Starry Stonewort Management in Wisconsin: Outcomes and Forthcoming Efforts

Brad Steckart – AIS Coordinator for Washington and Waukesha Counties Heidi Bunk – Water Resources Management Specialist, WI DNR

Agenda

- Starry Stonewort distribution in Wisconsin
- What happens when we find it?
- Four methods that have been attempted
- Future Treatments and Integrated Management Approaches
- Continuous Prevention and Education Efforts
- Questions?

Distribution in Wisconsin



- Door County and Lake Michigan
 - Bayside and Lakeside
- Washington County
 - Green Lake
 - Silver Lake
 - Pike Lake
- Waukesha County
 - Big Muskego Lake/Bass Bay
 - Little Muskego Lake
- Racine County
 - Long Lake
 - Wind Lake



Point Intercept Surveys

Once a population is found...





Monitoring

Point Intercept Surveys Meander Surveys

• Once a population is found...





Monitoring

• Once a population is found...

Point Intercept Surveys Meander Surveys

 Diving Surveys and Buoy Placement



Integrated Pest Management Approach

Certain methods work on certain population sizes, etc.





Integrated Pest Management Approach

On each lake, unique rapid response management techniques have been carefully chosen, yielding results of varying success.

Must consider:

- lake type
- infestation size
- surrounding vegetation
- habitat



Hand pulling

- Usually the first step in treatment of AIS
- Especially if population is small and found early on...



Diver Assisted Suction Harvesting - DASH



Able to physically remove bulbils from sediment

Native plants stay in place for competition and wildlife habitat Avoids using chemicals that have not worked in past

DASH

DASH from August 20th – 26th, 2015





Initial Distribution of Starry Stonewort

SILVER LAKE Location of Starry Stonewort (Nitellopsis obtusa) Brad Steckart



Prepared by: Washington County Land Conservation Subject to Errors and Omissions

abruary, 2015

Starry&tonewort

80-90% Reduction in visible population of starry stonewort

2015

Results

DASH



Starry Stonewort Distribution after DASH Removal

SILVER LAKE Location of Starry Stonewort (Nitellopsis obtusa) Post D.A.S.H. **Brad Steckart** SCALE Legend 2013 Pictometry 800 FI Prepared by: Washington County-Land Conservation Subject to Errors and Omissions StarryStonewort February 2015

Results Two Years Later - 2017

- Starry stonewort is still present
 - Scattered populations

 Satellite populations found further away from original population

SILVER LAKE 2016 Location of Starry Stonewort (Nitellopsis obtusa) Post D.A.S.H. Brad Steckart 0.05 0.1 0.2 Kilometers Silver Lake Washington County WBIC 36200 32m between Points Page 2 of 2 472 473 433 434 430 432 427 428

Lessons Learned: Chemical Treatment of Starry Stonewort



Herbicides utilized in SE WI for Starry Stonewort treatments

- Endothol (example: Hydrothol)
- Chelated Copper (example: Komeen crystal, Cutrine)
- Flumioxazin (example: Clipper)
- Diquat (example: Reward)

Metrics studied

- Sub P/I data
- Organism height
- Wet mass



Wisconsin Herbicide Treatment Evaluations

		Date(s)			Treatment	% SSW Change
Lake	County	Treated	Product(s)	Rate(s)	area	(Pre vs. Post)
Little Muskego	Waukesha	06/29/2016	Copper	0.5 ppm	2.4 acres	-12%
		06/08/2016	Copper	0.8ppm	2.7 acres	1270/
long	Racine	06/29/2016	Copper + Hydrothol	0.8 ppm + 0.29 ppm	2.7 acres	+2/%
Long		06/16/2016	Copper + Flumioxazin	0.83 ppm + 0.15 ppm	1.0 acres	
		06/26/2016	Copper + Diquat	0.83 ppm + 0.35 ppm	0.74 acres	+5/%
Big Muskego	Waukesha	09/24/2015	Copper + Hydrothol	0.8 ppm + 0.17 ppm	1.5 acres	109/
		06/27/2016	Copper + Hydrothol	0.8 ppm + 0.17 ppm	1.5 acres	-10%
		06/27/2016	Copper + Hydrothol	0.8 ppm + 0.17 ppm	1.3 acres	+33%
		09/24/2015	Flumioxazin	0.2 ppm	0.75 acres	
		06/27/2016	Copper	0.4 ppm	0.75 acres	+09%



Hillview Bay, Little Muskego Lake June 29 Treatment - FOO

Treatment Area (N=25)							
	Pre July 2015	Pre May 2016	Post July 2016	Post August 2016	August 2016 Bulbil Only Sites		
Nitellopsis	100	100	88	96	36		
Chara*	88	32	12	4			
Vallisneria*	88	4	28	36			

Control Area (N=25)								
	Pre July 2015	Pre May 2016	Post July 2016	Post August 2016	August 2016 Bulbil Only Sites			
Nitellopsis	84	80	68	76	36			
Chara*	100	68	84	52				
Vallisneria*	100	8	40	40				

Whole Bay (N=282)								
	Pre July 2015	Pre May 2016	Post July 2016	Post August 2016	August 2016 Bulbil Only Sites			
Nitellopsis*	60	53	78	78	10			
Chara*	82	63	57	42				
Vallisneria*	83	5	64	60				

Frequency of dominant plant species in Hillview Bay, Little Muskego Lake before and after a copper (Komeen crystal) treatment. Bold * items indicate a statistically significant (p <0.05) difference between 2015 pre-treatment and 2016 post-treatment surveys.

Little Muskego Herbicide Evaluation 2015-2016 Comparison



- Starry stonewort biomass reduction was substantial, but not gone.
- Two dominant native plant species decline more drastically than starry stonewort from 2015 to 2016.
- DNR and partners surveyed Hillview in 2017.

Big Muskego 2015 Channel Treatment



Hunters Nest – Treated with Endothol and Chelated Copper

Hunter's Nest Launch					
	9/23/15	10/14/15	10/26/15	6/23/16	
Site	Weight (g)	Weight (g)	Weight (g)	Weight (g)	
1A	334	0	0	19	
1B	6.5	0	0.2	0	
2A	3.25	0	0	166	
2B	0.5	0	0	35	
3A	9	0.2	0	0.75	
3B	1.8	0	1	11	
4A	396	0.8	24	1533	
4B	1853	0.3	2.8	1035	
5A	849	3	16	1856	
5B	901	56	20	131	
6A	81	19	2	905	
6B	117	0	3	1254	
7A	84	0	0	877	
7B	43	10	0	675	
8A	385	32	2	877	
8B	480	0.7	0.2	760	

Durham – Control

Durham Launch (Control Site)							
	9/23/16	10/14/15	10/26/15	6/23/16			
Site	Weight (g)	Weight (g)	Weight (g)	Weight (g)			
1A	25	0	0	0			
1B	0	0	0	0			
2A	0	0		0			
2B	22	0		0			
3A	3.75	0	111	0			
3B	15.5	0	62	0			
4A	720	0	1.1	4			
4B	90	0	0.2	41			
5A	3.7	610	3200	412			
5B	803	590	1975	50			
6A	1803	3250	1560	0			
6B	588	0	1790	0			
7A	5	690	560	0			
7B	1701	1070	1120	0			
8A	66	1860	460	0			
8B	1503	983	840	0			

Boxhorn Treatment 2015

- East central side location on Big Muskego
- Open water, no channel

Boxhorn – Treated with Flumioxazin

Boxhorn Launch						
	9/23/15	10/14/15	10/26/15	6/23/16		
Site	Weight (g)	Weight (g)	Weight (g)	Weight (g)		
1A	0.5	0.6	0.3	1808		
1B	3.9	0.1	0	385		
2A	0.3	0	0	20		
2B	0.3	0	0	30		
3A	10.5	0	0	86		
3B	0.1	0	0	9.6		
4A	2.9	0	0.2	0		
4B	0.6	3.2	0	0		
5A	2.1	0	0	10		
5B	0.2	0	0	498		
6A	3.5	0	0	0		
6B	0.2	0	0	0		
7A	3.75	0	0	0		
7B	0.2	0	0	0		
8A	24.25	0.3	1.3	8.75		
8B	14.5	1.3	0.1	21		

Wisconsin Treatment Evaluation Summary

- No herbicide treatment has provided more than short-term (< 1 year) control.
- Herbicide treatments may reduce SSW biomass in the short-term, but don't kill the entire organism.
- Native charophytes and macrophytes can be impacted by treatments.
- At least some of the herbicide degradation/dissipation appears to be due to off-site water movement.

Drawdown as a management tool



Winter Drawdown For Little Muskego Lake

- Started September 5th 2017
- Goal to draw down a total of 84 inches
- Raise gates and then pump water after that
- Stop fall drawdown October 1st or when water temperature is approaching 55 degrees
- Closed to all fishing starting November 1st, 2017 until March 4th, 2018
- Ended October 12th
- Achieved 72 inches drawdown

Starry Stonewort Bulbil Lab Trials Dr. Ken Karol and Stephen Gottschalk New York Botanical Gardens

Desiccation	1hr	6 hr	1 day	5 day	1 month	3 month	Total
Attempts	15	15	45	30	30	25	160
Success	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Success Rate	26.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.50%
Freezing			1 Day	5 day	1 month	3 month	Total
Attempts			30	30	30	25	115
Success			0	0	0	0	0
Success Rate			0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
				0.0070		0.0070	
All controls	1hr	6 hr	1 Dav	5 dav	1 month	3 month	Total
Attempts	15	15	45	30	30	25	160
Success	12	11	27	24	17	10	110
Success Rate	80.00%	73.33%	60.00%	80.00%	56.67%	76.00%	68.75%

Goals of a drawdown

Desiccation:



How does this work?

Aeration:



How does this work?

Freezing:

Kills some vegetative reproducers and increases seed producers













Little Muskego





Little Muskego Lake Drawdown 2017
C = Water's Edge Surveyed on 10/18/17, 12/0/17 & 14/18

Map Background is a 2015 Avrial Photo





Proposed management in 2018

- Dredging
- Benthic barriers
- Chemical treatments in contained curtain (sediment barrier) to prevent diffusion

Dredging

- Permit process takes time
- Likely will need an individual permit
- Sediment/contaminant testing
- Disposal cost trucking, burial
- Hydraulic dredging
- Geotextile bags needed on site for weeks
- Cost can quickly add up

Geotextile Bag



Benthic barriers

- Wildlife and fisheries have concerns about widespread use coordination work in progress
- When you put a barrier down on the bed of a lake, sediment is deposited on top at best, a temporary fix in small area
- Blocks germination of native seed bank
- WDNR studied the use of these barriers in the past concluded the benefits did not outweigh the ecological cost

Curtained chemical treatments

- Curtain material needs to not allow water exchange
- Bottom of curtain needs to be weighted
- Top of curtain needs to have floats
- Research question to be answered: If chemical does not diffuse off site and maintains contact with the target organism for a longer period of time, can long term control be achieved?
- In the case of starry stonewort, will the bulbils and rhizoids be killed?

Examples of containment curtains





Outreach and communication



MYLIFE







Shuttlecock Studios 2011

AIS Cleaning Stations

Enforcement days at launchUse tools at cleaning station





Before Leaving... Inspect Everything! Dock Lines Anchor Live Wells Bilge Rollers Trailer Hull Axle Motor

CBCW

Clean Boats, Clean Waters is the best and most effective way to prevent the spread of aquatic invasive species between lakes!







same prevention methods



Photo: Grad Steckar



Questions?

