

LAKE GASTON STAKEHOLDER BOARD

June 2, 2005 Meeting
(Fourth Meeting)

Notes Taken By: Christine Thompson

Time: 9 am – 4 pm

Location: Aquatic Nuisance Plant Control Building,
1375 NC Highway 903, Littleton, NC

Moderator: Dr. Boyd Strain

Lake Gaston Stakeholder Board Participants

(2005 Meetings: March 24 and June 2)

2005 6/2	VOTE 6/2/05	2005 3/24	Name	Organization	Email
X		X	Skip Wiegiersma	ANPC	skip@gloryroad.net
		X	Richard Hinterman	ANPC	RichardHinterman@aol.com
X	X	X	Beth Smith	C21 Choice Properties	rlescape@buggs.net
		X	Wendy Smith	C21 Choice Properties	sold@buggs.net
X	X	X	Becky Mitchell	City of Virginia Beach	bmitchel@vbgov.com
		X	Dollie Burwell	Congressman GK Butterfield	Dollie.burwell@mailhouse.gov
X	X-A	X	Dr. Michael Smart	Corps of Engineers	msmart@gte.net
		X	Alfred Cofrancesco	Corps of Engineers- Environment Engineering & Science	Al.F.Cofrancesco@erdc.usace.army.mil
X	X	X	Bob Conner	County of Brunswick	ccs@buggs.net
X	X	X	Rives Manning	County of Halifax (Commission)	hfis@3rddoor.com
		X	Robert Hendrick	County of Mecklenburg	Meck_co_zoning@yahoo.com
		X	Wayne Jenkins	County of Northampton	Wayne.jenkins@ncmail.net
X	X		John Slaton	County of Northampton (Alternate)	kslaton@lgaston.org
X		X	Joe Peterson	Dominion Power	Joseph_Peterson@dom.com
		X	Bill Bolin	Dominion Power	Bill_bolin@dom.com
X	X		Jim Thornton	Dominion Power	Jim_Thornton@dom.com
		X	Glenn Bishop	Dominion Power	Glenn_bishop@dom.com
		X	Noreen Clough	ESPN/BASS	Noreen.K.Clough@bassmaster.com
X		X	Chris Horton	ESPN/BASS	Christopher.M.Horton@bassmaster.com
X	X		Pete Deschenes	Friends of Floatilla	stuga@3rddoor.com
		X	Brett Boston	Group Solutions (moderator)	bostonbret@aol.com
		X	Vern Herr	Group Solutions (moderator)	VHerr@groupsolutions.us
X	X	X	Larry Jolly	Lake Gaston Association	jollys@lgaston.org
X	X	X	Almira Papierniak	Lake Gaston Chamber of Commerce	lgcc@telpage.net
X		X	Doug Hughes	Lake Gaston Gazette	lakegastongazette@meckom.net
X		X	Dr. Boyd Strain	Lake Gaston Science Team	bstrain@ncol.net
X	X	X	Don Beazley	Lake Gaston Water Safety Council	dbeazley@3rddoor.com
X	X	X	Elton Brown	Lake Gaston Weed Control Council	Eye5sh@meckcom.net
		X	John Slaton	Lake Gaston Weed Control Council	kslaton@lgaston.org
		X	Pete Dechenes	LGWCC/ LGA (see Friends of Float)	stuga@3rddoor.com
X		X	Doug Bearce	Littleton Observer	dogman@gloryroad.net
		X	Dr. John Madsen	Mississippi State University	jamdsen@gri.msstate.edu
X	X	X	Randy B. Lee	NC BASS Federation	NCBassCondir@aol.com
		X	Kent Nelson	NC Wildlife	kent.nelson@ncwildlife.org
X			Christian Waters	NC Wildlife	watersct@earthlink.net
X		X	Wayne Jones	NC Wildlife	jonestw1@earthlink.net
X	X	X	Bob Curry	NC Wildlife	Robert.curry@cnwildlife.org
X	X		John Sutherland	NC DENR DWR	John.sutherland@ncmail.net
X		X	Rob Emens	NC DENR DWR	Rob.emens@ncmail.net
		X	Jamie Ruff	Richmond Times-Dispatch	Jruff@timesdispatch.com
X	X	X	Harrel Johnson	Roanoke River Basin Association	Hjohnson@rrba.org
		X	Shaun Hyde	SEPRO Corp.	shaunh@sepro.com
X	X	X	Jim Howell	Striper Club/LGWCC	jhow@lgaston.org
X		X	Bob Coleman	Striper Club/LGWCC	Rcole27850@earthlink.net
		X	Dr William Haller	University of Florida	wthaller@ifas.ufl.edu
		X	Kurt Getsinger	USAERDC/EP-P	Kurt.getsinger@erdc.usace.army.mil
		X	Alan Tasker	USDA Animal & Plant Health Inspect. Svc	Alan.V.Tasker@aphis.usda.gov
X	X	X	Roger Fitchett	VA BASS Assn.	rogerfitchett@cox.net
X		X	Gary Martel	VA Dept of Game & Inland Fish	Gary.martel@dgif.virginia.gov
X	X	X	Vic DiCenzo	VA Dept. of Game & Inland Fish	Vic.dicenzo@dgif.virginia.gov

VISITORS

X		Christine Thompson	Meeting Recorder, Bd. Of Realtors	agent@lake-gaston-properties.com
X		Bruce Johnson	Property Owner	blmsjohnson@earthlink.net

Agenda Fourth Meeting Lake Gaston Stakeholder Board

Date: June 2, 2005

Time: 9 am – 4 pm

Place: Aquatic Nuisance Plant Control Building, 1375 NC Highway 903

Meeting Convener and Moderator: Dr. Boyd Strain

Welcome, Introductions, Logistics:

Governance: Harrell Johnson / Judge Manning

Establish Voting Procedures for this Meeting: Strain

Funding: Jim Howell

Lunch: Dutch-treat sandwiches and drinks will be available at the nearby Lake Gaston Grocery and Grill

Communications: Doug Hughes

Science Report: Discussion and modification of Strain Science Plan

Discuss 2005 Insertion of Grass Carp: Strain

Summary Statements on “Managing Aquatic Plants Document: Strain

Next Steps:

Set long-term calendar:

Adjournment:

Meeting convened 9:10 am.
Welcome by Dr. Strain.
Lunch on own. Thanks to ANPC for room and coffee.

AGENDA ITEMS:

Governance: Harrel Johnson

There is no change between handout & email sent previously. Governance document developed by committee of Lee, Beazley, Manning, Johnson, & Jolly.

Purpose statement is boilerplate. The one item with difficulty is what we should say.

- Article 1: Purposes
- Article 2: Course of action that members are to adhere to as part of group.
- Article 3: Defines membership. Most controversial - rules of engagement. Group must make commitment of 3-5 years. Some level of time/talent/resources.
- Article 7 Establishment of technical advisory group - Not decision making.
Chair, secretary
- Article 9: Agendas, times, planning, announcements.
Timeline relative to Article 2
- Article 10: Decision making - propose we seek consensus, but majority of present will constitute decision. Quorum = 1 member
- Article 11: Member may bring alternate tech advisors.
- Article 12: Post decision minority decision for later review, if requested.
- Article 13: There was division among group – “proxy votes not accepted.” Disagreement: what is a proxy? Teleconferencing acceptable as determined by board.
- Article 14: All meetings open to public.

Last requirement of ratification & signatures for each group.

Harrell Question: Is today working input or will we vote on this governance document?

Strain: This is working input only.

Elton Brown: Art 2, 1st Item. Please explain:

Johnson Response. We are entering into model of some type to make recommendations to LGWCC. We hope/know we will find things that do not work. This gives us opportunity to make changes. We are not locked into specific model and we may have to change. Gives us wiggle room.

Elton Brown: will this give folks opportunity to disagree and criticize stakeholders. I fear its written this way. Johnson: Don't know how you can suppress criticism.

Elton Brown: Criticism would be counterproductive. Larry Jolly: that was not the intent in early discussion. Elton Brown: not clear in that regard. Don Beazley: You can't take individual's point of view away. Harrell: implies a gag order.

Roger-VABASS- we will all disagree on different issues... can't stop individual. If you did, there would have to be a penalty.

Boyd Strain: Can we pass back to committee?

Bob Conner: We reviewed this in committee. We agree with other group to reach consensus to get this through. May be issues we tackle at a later date. This group must reach consensus.

Doug Hughes: There is some precedence in business for something like Elton is talking about... At Amex, we agreed that once we made a decision, then everyone would walk out of room supporting it even though you personally might disagree. Otherwise, you limit the boards (Am Exp) ability to make decisions.

Boyd Strain: With this being a public group & press present at our meetings, then dissention would appear publicly.

Harrell: I'm wondering if it may be difficult to get grants down road if you put in governance documents. Doug's idea is appropriate for corporations, but not public groups.

Pete Deschenes: Applaud group for putting this together. Recommend we accept today so we have framework, recognizing we will make changes in future.

Boyd Strain: We have a Motion by Deschenes to adopt this version of the Governance document.

John Slaton: Second.

Discussion: Question- Will this be modified today? Not much time to modify today. We can entertain amendments.

Elton Brown: We have something on the agenda about adopting procedures (voting). I recommend we do that first before we take a vote on this. If we adopt, we can make an amendment.

Conner: Go w/motion subject to amendments.

Beazley: Procedure on amendments.

Boyd: Amendment recommendations?

(By Manning?)

Article 4; #1. Ad 2nd line, add "safety" after economic interests.

Article 2, #10. 1st sentence, after 1st comma, change "simple majority" to 2/3 present will constitute a decision.

Deschenes modified Motion (2nd by Larry Jolly).

Elton Brown: we must first establish voting rights.

Boyd Strain: Issue – we must first establish who can vote. Review the list before you of stakeholders and tell me who the voter is for each entity. Boyd wrote down voter for each stakeholder/entity.

Bob Curry: Proxy vote question concerning # of voters per group.

Conner: It's our responsibility that if we cannot attend than we send a delegate. If a delegate isn't here, than we lose our vote.

Boyd Strain: That is how it's written in the Governance document.

Bob Curry: There is a vacancy coming in NC Wildlife (Wayne Jones) & it may be difficult for us to designate a representative. Our district biologist is the one now, but that may change. Larry: As the document is written, that's acceptable.

Boyd Strain: We have 18 representatives today. $2/3 = 12$ votes to decide an issue. We have to pass amendment.

Harrell Johnson: Intent of original motion & amendment is to approve but not ratify this document. Yes. We can polish it later. We need way to vote & vote on issue of 2005 grass carp #'s if we get to that today.

Boyd: Any other points or other amendments before we vote?

Elton: Article 4, #2. Does that address Mr. Curries question about who can come? Yes.

Vote Amendment: Yes=17, No=0 Abstention=1

Vote on Pete's as amended: Yes=17, Abstain=1, No=0.

Adopted the document as modified on those two points.

Establish Voting Procedures for this Meeting:

This was established in prior discussion.

(Stretch Break)

Funding: Jim Howell

Jim Howell's group will present progress of group:

All are aware of HR 1281. It passed the House and is going to the Senate. We are hoping for approval by 6/15/05. Everything hinges on an optimistic outcome. If approved, and the counties approve by July 1, then they can enact. The counties could put in place a law that permits each county to collect from those individuals that live on the water or have access to a community boat ramp.

Judge Manning prefers a fixed fee. This bill doesn't do that. This bill is for some percentage. If you look at the numbers required from county, John & I feel we need 6 cents per \$100.

We are offering proposed funding sources (not dollars) for 2006. Need \$2.2 million or little better to fund everything:

Source for 2006 if bill not approved

1. Two contracts that treat (boathouses, commercial facilities, local.) Local being residents.
 - Dry hydrants, (public – weed council)
 - Fluridone (boat houses, prior successful) - local
 - Re-vegetation needed – public
 - Mechanical removal where effective & practical – local
 - Biological control (grass carp) - public
 - Insects - public
 - Prevention program – public (i.e. signs)
 - Monitoring (LGA) - local
 - Satellite survey - public
 - Bathometer - public
 - Ground truthing - public

- Research - public

All locals change to public category if HR 1281 is approved & counties approve & tax people on assessments (those people in NC only -not VA).

Almira Papierniak: I thought we were seeking other funds?

Strain: We got 4 counties last year. Public \$ came by general funds. This moves opportunity to taxing, not general funding. Doesn't mean we aren't seeking funds in all ways possible.

Conner: If all people are assessed \$100-200 / year is that creating a problem for LGWCC when it comes to treatment? Now all money goes into pool. It may be an issue. Won't hit Weed Council, will hit in surrounding counties... "why aren't you treating in my county, cove?..."

Elton Brown: assuming funding goes back into county that contributes, the intent is to treat all those areas. The stuff we won't fund is what won't affect individuals.

?: Will have certain group/indiv that will come out with that.

Manning: My vision is that not all costs that the county pays will come from individuals. County will contribute from general funds because everyone benefits. Don't feel like everyone in county should pay because those who own lakefront property benefit more than non-property owners. My vision is two sources: part from general & part from lake owners.

Brown: we need ability to get matching funds. If we don't have county backup, we won't get other dollars.

Papierniak: Chamber is NOT in favor of SSTD. Even though lake owners benefit, they are not the only ones. We feel it should be more of a general tax.

Slaton: If you look @ \$2.2 mill plus federal funds & research funds, monies from states & counties still come up about \$600-800,000 short every year and primary sources will be property owners. We need to step forward.

Strain: We have 1 statement of opposition. Any others?

Manning: If people on the lake are not willing, how can you ask rest of taxpayers? If you sell your property, the benefit of the property has increased. Are you going to share that profit? You are getting special privilege if the taxpayer pays for your benefit. I think there is a shared benefit.

Deschenes: Stakeholders may be stepping over bounds. We can tell the counties there is a deficit, but it's the government's call as to how the money is generated. If we are expecting something to pass by July 1st, it isn't going to happen... one NC county has never been represented here.

Strain: That's the decision... politics will make the decision. There is opposition, but much more support in this room. I think it will be solved by the county governments.

Conner: When you hear \$500K & \$300K, sounds good, but vaporware. Not assured of that or in succeeding years. You have to have steady, ongoing source of funds in order to run program. Look

at its long term, constant source. Only way is tax or other use tax by people who use lake. Will be trouble to look every year.

Beazley: What do we do with this report?

Strain: We will pass this to review.

Beazley: One negative comment in a room of 20 voters, we will be here forever getting consensus.

Strain: Wish we were at point to vote, but haven't made it. Just gathering input.

Brown: Will the 5 counties meet again? Leave them out for now and let them decide.

Options on table.

Johnson: Thought all we were discussing is that "in process" and just acquiring another tool. Up to counties to decide which tool, i.e., fire district. Don't understand argument, it's the counties decision.

John ???. If \$ is collected from this system from NC, will the funds be used only on NC portions of lake, or will it go into the pot?

Brown: Original premise is that funds would be collected for certain goal...for lake-wide project... wherever needed... which is determined by the plan.

Bruce: What we are saying is if one county agreed and others did not, will the county who didn't fund also get benefit? Strain: They will have to ante up somewhat. In VA, it's not by special tax district, but through general funds or whatever procedure they intend to come up with.

Deschenes: Pragmatic about this. If we hope to see any type of taxation along lines of SSTD, it isn't going to happen for 2006. We might as well adjust our thinking treatment year 2007.

Strain: Shooting for 2006 plan & will have to adjust depending on funding. In terms of 5-year plan, need to keep 2006 as target.

Any other point? No comment.

Report accepted as submitted. Committee asked to make a final version for next meeting.

Deschenes: Action item. Counties agreed to meet again. We should have Stakeholders board on agenda and put finances on agenda with 2006 target year as a reality.

Should be a motion: Larry Jolly Second.

Motion by Deschenes: Make a presentation at the next five-county meeting with bill for what 2006 would take if we get what we hope, (i.e. "put moosehead on table)".

Vote: Yes = 17 Abstain = 1 No = 0

2005 Insertion of Grass Carp: (Strain)

Strain: Bob Currie is here today. Basically we had approval to insert 10,167 fish in 2004 that was postponed to 2005 expecting a better survival rate. Then Stakeholders Group appeared. Idea came up in opposition from various sources, and we want opinion of Science Advisory Group of whether carp should be inserted in 2005. Sent query to list and got 1 solid yes, 8 no votes, 1 abstention, and at end I voted yes. Result: Solid recommendation by the Science Team not to insert fish (grass carp) in 2005.

Some no voters are in the room and can give explanation.

Question: Do we want to take a vote after hearing science arguments?

Conner: Need to hear pros/cons.

Thornton: We have scientific committee put together to recommend. Are we saying stakeholders can override the committee?

Strain: Yes, has that right.

Sutherland: Why we should:

Asked by BASS ESPN for list of lakes that we (NCDENR DWR) have put carp in.

Our Div of Water Resources has used carp in the lakes shown on this list.

We used chemical treatment for some time. Starting using carp in 1989 in lakes, and based on what other states were doing used target density of carp per vegetated acre at about 15-20 ... critical # in lake before started to see good control. We had success in lakes that are smaller than Gaston, but other examples from SC where used carp to control hydrilla is Sante Cooper using 15-20 to see good results.

We have put together rationale for 15-20/ acre. Haven't reached that target level in last 10 years since last stocking in 1996 @ 6 2/3 per vegetated acre and sub stocking of 5,000 fish to take care of annual mortality. We don't actually know what mortality is because no actual data taken with monitoring devices. Doing that in other places and what we hear is their rates between 25-30% annual disappearance of carp from predation, death, emigration and who knows what.

We recommend adding additional 10,000 fish several years in row that would provide 3-4 fish per vegetated acre to density of 15. Take couple years. Do it slowly and will see affects. They will eat hydrilla as it sprouts each spring. Basically, our recommendation is to put more carp in.

Key is: once you take carp 1 year is not enough. Need to keep them there 6-7 years to capture all tubers. Tubers don't come up each year because they stay in subsoil. Also spreading thru other means (fragmentation & turions)... need them for that period of time.

That's our plan. Support 10K fish this year & add each year after until you build it up.

Example of overstocking: Lake James in NC. They put 30-40 per acre for 1200 acres. They overstocked, and now there is no hydrilla and other native vegetation is gone.

On Lake Gaston, the best approach is to put fish in every cove, but can't do that. What the fish growers tell us is when you transplant fish, they immediately look for home pond and they take off & migrate to find "home." Makes it difficult to target fish to weeds. Best bet, fence off cove for few week to acclimate.

Our plan is to slowly build up the # of carp. Add 10K then another 10-15K for the next several years. In 2-3 years you will see results. If you stop adding fish, the #'s die off and acreage drops off, the fish will eventually die. At recent aquatic weed meeting in March, SC reported good growth of native grasses & vegetation in those lakes & fishing has never been better.

Strain: Issue today. Should we put 10K in 2005 and recommend that? My reason: I fully understand problem of putting carp into lake where trying to control vegetation to reduce weed & substitute with native to maintain healthy lake. Don't want sterile lake. We should put in 10K this year because we are operating on 5 year plan and consider the recommendations. Since we are still in 5-year plan that calls for 10K this year, that's why I think we should go ahead.

Johnson: Do we know what current density is?

Strain: NO.

Harrel. Until we know density, we don't know what's going to happen.

Strain: That summarizes the argument of those who voted no. We have some statistical tables that tell us what we would have if 20 % attrition, but we don't know.

Johnson: Typically with stocking programs it is to grease the squeaky wheel. Such things as token stocking... and sometimes you have to do it. What is 5K stocking going to do as far as this lake?

Strain: What if we did token stocking to appease public? 5K or 10K?

Sutherland: Refers to application & 10K fish. Decision is to wait for survey because figures weren't out. Had to do with replacing. Usually fish become less effective when they age. We wanted to look at figures 2 years after fact. Don't know where replacement 10K came from. Then it deferred to Stakeholders Group

Have talked to Fred Harris about memo. It was not to approve 10K. That was a deferred decision & that's what the discussion was.

Strain: Defer until 2005. We have heard that if we don't stock by mid June, temperatures will be so high we will loose what goes in. Can we make reasonable recommendation based on time schedule or do we need to defer?

Jones: Started out with 7-8 fish/acre as maintenance. Don't see problem replacing on every 2-3 year basis for loss. Mortality is part of any grass carp program.

The other lakes reported by Sutherland were big mud holes and farm ponds. Coverage is ideal. Not much difference. Fishing is not as good.

Attrition rates are OK @ 20%. Talked to people around SC, FL. 50% rates over 5 years attributed to bow fishing as anything. It occurs. Don't know that 10K has any impact one way or another but stakeholder board formed to get control of hydrilla. We are never going to know how many fish we now have. We made assumptions that 10K put in 5-6 years ago based on some studies.

My opinion. Need to let science team come up with plan. Old stocking rate used to get fish in December because of better cost to purchase rate. Stocking fish in winter looses more fish. Much better effect in spring as it starts growing for more effect.

Strain: in that statement he summarized most of arguments given to me by those who voted no. Concluding that, since we don't know, we shouldn't put in this year.

Jones: Most of these lakes compared didn't have fisheries. They didn't do quantitative study on the SC system. We don't know what native vegetation is in those lakes.

Gaston has exotic species that carp won't eat.

Strain: Skip, please discuss that point on the other exotics that are now in Lake Gaston.

Brown: Would like to make a correction to a statement, "The Stakeholders board was put together to control Hydrilla." We are fighting against NOXIOUS Weeds, and we should stop using the word Hydrilla. (Agreed to)

Conner: Answer may have been in email. For all carp loose in lake, we have no idea what # exists now. What affect has the carp had on hydrilla? Out of 100% of the carp, what have they consumed? Do we have statistics following through to determine effect? We need some type of control before spending money for grass carp.

Strain: Do we have monitoring program by either state?

Answer by _____? If you go back to original stocking, a figure was thrown out that 7,000-9,000 acres of habitat. One of things is after first stocking it dropped off for 1-2 years, Once fish get really big, they require less energy & food to retain bulk. Same for carp. Younger grass carp ... another reason for restocking.

Conner: What is % of vegetation they are eating? How can you determine?

Dicenzo. You can't. That's why it's hard to manage. We did it in Lake Anna and completely wiped out the vegetation & stopped fishing. No way to know.

We can try to catch with net, but might kill them.

Strain: There are probably ways, but very expensive.

Slaton: Isn't there a visual observation by ANPC.

Conner: As sound business, if I'm going to spend money, I want to see results.

We need plan from two states that give us results.

Strain: Let's hear from Skip about other species & replacement of Hydrilla.

Skip Wiegiersma: There are certain plants that carp will like & some they will not. We have milfoil & others making their way down the lake. Carp will eat those the last. if at all. Won't go after others before native plants. My concern is that they will replace hydrilla with harder to control plants.

Let's say Gaston is capable of 8,000 acres of hydrilla. Maybe carp are handling a good portion of that. I can show you where hydrilla is gone in the fall in areas we haven't treated it. Don't know if its because of carp or drifted Fluridone.

Biggest issue: In any management situation, take action then monitor. My recommendation is no more than 10-12/acre over time. Wait & make adjustment after that. If up—add more. If down—hold off. If you don't know what you have, make your decision based on what you see.

If you put carp in this year, you don't see results for 3 years. My concern is we act too fast by adding this year.

Conner: I don't see evidence that we know that these fish migrate evenly or they stay in cove where placed. Seems to be they stay. Deciding carp per acre isn't good. Need monitoring program.

Boyd: do they stay or move?

Jones; On Gaston they go to first place they find food. Will not fight current. Will go for quiet cove.

Skip: We put them in at Rt. 1 bridge, and if you assume they stay, you would think that water would be clean, but it's the worst area. I have seen good #s of carp all over. They are moving.

Danger: movement can be extensive. They may go through dams.

Deschenes: A question for the science team. If we reduce hydrilla, other threats are worse. Has science team considered treating the other weeds now? Leave control of hydrilla to carp?

Skip: The problem we have is that most of milfoil is in fast moving water. Takes more \$\$ & harder to kill. No treatment methods are working in these areas.

Bruce: Lake Gunterville had 83% reduction by adding carp & 58% reduction of milfoil. Carp will eat milfoil. Washington State is using carp to attack milfoil.

Chris – Let me say something about Gunterville. The reduction was coincidental. Carp were added in the same 3 years as high water flows when plants couldn't grow. Can't contribute total weed reduction to carp... environmental change.

Same happened in Lake Anna. Combination of environ & carp. We lost about all vegetation due to high water & turbulence.

Smart: I didn't respond because it's complicated and if we are taking a holistic approach, it must be in context. Need to know other components. Having said that, I'm not opposed to putting 10K in lake this year. One of problems is that if you sneak up on the balance the scale tips & now you have young, active fish & haven't hit 20-3 yr period of maximum affect. For my money, put fish in now to control hydrilla, then 5 years from now when fish are old, can get where we want with native vegetation.

Comment: If we do put fish in, radiotag so we can get #s on mortality, etc. Put enclosure around lake and monitor it. There are things we could do to gauge results that are not expensive.

Strain: problem with monitoring is expense. If we had \$350 K from Corp for research, we would have it. Radios are \$600 ea. Fish die @ 30% per year. What % do you put radios on fish? Don't know.

Hughes: Wayne can live with 10K fish, some others agree even on science team. We are selling 2006 treatment/management plan to the public with a 6% tax rate for property owners. I don't feel you will sell any of that if you don't put fish in this year. Question is... is 10K detrimental? I'm not hearing it is. Need to move forward to sell viable plan & put some fish in... 5 or 10 or ?? Strongly suggest 10K.

Strain: Doug moved us on to the Stakeholder consideration but I want to be sure we have pro/cons from scientists before we consider Stakeholder input.

Brown: Mike, you mentioned water quality. Agreement with Power Company has wording vis' a vis' water quality which hasn't been determined. As Pete mentioned when put on the Weed Council, one of the tenants of our objectives is water quality which hasn't been defined. Those two entities must decide a definition before we take chance.

Mike – wouldn't argue that.

Other point in terms of establishing native veg. Can't do that with hydrilla. We know hydrilla = tuber bank. We know we have to build protective enclosures from turtles, etc. When go into areas void of Hydrilla, we guess they still have tuber bank. If we create an enclosure what if they fill up with hydrilla? Must get rid of tubers first: draw down, etc. good way to reduce tuber bank is draw down.

Brown: Power company would oppose & have to approve. They won't do it.

Strain: Hydrilla goes to 17 feet deep. Drawdown not in the picture.

Mike: drawdown 4-5 feet & eliminate those tubers where the home owners have most problem.

Boyd: that's an issue for science group.

Jolly: One of the reasons for science team is to provide recommendation/plan. Based on this discussion this morning, what's the consensus now? Have comments changed their thoughts?

Boyd: Does anyone (science team) want to change vote? The vote is for the year 2005 putting in 10K fish within next 2 weeks.

Question: Who voted? Answer: The Science Group (list).

Voted 8/2 NOT to put them in for 2005. (Note) None of the scientists offered to change his vote.

Conner: Confused on this.

Strain: Stakeholders need to make arguments & then vote. Let's discuss from stakeholders, then ask for total board vote.

Brown: what is recommendation for 2006 plan?

Strain: We go into the plan this afternoon. Won't finalize it today because scientists are coming end of June .

Brown: Question for science team... assuming 8-10 carp put in any given time when will they reach max effectiveness? Five months won't make a difference, will it if we are talking about 2006 plan? One thing stated contradictory to Mr. Malone was spring/fall. Option is April/May or Oct/Nov. He prefers fall rather than spring in order to get larger fish by April, must keep them over winter. (Discussion on cost.)

Brown: If we order 8-10 inch long we might get 10-12 inches, but not smaller.

Strain: that issue will be presented this afternoon.

Jolly: We established the team of experts. We should be guided by that.

Deschenes: I agree with Doug. We have to take a recommendation and turn them into a plan. Then put business hats on and factor the affordability.

2nd point. Not sure we should vote before lunch. 10K grass carp are not independent of science plan. Is that plan based on full funding. If so, it needs to be iterated another time.

Strain: Plan for 2006+ and assumes a funding for that.

Brown: Never had something on table to determine proper funding.

Strain: Prefer make 2006 plan based on a funding level based on current facts.

Wiegersma: Would like to point out that we are anticipating in spring 2006 to do quantitative assessment of Lake Gaston through Corp of Engineers. Will be detailed survey with maps & determine how much vegetation, like 1999. It will be a good benchmark for going forward. That will tell you where you are & add management plan and you will see results. Maybe that's the time to do this.

Strain: Maybe 2006 is too early to propose a full blown plan. If detailed study is going to occur 2006, then full-blown plan should start in 2007.

Randy Lee: On carp issue from hearing members of science team ... if factors for weeds is weather, temperature, turbidity, growing season, carp, etc. If we decide to put in carp, I'm for going with recommendation on science team. What affect will it have on the public if we put in carp & the hydrilla is down for reasons other than carp?

Strain: Are you ready? The recommendation is 2005 10,167 carp or not?

Jolly moves, Howell seconds. A/D discussion?

Brown: for the record... the Science Team votes 8/2 against inserting carp. If we override this now, will public opinion sway our votes?

Boyd: if stakeholders vote for carp, they will go against the science group.

The Motion: To insert 10,167 carp or not.

Brown: as Pres of LGWCC, I would like time over lunch to discuss this with the Council. I'm not comfortable voting now.

Strain: OK. Break for Lunch and we will vote immediately after lunch.

Strain: Recess for Lunch (Lunch Break)

Meeting reconvened: 12:30 pm

Open floor to consider the motion which is: Vote yes, to put in 10,167 grass carp in 2005. Vote no, NOT to put in carp in 2005.

Don: Still undecided after lunch discussions. I will vote NO for carp. We brought together group of well known scientists. Reasons - we put 25,000 carp in 2003 and we had reduction in acreage in 2004.

Slaton challenged these figures. Using satellite figures there was definite increase from one year to another. We feel satellite is more reliable than other sources. In fact, it (hydrilla) increased 500 acres. This info is supported and no doubt about the increase (2004-there was 2,900 infested acres. 2003 -2.537 infested acres)

Don: accepts fact of discrepancy of figures. Since fish introduced in 2003 (2004 1st feeding year), this year would see increased feeding. Plus the fact that if we go to outside sources (fed & state) requesting funds for carp or whatever & they say, "do you have scientist to engage for recommendations" & we say "yes, but we didn't take their advice," I wonder why we engaged them and how enthusiastic they will be to help us in future years.

Deschenes: Still undecided. Concerned dealing with gray area. Not hard science. We are trying to treat as black & white. I would vote against this motion. In favor of tabling it until late June after getting on lake & re-examining this issue. Recognize straw ballot public sentiment.

Slaton: I'm concerned that we haven't communicated well with the science team on what the true #s were based on imagery. Don't know the problem, but don't think they had correct data.

Pete moves to table. John seconds.

All in favor of tabling raise hand: Yes=8 Not = 7 Abstain=2

Strain: The motion fails for lack of 2/3 majority vote. We can go on.

Roger Fitchett: Called for vote on the original motion. *[Vote yes, to put in 10,167 grass carp in 2005. Vote no, NOT to put in carp in 2005.*

Back & forth discussion about proper procedures for voting.

VOTE TAKEN:

Yes to put them in 2005 = 2

No to put them in 2005 = 12

Abstain = 4

Curry: Didn't want to muddy up the motion, but the vote was for 10,167 in 2005. If we see a change in vegetation, we can add carp later?

Yes.

Communications: Doug Hughes

Hughes: We don't have anything in writing yet and will get together in next couple of weeks with a media plan assuming we have a science plan.

Strain: since this project is behind others in draft, could we ask you to give feedback in one month's time?

Proposal: Will put together a document in one month and we will have 7-10 days after to comment so they can incorporate comments into final version before next stakeholders meeting.

Science Report: Discussion and modification of Strain Science Plan

Strain: I sent "Strains Proposal" to everybody a month ago, so everybody has seen what the Science Group is up to now. Problem... it's one person's plan. Madsen's proposal from a 2004 report is basically the skeleton for the plan I would support; it is an excellent recommendation for future activities. I did insert recommendation for LGA monitors. The largest question in my plan is going to be my proposal of inserting 14 carp per infested acre as part of 5 year plan. If that stays, find out how much is out there end of 2005. Ratchet up/down if we are trying to reach 14 per vegetated acre. Carp are still part of formula, but we don't have hard data to make that decision. We know what biologists & ecologists are saying is a problem, but we don't have data. Personally, I think we should put carp in using #'s from other lakes that could have negative effect on Hydrilla. Scientists are clearly opposed to carp at that #. I would take it out of Strain proposal if they have data we need. Argued with Bill ?? He believes we cannot put in until we know what we're doing.

Madsen proposed a model that is a tool to monitor these things (Amur Stocking Model, USACE 1999). I like the report from the man in Raleigh using a bathometer (a sonar device calibrated to respond to vegetation). You can survey the lake using that rather than spot measurements or aerial photography. We can use that to see if vegetation is decreasing in areas that aren't getting sprayed but do have carp.

One big component is to spray all docks, commercial & private as part of our basic plan. Use enough \$\$ to use contact spray to remove in season we want it removed. Objection is that this will be prohibitively expensive. Don't know how much \$.

Additionally, want to use Dominion's management map. They are in process of giving us this so we can make overlay map. If we have shoreline management map to mark eco sensitive areas. And build treatment plan for high hydrilla population & fluoridone to eliminate so carp can help, that's the basics of my plan...Contact spray now, Fluridone coves to eliminate sources, interact with eco sensitive areas of the Dominion shoreline management plan, develop a revegetation plan... Will encourage native plants where they are own their own. We can plant to help native plants to get new populations started.

Adopt as conceptual plan, but make it specific after 2005 survey. Now Skip has told us that 2006 is to be a big study year, so maybe we should wait until 2006 before we set details on what gets sprayed with what beginning in 2007.

Wiegersma: The cost breakdown is in the previous 5 year management plan for a ballpark # for what you need to do that.

Strain: We need a map file for all scientists to place on their computer that is interactive as an overlay for the satellite map. We need tools like that to be able to say where to spray. (Thornton is working on it)

We can do it now if Dominion will release it to us. We could do it manually on maps we now have. Boyd will work with ANPC's computer & send it out on CD to scientists.

Map is based on coordinates. Dominion maps are GIS generated, but Dominion doesn't have GIS base right now. Possibly Dominion could use ANPC computer to create overlay. Skip: we can create that layer and put over satellite image. OK. Do it. Then Boyd will distribute.

Boyd: At the next stakeholders meeting... try to agree on scientifically based 5 year treatment plan. Using what John has done & what we know, we should be able to do that before next meeting.

Brown: Chris Horton has to leave & he agreed to make presentation.

Strain: Have we proceeded to an agreed upon working schedule? We are going to get overlay and work out into consensus agreement for people on the science team.

Johnson: When is an appropriate time for us to charge the Science Team for whatever is going to be in this plan? I'm still focused on carp issue. There has to be a stocking system out there. Is now an appropriate time to charge Science Team to look at other methods for assessing stocking carp issue?

The Science Team is coming up with a treatment plan and also an evaluation. That includes carp.

Johnson: making recommendation to Science Team to NOT say that stocking carp is impossible.

Wayne: agree with Harrel.. Time for Science Team to come up with detailed plan for next 5 years. Details. Need it now what we are doing and how we are evaluating.

[Deschenes: Motion to charge Science Team to provide a detailed *treatment and assesment plan for 2006 and beyond*](#)

[Harrel: 2nd](#)

Fitchett: Question for Science Team... Is that relatively simple or complicated or accurate at this point with the info you have?

Horton: Possible. Living document subject to change as new info comes around.

Strain: 3 of top scientists invited here at end of June to help us do this. (Madsen, Haller, Getsinger).

Horton: ["Those three are focused primarily on herbicides."](#) ~~Those three have primary expertise in herbicides.~~ Other issue is biological control as well as re-vegetation. Need to have those experts here as well. Put plan together face to face.

Boyd: Had volunteer for chemical types. Need biologist here.

Horton: We can work on that. Don't want it to stay fragmented. Need everybody integrated.

Wiegersma: June 29 is lake survey field day. We need others avail on June 30th to get 5-6 people to help & review what we've done.

Fitchett: what kind of timeframe to get answer?

Strain: could meet quarterly or every other month. Would like to set long-term meeting now so we can get this on calendar.

Deschenes: there is a motion & second on floor.

Roger: it pertains to motion. What timeframe for answer

Strain: 6 months. If stretch out need to put in 2006 study year. Need generalities in 2 months...

Horton: We have to go to public to get buy-in from them.

Strain: Guntersville took 18 months before they finalized the docs we now have. If we can pull off in 6 months we will be ahead.

Brown: They had funding in place in advance.

Beazley: how long do we need to get this?

Wiegiersma: Don't know if we can put a time on it. Very busy this time of year. Could take longer than 2-3 months.

Boyd asked other groups how much time they need.

Deschenes: Communications plan depends on science team and when we get docs.

Strain. They can at least put the verbage together.

Strain: Would like document in near final form. Short doc to send out with proposals for funding. We need something to show who we are and what we are doing.

Motion repeated:

Elton : if we don't have something by November 1st, we will have trouble getting funding.

Strain: do you want to put date in motion?

Deschenes changed motion: Motion to charge Science Team to provide a detailed treatment and assesment plan by August 15, 2005 for the year 2006 and beyond.

Horton: Fall of year is much easier to collect everyone's input. Would feel more comfortable if given to fall.

VOTE TAKEN In favor:

Yes = 17, NO= 0 Abstain =1

Strain: Science Team has the charge and we will try to do the best we can.

Summary Statements on "Managing Aquatic Plants Document: Strain

Horton: Bass Federation ~~s is-are~~ in this from beginning. Even though we're ~~not likely to can't~~ hold ~~major~~ tournament ~~evnetss~~ on Lake Gaston because there are not enough hotels ~~in the area.~~ ~~Wewe~~ do have obligation to our membership to improve / maintain fishing.

We saw an opportunity to potentially ~~get-to-prevent~~ the level of disagreement that Guntersville was before that stakeholders group was formed. We don't want to see it get to that level here. If you get together as group beforehand, it is much more effective.

Bass ~~was simply is~~ a catalyst to get ~~this process -it~~ going. Bass anglers are represented in NC & VA ~~by the BASS Federations~~. BASS/ESPN does not have a vote at this table. This is local issue, but we want to help solve it. What we will do is stay in it for the long run and help work on getting funding. When our plan comes together we have no problem going to legislators to get funding.

In the meantime, the opportunity for independent & private funding exists. Working on those now. In contact with [US Fish & Wildlife Service](#). Might be other avenues. When this gets to the point we can take to legislators... we can say you have a constituency... everyone agreed... worthwhile effort... we ~~will~~can try to pull strings. We are not going away. Bass Headquarter's role is to lend assistance. You have made a lot of progress. Very pleased to see group wants long term ecological health of lake as a goal. We are working on funding issues & will continue.

Thank You.

Strain: any other statements by any organization to follow that up?

Horton: One other thing. I had to bite my tongue because of a disappointment. We have a Science Team to make recommendation to this group. Its hard to get scientist to agree, but they all agree that its agreement from the team. They cannot act independently. We must maintain consistency. Let's continue to work through science team for recommendations and not as independents. We have to agree to disagree. Go with what comes out of committee. I am speaking to the letter that was sent out of NC DENR.

Coleman: Clarify what is the difference between advisory and gatekeeper. In other words, is Science Team to advise Stakeholders, or are they in place to get through Stakeholders to do anything? In other words, without our approval can they act?

Horton: That's a valid question.

Coleman: If the Science Team is immune to public opinion they don't have pressure of having to deal with public.

Horton: (I guess what we have to ask is "Are we here to satisfy everybody or the Lake Gaston body of water"?)—someone else said this. I said, "Having a seat on the Science Team means that you are part of a professional advisory group, whose job is to make the best recommendation possible, based on the consensus of the group. Participation on the team indicates that the member is resolved to functioning within the framework of the group, not independently."

Bruce: It's a question of Best way vs. economical way. Scientist will tell best way.... But maybe you can't afford that. The best way may not be most economical way. Scientists need to look at that. Must be feasible and economical. Lake owners have to pay for it.

Strain: We hope to establish finance advisory committee, e.g. bankers to help with finances. Haven't brought that in yet.

Smart: I want to move away from carp as example... we discussed drawdowns a little. Science Team may recommend that it's a viable alternative for weed control, yet this group may so no.

Horton: Science Teams responsibility is to recommend best product. You review product & tweak it here/there. Although they should take funding issue in... it's not their task.

Sutherland: I don't remember our group being asked to join the Science Team. Since Rob is new without history of program that's why I wrote the letter about our experience using carp. The letter wasn't trying to go around... just get better understanding.

Next Steps:

Set Long Term Calendar

Strain: I want to discuss intensity of operation level. Meet every other month or every quarter? Quarterly gives us adequate time.

Jolly: Didn't we agree Aug 15 as date for completing plan

Strain: completed to a point of voting.

Jolly: If that's a date, we need something to sink our teeth into.

Strain: Next meeting should be around 9/15. That would be 4 months from now. Then every 3 months after that.

Skip: ANPC Pig Pickin is Sept 24th. Discussion revealed Sat is not a good day for SH from out of town.

Strain: Discussed days of week. How about 22nd of September (9-4) Thursday. How do we want to organize for continuation?

Boyd was nominated as moderator and he agreed to convene next meeting.

Roger: It May be good idea to move this meeting around to different counties. Group agreed.

Strain: We will finalize details of plan so send alternate if you cannot attend.

With 2/3 requirement it's tough to get things passed.

Strain: Do we want to set our quarterly meetings?

Agreed: December 15th (Thurs). Boyd will send messages.

Other Issues:

Brown: Funding for out of town attendees. Did we set some amount to send to LGWCC for those who are underfunded so we can get in our budget?

Estimate to use is \$1,000 per person per meeting, or \$10,000 for next meeting.

Horton: Mike Grodowitz was supposed to be on Science Team, but got dropped. He will be added by Strain.

Adjournment:

Strain adjourned the Meeting at 1:45 pm