

***Weed Harvesting*— Chapter #38**

In a mail report given by Lorraine it was determined 41 supported harvesting and had paid \$138 toward it. The coupon surveys that were sent back from Lakers in March of 2000 supported weed cutting (27 of 37 surveys), it was opposed by two. Rich received a call from Bob Fahey who was interested in cutting the weeds. The main concern was the cut weeds must be removed. Bill Soules suggested that if it was possible the SLA should push for a local town law that would require weed removal by harvesters.

In May 2000 the company that was scheduled to do the weed harvesting was getting booked up. Their target date was the second week of July. The funds were not currently available and it was asked if the money could be refunded to those who had donated if the funding amount was not reached. Another suggestion was to supplement the donations from the SLA treasury.

Roy Schneggenburger updated the SLA on weed harvesting at the June 2000 meeting. The fund had nearly \$300 and there was a tentative cutting date for the third week of July. There was no deadline to receive funds, but \$3000 was needed. Rather than conducting a mailing, Roy counted on the Tract directors to get the word out and collect \$10 donations from landowners. Cutting would go from dock ends to 40 feet out. If anyone would want weed cutting around their dock they would have to arrange that on their own. Weeds would be cut and hauled away by Central NY Weed Harvesting. As reported at the annual meeting, Vice president Schneggenburger announced that the seaweed would be harvested on the weekend of July 29-30 if enough donations were received. So far \$1500 in donations was collected and a vote that was passed agreed; if the goal was not met the funds would roll over into the year 2001.

At the September 2000 meeting the weed harvester report was given and \$1,053 was raised. Gabi Lischer received \$250-\$300 pledge from the Country Club for the following year. Of the 24 tracts, 10 had given almost \$1000 and 14 had given nothing. If each tract collected \$100, the goal would be reached. The harvester could remove fallen trees at an additional cost. CNY Weed Harvesting had a 10 foot cutter and a 6 foot wide machine (this would be good for the outlet and around docks at an added cost).

In July of 2001, the SLA co-sponsored the first harvesting of seaweed in Silver Lake. Out-going Vice President Roy Schneggenburger coordinated the program and reported on it. He said that the state would not allow the harvesting company's 10 foot wide unit to launch from its park. There were no other sites on the lake that could accommodate the large harvester. The company had to bring in its smaller unit. It spent three days on the lake. Several tract directors reported the harvester bypassed the water near their shores; the East side residents of the lake for the most part were pleased with the harvesting effort. The weed fund had enough money pledged to meet its goal.

After the weed harvesting was complete a report followed. Including pledges the goal was reached, the bill (\$2,970) was paid with \$470 owed/withheld. Roy had contacted the Company. His July 19th follow up call with the company stressed objective of removing the weeds. Adam Koziel had widened his access by 4 feet to accommodate the machinery. Tracts that reported little or no cutting were Waltz, Austin/Shearman, Prentice, Broadbooks, Country Club North & South, Luther/Wheaton, Davis, Fairview North, Sutton, Traber North, and Palmer/YMCA. Nine tracts were poorly cut, 3 were partially cut, 7 were done fairly well, and one area reported good results. Bill mentioned that the payment that was made should be considered in full and the SLA would not pursue the company to fulfill the contract, the SLA would determine disposition of the fund balance. Other options to remove weeds were being researched.

Roy discussed the weed harvesting issue with the SLA board. He was researching what other lakes did because he felt it was worth a second year. The SLA still owed the previous weed harvesting company approximately \$500. There was \$729.86 remaining in the weed fund. The board questioned if they were sure that the SLA wouldn't be sued by the continued non-payment of the balance owed due to dissatisfaction. It was asked if the company was formally contacted with the SLA's position. It was then discussed if the SLA was in a libelous situation and if they needed legal

counsel. Roy felt the company would not pursue non-payment. Upon a motion by Dick and all approved, Roy would mail 4 copies of the contract for the SLA Executive Committee to review at its winter meeting.

There was a planning meeting scheduled for January 26, 2002 and it was discussed that there was trouble communicating with Roy Schneggerburger. He did not send the 4 copies of the weed harvesting contract as directed by the board in November. The SLA decided to renew the directive to Roy by phone and to contact the harvesting company by phone then by letter. The SLA would also draft a letter on concerns to Roy.

A steering committee of Dan and Joan Fix, Bill Soules, Linda Holz, Lorraine Strum, and Rich Eliazs met in February of 2002 to review copies of the harvesting contract and a letter received from Gary Leroux that was mailed to Lorraine. The consensus reached was that the SLA was liable and should settle with CNY Aquatic Harvesting. The committee would recommend at the full board meeting in March, that the \$470 balance of the total \$2,970 contract be paid and the remaining funds of \$149 go toward postage owed to the fireworks fund. At the March meeting the planning committee obtained a copy of the contract From Gary Leroux of CNY Aquatic Harvesting. Communication was the issue in resolving the matter. It was agreed after the discussion to pay the amount owed (\$470).

The committee discussed the SLA sponsoring a demonstration of an alternate weed cleaning process using suction. Lorraine was directed to obtain companies to get written quotes and scope of work for a demonstration. A target area for the demonstration was Prentice Tract. If the cost of the demonstration was reasonable the SLA would recommend it and the cost would be covered by the SLA.

Roy made a motion to have a representative from this weed vacuuming company come to the April 2002 meeting. The board approved. Some tracts may want to team up to have it done. Members would have to understand it was an individual venture and expense. At the meeting Michael Yeaw explained how his weed harvesting system worked. He would do a demonstration for the SLA July 12-13 for \$100/per hour with an estimated 2-3 hours work over 1,500 square feet. Roy motioned to spend up to \$300 for a demonstration contingent upon site/weed conditions for the Friday before the meeting and that Saturday morning with potential sites easiest for member viewing being the Camp or the Institute. Bill Soules seconded and all voted Aye.

Ruth Lavin read a letter from Richard Rahn and 11 cottage owners from Eberstein Tract about the weed growth in the lake. It was suggested that the SLA contact government officials for help. A report noted that a large grant was given to Conesus Lake to help with their weed issue. Bill Soules explained that some weeds were needed to produce oxygen for the health of the lake and fish. Ruth said that people were raking weeds and dumping them in the drainage ditches on the East side of the lake.

Roy submitted a report on the company Pondcleaner. In his summary, he recommended a 5 year harvesting project (based on a 1998 start) and that in 2003 there would be a two-phase harvesting strategy: 1) a company other than CNY Aquatic harvesting be funded through donations from members 2) Pondcleaner would return with payment by individual/private contracts.

Reports that came from SLA board members that attended the FOLA Region 1 meeting consisted of these comments: Mary Kay Barton said that weed control on other lakes are too expensive; she agreed with Cornell in opposing chemical controls; a possibility would be to apply for bond money for sediment dams as a logical and holistic control. Bayne Johnson commented that other lakes have the same dilemmas as Silver Lake; a different solution could be using bed tax (lodging) revenues for the lake. Cornell's Paul Lord talked of municipalities putting landscape fabric and stone along ditches to control nutrient run-off. Bill Soules added that the state allowed Waneta Lake to use Sonar to kill milfoil, then the results were studied and it was decided not to let twin Lamoka Lake do it. The Sonar drawbacks were: it stayed in the lake too long due to weather; no juvenile fish were found in shocking; they may have to retreat in 5 years. Other considerations were: draining lakes to kill weeds but it breaks up sediment and that releases more phosphorous. Residents could plant shrubs around the shoreline because they hold more nutrients than grass. Honeoye Lake planned to use alum, which works on the bottom but it could impact the lake's pH.

Pat Urschel said at the March 2011 meeting that he received a lot of questions about the weed problem. People were frustrated with weeds. Tom Kaufman said Bill Soules had knowledge of this issue. Weeds would need to be harvested if they would be cut. It was very expensive and a difficult process. Dick Swanson mentioned that some people are against cutting. How cutting would be done in front of some properties and not others was a problem. Julie Ciferni overheard a woman asking where to purchase weed mats. A response given was Silver Lake Marine, Weeds Inc. (Rochester), and someone on Conesus Lake sold them. Ruth then added when weeds are cut, they grow back twice as thick. Traditionally, weed harvesting does not help the problem. Mick Griffin said Skaneateles hired divers to pull weeds by the roots; the water was beautiful and clear. It was noted that Silver Lake was a shallow mud bottom lake and weeds would always be an issue.