LAKE MASPENOCK WEED MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL ADVISORY GROUP

HOPKINTON MA 10748

OCTOBER 29, 2015 MINUTES

In attendance;

John Westerling, Dept. of Public Works

Eric Sonnet, Parks & Rec. Dept.

Jeff Barnes, Conservation Commission

David Mitchell, Consultant

Jamie Goncalves, At Large

Cynthia Esthimer, At Large

Drew Logan, At Large

* Call to order by Jaime G. Minutes from 10-8-15 Meeting were unanimously approved without changes.
* David M. provided an overview and assessment of historical reports and surveys of the lake. Intending to contact the Dept of Fisheries to see if any additional information is available.
	+ He defines Lake Maspenock as being in a Mesotrophic state, ie, medium level of dissolved nutrients.
	+ Phosphorous levels have not spiked. The transition from private septic systems to town sewers seemed to have helped, as have the storm drains, but there is no telling what nutrients are in the sediment from prior years.
	+ There were reports of winter algae blooms in older reports.
	+ There was a discussion of growth of residential and commercial properties surrounding the lake. An increase in impervious surfaces would lead to additional runoff.
	+ There was a salt pile located near the lake years ago. We may want to consider testing for chloride.
	+ There has been a long history of non-native species such as fanwort and milfoil.
	+ Summary – the lake is fairly stable and should not deteriorate quickly. We need to decide what condition we want to maintain the lake.
* Eric S. noted that the weeds, particularly the largeleaf pondweed, have exploded over the last few years which lead to a group discussion around why and how. Drew L. suggested the extended drawdowns have been effective in controlling the milfoil and fanwort but as those populations decreased, it may have created room for the largeleaf pondweed to expand. David M. noted drawdowns are less effective on plants that germinate via seeds such as the largeleaf pondweed. When asked if there is a means to reduce nutrients in the sediment, David M. commented that dredging and phosphorous precipitants are available but neither are feasible either from a cost (dredging) or effectiveness (chemical) perspective.
* The group discussed the need to have a thorough assessment of the pros and cons of the various treatment methodologies available. David M. noted htat Lakeline by Dick Osgood is a good, objective source for this analysis.
* A discussion was had on how to engage the community in the process and several action items came out of this discussion. A survey will be developed and distributed to the community. Questions will focus on what people want from the lake. The discussion turned towards how we communicate. Creation of a website, direct mail, inserts for Hop Independent and public forums were suggested. The elementary school building committee process was highlighted as a best practice.
* Action items:
	+ Committee members will submit suggestions for survey questions to Drew L. who will combine and distribute back to the group.
	+ Cynthia E. has created an educational pamphlet that we can distribute. She will also develop content for an insert.
	+ Eric S. will investigate direct mail and Hop Independent inserts.
	+ Jeff B. will invite Mike Shepherd to speak at our next meeting and discuss the process that the elementary school committee followed.
	+ Jeff B. will speak with John W. regarding budget.
	+ Drew L. will invite a representative from the Lake Cochituate Association to present to our group in December.
	+ Eric S. will develop a timeline to capture key objectives over the next year.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

The next 2 meetings are in Rm. 215 at Town Hall

* November 12, 5:45 - 7:00 pm
* December 3, 7:00 – 9:00 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by Drew Logan