association could apply for survey funding in 2017 as opposed to a full AVMP update in 2017. Cost figures below include estimates for a full 2017 AVMP update as this would represent the maximum cost share for the association.

2017 Project Budget

Treat up to 25 acres of EWM on Dewart Lake with liquid 2, 4-D at 2.0 ppm. (up to 6 ft avg depth)	:	\$ 8,750
Spring visual survey, summer Tier II survey and plan update	S	\$ 5,000
**The association may decide to conduct a survey without an AVMP. The constitute for this is \$2,500.	ost	
Total cost estimate and Grant Request LARE share (80% of AVMP, 50% of treatment) Assocaitions share (20% of avmp, 50% of treatment)	up to up to up to	\$ 13,750 \$ 8,375 \$ 5,375

Public Involvement

Parties interested in the improvement of Dewart Lake include members of the Dewart Lake Protective Association as well as others who access the lake at the IDNR owned access site. The most common and often most effective methods for keeping the public informed about aquatic vegetation management practices are lake association meetings as well as periodical newsletters sent out by the associations. It is recommended that association members encourage neighbors and other lake users to attend lake association meetings so that interested parties are well informed about the LARE program. Making sure that meetings are well advertised and planned well in advance of the meeting dates are ways to help ensure good attendance. Carry-in dinners, door prizes, contests, guest speakers, and discussion panels are all excellent ways to boost attendance, encourage involvement, and keep association members informed about lake management activities.

The Dewart Lake Association held a public meeting on June 12, 2016 to discuss issues related to the LARE program. Jim Donahoe of Aquatic Weed Control attended this meeting to summarize LARE activities on the lake. Attendance was good with 18 lake use surveys being returned. The majority of association members were very much in favor of continuing efforts to control invasive plant species. Two people commented that they thought the weevil stockings were effective. The results of the 2016 survey responses are summarized in Figure 9.



Lake Use Survey	Lake name Dewart Lake
Are you a lake property owner?	Yes <u>17</u> No <u>1</u>
Are you currently a member of you	ur lake association? Yes <u>18</u> No <u>0</u>
How many years have you been at	the lake? 2 or less 0
	2-5 years 0
	5-10 years 4
	Over 10 years 14
How do you use the lake (mark all	that apply)
18 Swimming	5 Irrigation
18 Boating	Drinking water
17_Fishing	1 Other fun

Do you have aquatic plants at your shoreline in nuisance quantities? Yes 14 No 4

Do you currently participate in a weed control project on the lake? Yes 14 No 4

Does aquatic vegetation interfere with your use or enjoyment of the lake? Yes 12 No 4

Does the level of vegetation in the lake affect your property values? Yes 7 No 10

Are you in favor of continuing efforts to control vegetation on the lake? Yes 17 No 1

Are you aware that the LARE funds will only apply to work controlling invasive exotic species, and more work may need to be privately funded? Yes <u>16</u> No _____

Mark any of these you think are problems on your lake:

- 4 Too many boats access the lake
- 3 Use of jet skis on the lake
- 4 Too much fishing
- Fish population problem
- 2 Dredging needed
- 6 Overuse by nonresidents
- 10 Too many aquatic plants
- Not enough aquatic plants
- Poor water quality
 - Pier/funneling problem

Please add any comments:

Great lake - no problems as long as weeds are controlled Best lake in Indiana-weevils were great!! Aquatic vegetation has interfered with use of this lake in the past. Use of jet skis by underage and under-skilled drivers I think weevils worked! Not in favor of total lake spraying! Have to wait too late into the summer for treatment.



References Cited

IDNR. 2014. Tier II Aquatic Vegetation Survey Protocol. IN Department of Natural Resources. Indianapolis, Indiana.



Appendix

Common and Scientific Names of Aquatic Plants in Dewart Lake

Common Name	Scientific Name
American pondweed	Potamogeton nodosus
Bladderwort	Utricularia sp.
Chara	Chara sp.
Coontail	Ceratophyllum demersum
Curly-leaf pondweed	Potamogeton crispus
Eel grass	Vallisneria americana
Canada waterweed	Elodea canadensis
Eurasian watermilfoil	Myriophyllum spicatum
Flat-stemmed pondweed	Potamogeton zosteriformis
Floating-leaf pondweed	Potamogeton natans
Illinois pondweed	Potamogeton illinoensis
Large-leaved pondweed	Potamogeton amplifolius
Leafy pondweed	Potamogeton foliosus
Nitella	Nitella sp.
Richardson's pondweed	Potamogeton richardsonii
Northern watermilfoil	Myriophyllum sibiricum
Sago pondweed	Potamogeton pectinatus
Slender naiad	Najas flexilis
Spiny naiad	Najas marina
Southern naiad	Najas guadalupensis
Small pondweed	Potamogeton pusillus
Variable pondweed	Potamogeton gramineus
Water stargrass	Heteranthera dubia
Whorled watermilfoil	Myriophyllum verticillatum



Dewart Lake	Date	8/3/2016		Secchi 11											
Latitude Longitude	e Depth	Site	Eurasian watermilfoil Spiny naiad	Curly-leaf Chara Sago pondweed	Coontail	I Illinois pondweed Fl	at-stemmed pondweed V	Vater stargrass Nite	lla Large-leaved pondweed	Small pondweed	Canada waterweed E	el grass S	lender na American pon	ndweed Algae	e
41 37480 -85 7726	11 5	1	1	3		1							1		
41 37440 -85 7740	12 3.5	2		1	1	1							1		
41 37382 -85 7740	12 7	e	5					1							
41 37321 -85 7756	15.5	4													
41 37358 -85 7759	9 61	5	5					3		1			1		
41 37431 -85 7763	4	9		1											
41 37464 -85 7785	9 0	7	5												
41 37492 -85 7795	.n 10.5	∞	3											a	
41 37690 -85 7812	29 3	0		3								1			
41 37631 -85 7819	14 15.5	10	3							3					
41 37652 -A5 7836	in 15	11	1			1									
41 37656 -85 7837	75 5.5	12	3			1					1		1		
41 37630 -85 7849	10 4.5	13		e		1									
41 37542 -85 7837	70 10	14	3	1		1							1		
41 37461 -85 7832	9	15		m		e									
41 37345 -85 7814	19 5.5	16		3		3									
41 37244 -R5 7R0R	35 11	17		5											
41 37181 -85 7813	10 4	18		e		1							1		
41 37073 -85 7804	14 9	19	1											٩	
41 37040 -85 7800	11.5	20	3												
41 36946 -85 7806	39 4	21		5											
41 36866 -85 7798	9 8	22	1 1			1				1			1		
41 36824 -85 7794	10 16.5	23				1									
41 36710 -85 7802	'n 12	24	5		,										
41 36679 -85 7802	5.5	25	3	5			1								
41 36742 -85 7807	73 2	26		5		1									
41 36636 -85 7831	11 4	27		3		1									
41 36591 -85 7832	23 13	28		3											
41 36531 -85 7831	15 6	29		3		1			1						
41 36481 -85 7816	35 17	30			,	3			3						
41 36369 -85 7815	3.5	31		5		1								1	
41 36414 -R5 7805	7 24	32	5	1				1							
41 36421 -85 7785	53 4.5	33		5		3									
41 36451 -85 7784	47 13	34	1		-	1			5						
41 36544 -85 7775	8	35	5			1								đ	
41 36674 -85 7775	12.5 12.5	36	3												
41 36790 -85 7774	46 18	37													
41 36586 -85 7776	15 4	38		5											
41 36802 -85 7754	14 7.5	39	3			1							1		
41 36768 -85 7746	JU 2	40		5	1	1									
41 36896 -85 7735	56 11.5	41	1							3			1		
41 36932 -85 7736	13 7	42	5		1								1		
41 36979 -85 7714	4 4	43		1											
41.37098 -85.7711	116	44												_	
41 32090 -85 7206	11	45	5												

Data Sheets and GPS Coordinates



Latitude	Longitude	Depth	Site
41.37480	-85.77261	5	1
41.37440	-85.77402	3.5	2
41.37382	-85.77402	7	3
41.37321	-85.77509	15.5	4
41.37358	-85.77599	6	5
41.37431	-85.77631	4	6
41.37464	-85.77850	6	7
41.37492	-85.77956	10.5	8
41.37690	-85.78122	3	9
41.37631	-85.78194	15.5	10
41.37652	-85.78360	15	11
41.37656	-85.78375	5.5	12
41.37630	-85.78490	4.5	13
41.37542	-85.78370	10	14
41.37461	-85.78329	4	15
41.37345	-85.78149	5.5	16
41.37244	-85.78085	11	17
41.37181	-85.78130	4	18
41.37073	-85.78044	9	19
41.37040	-85.78009	11.5	20
41.36946	-85.78069	4	21
41.36866	-85.77988	6	22
41.36824	-85.77940	16.5	23
41.36710	-85.78020	12	24
41.36679	-85.78025	5.5	25
41.36742	-85.78073	2	26
41.36636	-85.78311	4	27
41.36591	-85.78323	13	28
41.36531	-85.78315	6	29
41.36481	-85.78165	17	30
41.36369	-85.78139	3.5	31
41.36414	-85.78024	7	32
41.36421	-85.77853	4.5	33
41.36451	-85.77847	13	34
41.36544	-85.77791	8	35
41.36674	-85.77795	12.5	36
41.36790	-85.77746	18	37
41.36586	-85.77705	4	38
41.36802	-85.77544	7.5	39
41.36768	-85.77400	5	40
41.36896	-85.77356	11.5	41

Tier II Sample Site GPS Coordinates.

26



41.36932	-85.77303	7	42
41.36979	-85.77142	4	43
41.37098	-85.77113	16	44
41.37090	-85.77062	11	45
41.36898	-85.76977	6	46
41.36832	-85.77002	12.5	47
41.36764	-85.77027	4	48
41.36712	-85.76888	7	49
41.36694	-85.76732	18	50
41.36662	-85.76657	4	51
41.36684	-85.76546	12	52
41.36660	-85.76434	10	53
41.36576	-85.76418	4.5	54
41.36592	-85.76360	17	55
41.36416	-85.76376	8.5	56
41.36395	-85.76270	10.5	57
41.36301	-85.76193	3.5	58
41.36301	-85.76082	5.5	59
41.36285	-85.75916	3	60
41.36393	-85.76033	13	61
41.36451	-85.76049	4	62
41.36528	-85.76069	6.5	63
41.36596	-85.76163	12	64
41.36690	-85.76199	3.5	65
41.36705	-85.76344	11	66
41.36764	-85.76407	7	67
41.36899	-85.76336	4.5	68
41.36919	-85.76366	7.5	69
41.36922	-85.76414	11.5	70
41.37014	-85.76403	3	71
41.37055	-85.76495	6	72
41.37074	-85.76521	11	73
41.37095	-85.76538	19.5	74
41.37120	-85.76495	3	75
41.37270	-85.76423	13	76
41.37337	-85.76180	4	77
41.37354	-85.76183	5.5	78
41.37381	-85.76279	12.5	79
41.37420	-85.76289	4	80
41.37402	-85.76391	14.5	81
41.37404	-85.76392	7	82
41.37407	-85.76518	3.5	83
41.37352	-85.76582	13	84



41.37313	-85.76649	7	85
41.37270	-85.76760	10.5	86
41.37328	-85.76916	2.5	87
41.37239	-85.76955	9	88
41.37238	-85.76973	13.5	89
41.37226	-85.77069	16.5	90



This page intentionally left blank.



2017 LARE Treatment Permit

Possible EWM treatment areas for 2017 are unknown. The permit and map below represents potential EWM treatment areas for Dewart Lake in 2017. After the spring 2017 visual survey, a defined, specific treatment map and permit amendment will be submitted to the IDNR. No treatments will be made without prior approval from LARE, the lake association, and District 3 Fisheries biologist Jed Pearson.

FEE \$5.00	e Form 28727 (R5 / 9-13) roved by State Board of Account	s, 2013	Check typ	e of permit: Multiple Treatment A	DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE ATTN: COMMERCIAL LICENSE CLERK 402 W. Washington Street, Rm W273 Indianapolis, IN 46204 Telephone Number: (317) 232-4102 Fax Number: (317) 232-8150				
INSTRUCTIONS:	 Please print or type in 2. Applicant must sign the will be performing the 	nformation. le application treatment(s),	and is the only sig he/she will also sig	nature required. If a gn as the Certified Ar	oplicant is oplicator.	also the certifie	ed chemic	cal applicator that	
Applicant Name			Lake As	sociation Name					
Street or Rural Rou	te				Tele	phone Number	0		
City and State			_		ZIP	Code	_	_	
Certified Applicator	Name		Compan	ly or Corporation Nan	ne Cert	ification Numbe	۲	-	
Street or Rural Rou	te				Tele	phone Number	-		
					Tele				
City and State					ZIP	Code			
Water Body Name Dewart Lake	(One application per wat	ter body)	Nearest	Town	Cou Kos	nty ciusko			
Is the body of water a water supply or does it flow into a water s						Yes		No	
area number:	Universal Transv	IOTOO MOTOOT		and the second	1. Topos		Perpe	endicular distance	
Maximum depth	Expected date(s)	Treatmon	t mothed:	to be controlled: up to 25	treatme	ent length (ft): ee map	fror	endicular distance n shoreline (ft): see map	
Maximum depth of treatment (ft): 10	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June	Treatmen	t method: Ch	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physi	treatme se	ent length (ft): ee map Biological Co	ntrol	endicular distance n shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical	
Maximum depth of treatment (ft): 10 Based on treatment stocking rate for bid	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June t method, describe chem ological control. <u>2</u> , 4-I	Treatmen nical to be us	t method: Ch	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physi sical or mechanical co	cal	ent length (ft): ee map Biological Co disposal area,	ntrol	endicular distance m shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical ecies and	
red areas on Maximum depth of treatment (ft): 10 Based on treatmen stocking rate for bio Plant survey metho	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June t method, describe chen blogical control. 2, 4-1 d: Rake V	Treatmen	t method: Ch ed, method of phys ther (<i>specify</i>)	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physi	cal [ent length (ft): ee map Biological Co disposal area,	ntrol	endicular distance m shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical ecies and	
red areas on Maximum depth of treatment (ft): 10 Based on treatmen stocking rate for bio Plant survey metho Aquatic	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June t method, describe chen ological control. d: Rake Rake V Plant Name	Treatmen nical to be us D isual C Check if Target Species	t method: Ch ed, method of phys ther (<i>specify</i>) Kelative Abundance of Community	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physi sical or mechanical co Aquatic Pl	treatme Secol [cal]	ent length (ft): ee map Biological Co disposal area, C S	ntrol or the spe heck if Target pecies	endicular distance m shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical ecies and % Relative Abundance of Community	
red areas on Maximum depth of treatment (fl): 10 Based on treatment stocking rate for bio Plant survey metho Aquatic Eurasian	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June t method, describe chen blogical control. 2, 4-1 d: Rake V Plant Name Water Milfoil	Treatmen nical to be us isual O Check if Target Species	t method: Ch ed, method of phys ther (<i>specify</i>) % Relative Abundance of Community 40	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physi sical or mechanical co Aquatic Pl	treatments of the second secon	ent length (ft): ee map Biological Co disposal area,	heck if	endicular distance m shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical ecies and % Relative Abundance of Community	
red areas on Maximum depth of treatment (ft): 10 Based on treatmen stocking rate for bio Plant survey metho Aquatic Eurasian 1 Curl	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June t method, describe chemological control. 2, 4-1 id: Rake Plant Name Water Milfoil ly Leaf	Treatmen nical to be us isual 0 Check if Target Species	t method: Ched, method of physe ther (<i>specify</i>) Kelative Abundance of Community 40 10	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physical or mechanical controlled Aquatic Pl	cal [ent length (ft): ee map] Biological Co disposal area, C	heck if	endicular distance m shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical ecies and % Relative Abundance of Community	
red areas on Maximum depth of treatment (fl): 10 Based on treatment stocking rate for bio Plant survey metho Aquatic Eurasian Curl	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June t method, describe chen ological control. 2. 4-1 d: Rake Plant Name Water Milfoil ly Leaf hara	Treatmen iical to be us isual C Check if Target Species	t method: Ch ed, method of phys ther (<i>specify</i>) % Relative Abundance of Community 40 10 30	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physi sical or mechanical co Aquatic Pl	cal [ent length (ft): ee map] Biological Co disposal area, C S	heck if rarget pecies	endicular distance m shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical ecies and % Relative Abundance of Community	
red areas on Maximum depth of treatment (ft): 10 Based on treatmen stocking rate for bio Plant survey metho Aquatic Eurasian 1 Curl Cl	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June t method, describe chemological control. 0/00000000000000000000000000000000000	Treatmen nical to be us isual O Check if Target Species	t method: Ched, method of physe ther (<i>specify</i>) Kelative Abundance of Community 40 10 30 10	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physi sical or mechanical co Aquatic Pl	cal [ontrol and	ent length (ft): ee map] Biological Co disposal area, C S	heck if Farget pecies	endicular distance m shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical ecies and % Relative Abundance of Community	
red areas on Maximum depth of treatment (ft): 10 Based on treatmen stocking rate for bio Plant survey metho Aquatic Eurasian ' Curl Co Sago P	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June t method, describe chemological control. 0/00000000000000000000000000000000000	Treatmen iical to be us iisual O Check if Target Species	t method: Check, method of physe ther (specify) Kelative Abundance of Community 40 10 30 10 10 10	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physi sical or mechanical co Aquatic Pl	cal [ontrol and	ent length (ft): ee map] Biological Co disposal area, C S	heck if Farget pecies	endicular distance m shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical ecies and % Relative Abundance of Community	
red areas on Maximum depth of treatment (fi): 10 Based on treatmen stocking rate for bio Plant survey metho Aquatic Eurasian ' Curl Co Sago P	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June t method, describe chemological control. 0/00000000000000000000000000000000000	Treatmen	t method: Ch ed, method of phys ther (<i>specify</i>) % Relative Abundance of Community 40 10 30 10 10	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physical or mechanical co Aquatic Pl	cal [ent length (ft): ee map	heck if Farget pecies	endicular distance m shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical ecies and % Relative Abundance of Community	
red areas on Maximum depth of treatment (ft): 10 Based on treatmen stocking rate for bio Plant survey metho Aquatic Eurasian V Curl Cl Co Sago P	map Expected date(s) of treatment(s): June t method, describe chen ological control. 2, 4-1 d: Rake V Plant Name Water Milfoil ly Leaf hara ontail Pondweed	Treatmen iical to be us D isual C Check if Target Species V Check if	t method: Ch ed, method of phys ther (<i>specify</i>) % Relative Abundance of Community 40 10 30 10 10	to be controlled: up to 25 emical Physi sical or mechanical co Aquatic Pl	cal [ent length (ft): ee map	heck if fraget pecies	endicular distance m shoreline (ft): see map Mechanical ecies and % Relative Abundance of Community	



										Page	of
Treatment area number:	Latitud Universal Tran	e / L sver	ongi se M	tude lerca	eor ator (UTM):	Total acres to be controlled:	Proposed shorelin treatment length (f	ne it):	P	erper from	ndicular distance I shoreline (ft):
Maximum depth of treatment (ft):	Expected date(s) of treatment(s):		Trea	tme	nt method:	Chemical Physi	ical 🗌 Biologica	l Co	ntrol		Mechanical
Based on treatme stocking rate for b	nt method, describe che iological control.	mica	al to	be u	ised, method of pl	hysical or mechanical co	ontrol and disposal ar	ea,	or th	e spe	cies and
Plant survey meth	nod: 🗌 Rake 🗌	Visu	al		Other (specify)						
Aquati	c Plant Name	C S	heck Targe peci	k if et es	% Relative Abundance of Community	Aquatic Pl	ant Name	C S	heck Targe pecie	tif et es	% Relative Abundance of Community
				1						Π	
		\vdash		†						ίĦ	
Treatment area number:	Latitud Universal Tran	e / L sver	ongi se M	tude lerca	e or ator (UTM):	Total acres to be controlled:	Proposed shorelin treatment length (f	ne ft):	P	erper from	ndicular distance I shoreline (ft):
Maximum depth of treatment (ft): Expected date(s) of treatment(s): Treatment method: Chemical Physical Biological Control Mechanical								Mechanical			
Based on treatme stocking rate for b	nt method, describe che iological control.	emica	al to	be u	ised, method of p	hysical or mechanical co	ontrol and disposal ar	ea,	or th	e spe	cies and
Plant survey meth	nod: 🗌 Rake 🗌	Visu	al		Other (specify)						
Aquati	c Plant Name	C S	heck Targe peci	k if et es	% Relative Abundance of Community	Aquatic Pl	ant Name	C S	heck Targe pecie	: if et es	% Relative Abundance of Community
				1						Π	
				1						Π	
										Π	
				1						H	
				1						Π	
					AGR	EEMENT					
I have read and understand the Indiana Aquatic Vegetation Control Permit Laws and agree to abide by them. Under the penalties of perjury (IC 35-44-2-1), I affirm the information supplied by me is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.											
Signature of Applicant Date (month, day, year)											
Signature of Certi	fied Applicator						Date (mon	th, c	day, j	/ear)	
<u>Make</u> <u>R</u>	check or money o eturn completed a	rde ppl	r pa licat	aya tior	ble to DNR - [n with the \$5.0	Division of Fish an 00 permit fee to th	d Wildlife in the e address show	am n o	n pa	nt of age	<u>i \$5.00</u> 1.
					OFFICE	USE ONLY	ł				
Permit Number					Check Number		Other				
Denied	Approved	Арр	prove	d w,	/Conditions	Fisheries Section Appro	val				



Permit Map

The red areas below are potential EWM treatment areas for 2017.



32

