

Except from a report by the CLA to the Chamber of Commerce
September 29th, 1989

Page 3

we need more studies--we need another study. Expect it; you're going to hear it forever. Our role will have to be to determine which studies are appropriate and which are superficial. Thanks to the local Foundations, a lot of studies have been performed over the years and we have excellent statistics on the condition of the lake. As far as the Lake Association is concerned, the lake is right where we expect it to be, giving its age. It's in a normal state of evolution. That, of course, has been accelerated by man's manipulation of the environment and development. And that is where the Lake Association came into being forty years ago--to decelerate man's affect and to keep that lake useable for what we'd like to see it be. Natural evolution could turn that lake into a swamp or even solid ground. Our position is that we want to keep it as a lake. And that's going to take work, and that's going to take annual work. If you look at some of the studies, and current ones have been funded right now by a couple of local Foundations, you'll see that they are going to point out that that work must be done. So, the CLA has a public image of always concentrating on the short-term remedial work--let's get us through this summer; we want to use the thing. Because that's what's had to be done. But, the Lake Association is also concerned with the long-term approach. It started a few years ago when it called for the sewerage of the lake. It didn't get involved in the politics of which method of sewerage to use, but it did cooperate with matching funds with Chautauqua County to hire an engineer to get the ball rolling back then. It's done some other things. But when we get into short-term, day-to-day things, there are only certain options that you can do with the lake. You can draw down the water in the winter--that's not going to work here. You can harvest the weeds--we do it, and that's helpful. It's expensive. But it does remove nutrients from the lake so they don't recycle. You can use herbicides--we have--you've seen the effectiveness of that. From 1982 to 1988 the lake was in beautiful control. It had one of the best fishing populations ever, and no one, I repeat, no one has ever documented any harm from the herbicide program. I'd love to have them challenge me on that statement. Dredging-- that's a way to go. That's expensive. Botton Covers--to stop the weeds from growing. We want the weeds. The fish need the weeds. The lake needs the weeds. It's just how many of them does it need. Biological controls. grass carp--whatever--that's a temperamental and interesting way to go. Nutrient Precipitation--that's something we're looking at for the future. We are seriously talking about the possibility that we should

Page 4

recommend a pilot program of using alum to precipitate out the phosphorous. The phosphorus is a limiting nutrient in the lake that makes those weeds grow. Limiting light penetration you can't do. Those are general short-term options. So essentially, the Lake Association is stuck with: harvesting, herbicides, and nutrient precipitation, and that's experimental.

The long-term options that we are going to be stressing to the public in the future are to deal with pollution, nutrient control, water shed management, zoning, land use development, and controls. The "water shed" is a key word and that's going to be stressed in the future, and don't think the Lake Association hasn't been involved in that. A lot of people think it hasn't. It has, and it's going to be more involved in the future. We're going to work on that and we're still working on it a little bit.

But really, we're here today to talk about short-term issues: keeping the lake useable, harvesting vs. herbicide, the whole issue of chemicals. The CLA has expounded a mixed program; however, the Department of Environmental Conservation wants no herbicides especially Diquat. The state owns the ball and we can't play the game without it. And that's where we are. We assert that the DEC is unreasonable, arbitrary, and acting without appropriate factual support. But, the law gives them the authority to do that. So, we've got the mess out there that you had last summer.

To double the existing harvesting fleet would cost a capital outlay of \$648,200 plus operational costs which would bring that total to \$828,200. That's the kind of thing we are talking about when we say let's do away with the herbicide program and go with the harvesting. And, doubling the fleet for that \$800,000 figure we believe isn't enough. It ought to be tripled or more. You are going to have to have a harvester in every community. So we press for the herbicide component. In the meantime, we talk about trying to find \$102,000 to buy a harvester with a 12-foot wide cutter bar, perhaps for next year, to work the lanes out in Burtis Bay--just so boats can get up and down that lake.

Now, we are arguing essentially with the county and the state about treating a maximum of 585 acres with either 585 gallons of Diquat or 1521 gallons of Aquathol-K. Let's put that into perspective. In 1959 the state treated the lake with 10,010 gallons of Sodium Arsenate plus an unverified poundage of 2-4-D granuals. In 1961, 8,044 gallons of sodium arsenate and 1,726 lbs. of 2-4-D were used. In 1965, 45,000 lbs. of 2-4-D and 150 gallons of Diquat were used. In 1970, 750 gallons of