

AIS POPULATION MANAGEMENT

\$50,000 (Small-scale) \$150,000 (Large-scale)

Applicant Name:

PROJECT SCORE

Project Title:	<i>Callahan Lake Protective Association, Inc</i>	14
Ranker ID:	<i>2024-25 Callahan and Mud Lakes EWM Management Project</i>	
	<i>7</i>	

1. Prevention (10%)

The degree to which the project implements a strategic prevention strategy for an AIS population.

Additional tips:

- Waterbody has a high priority for prevention or is a regionally isolated population.
- A prevention strategy is in place
- Participation in Clean Boats, Clean Waters, support for disinfection and decontamination, early detection monitoring, participation in other department-approved AIS prevention initiatives.

Comments: **0-3 points**

Some watercraft inspections completed, but nothing that much better. ED surveys performed each year, and check docks for Zebra Mussels. E21

2

2. Strategy & Decision-making (20%)

The degree to which the project implements a strategic control strategy for an AIS population.

Additional tips:

- All projects must follow a management plan, but higher-scoring projects cite action triggers, strategies, and objectives from the plan.
- The applicant has analyzed the efficacy of past control efforts and proposes to evaluate the efficacy and non-target effects of the proposed control project.
- The applicant has demonstrated willingness to change their management strategy as a result of new information (e.g. species characteristics, control efficacy, habitat composition, water quality, non-target effects).
- Higher-scoring projects identify the decision-making process guiding their efforts (e.g. adaptive management or scenario planning)

Comments: **0-6 points**

Decision making does seem to be solid, but even proposing usage of chemicals in wild rice area doesn't seem smart. | Proposing the IPM usages, and treating areas that prevent it from expanding in areas is also smart.

3

3. Ecosystem Benefit (20%)

The degree to which the project protects or restores the aquatic ecosystem's quality, integrity, diversity, or provision of services.

Additional tips:

- The applicant has taken steps to protect or improve the quality of the waterbody or watershed through planning and implementation in *addition* to work on AIS.
- Higher-scoring projects are explicitly designed to maintain habitat quality, functional value, or other beneficial characteristics of the ecosystem.
- Target population has documented adverse impacts in the specific project area.
- Low-scoring projects will fail to provide evidence of adverse effects.
- The project will improve conditions on a high-quality system.

E.g. [state natural area](#), O/ERW, sensitive area, critical habitat area, or an area of special natural resource interest.

Projects must provide specific justification of how the management will prevent damage to native communities or reduce the risk of damage.

Higher-scoring large-scale projects prioritize control efforts

E.g. starting with areas of greatest vulnerability, populations most tractably controlled, or other approach to maximize efficacy or benefit.

Higher-scoring projects will have larger beneficial effects.

Lower-scoring projects may make non-specific or generic mention of selective control activities.

Comments: 0-6 points

Does treating small acreage of AIS worth the potential harm of herbicide treatments? |

3

4. Population Extent (10%)

The degree to which the scale of the control activities is appropriate given the extent of the target population.

Additional tips:

The extent of the target population is clearly stated in the application, and the project intends to use current information on population extent to plan control activities.

Proposed control activities are scale-appropriate.

Project builds on successful past interventions to successively reduce population size. For example:

A small-scale project is proposed within 2 years of an early detection and response project.

A small-scale project proposed to control a small-scale population attained after a large-scale control effort.

Comments: 0-3 points

Population is well-documented, but I don't think the application methods are appropriate for the size of the population. SV did not that they will use this project to evaluate spot treatments with ProcellaCOR and 2,4-D but that the mapping methods won't be able to determine the impacts on native communities.

1

5. External Support (5%)

The degree to which the project builds public or partner support, makes efficient use of resources and leverages additional funding.

Additional tips:

Support is committed in writing by entities external to the project. These entities are not receiving grant funding for any work provided.

Higher scoring projects will include written support from parties most affected by the project.

-Projects requiring landowner permission will include written support from landowners.

The grantee brings substantial external funding to the table to support the project (at least 10% of the required match amount, more points may be awarded for larger match).

The applicant conducted AIS control consistent with their department-approved plan in the previous season without financial assistance from the state.

Comments: 0-2 points

Some external support from county, and other areas in letters, but the monetary contribution was not noted in LOS for 2024.

1

6. Probability of Successful Implementation (15%)

The degree to which the applicant is likely to successfully meet project objectives and accomplish project goals.

Additional tips:

Project objectives are clear, with activities associated with a date of implementation. Lower-scoring projects are generic with implementation plans that lack detail.

Applicant demonstrates a level of capacity appropriate for the scale of the project or has identified technical assistance resources to ensure successful implementation.

Applicant has a history of satisfactory performance under grant agreements or contracts, or otherwise provides evidence of their ability to successfully implement projects of a similar scale.

Comments:

0-5 points

Seems they have successfully completed some grants, and work in the past, etc.

3

7. Complementary Management (10%)

The degree to which the project will complement other management efforts by protecting or restoring surface waters by working effectively at the watershed scale.

Additional tips:

Higher-scoring projects will complement and be well-connected to a planning or implementation effort that is larger than the grantee's own (TMDL, adaptive management plan, Key Element plan, County Land and Water Resource Management Plan) conducted by the department, a local unit of government, or other partner.

Higher-scoring applicants will demonstrate a commitment to ecosystem protection and restoration. They will have implemented or significantly participated in one or more projects having broader beneficial effects on the ecosystems within the past 5 years.

Shoreland or wetland restoration

Healthy Lakes & Rivers

Sediment and nutrient loading reduction

Implementation of department-approved recommendations from a management plan to protect and restore surface waters, unrelated to AIS control

Comments:

0-3 points

Some minimal complimentary management with CLMN, etc.

1

8. OTHER**First-time AIS population management grant for the species and waterbody?**

YES, first-time AIS population management grant for the species and waterbody (1)

NO, not the first AIS population management grant for the species and waterbody (0)

0

Was biologist's feedback incorporated?

YES, project incorporated feedback provided during project development (0)

NO, the project DID NOT incorporate feedback provided during project development (-3)

NA, no feedback provided (0)

0

Public access?

Public boating access satisfies s. NR 1.91 by meeting access standards or public demand, or is a regional or river project (0)

0

Public boating access meets and exceeds 1.91 minimum standards (1)

Participant in DNR-sponsored research and demonstration project?

Yes, applicant is a participant in a DNR-sponsored research and demonstration project (1)

No, applicant is not a participant in a DNR-sponsored research and demonstration project (0)

0

OVERALL TOTAL:

14

TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE:

31

Additional Comments:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Technical comments:

Were goals and objectives clear? (No, Somewhat, Yes)

Issues to address prior to award, if any:

Other comments:

AIS POPULATION MANAGEMENT**\$50,000 (Small-scale) \$150,000 (Large-scale)**

Applicant Name:

PROJECT SCORE

Project Title:	<i>Callahan Lake Callahan Lake Protective Association, Inc</i>	11
Ranker ID:	<i>2024-25 Calla2024-25 Callahan and Mud Lakes EWM Management Project</i>	
	<i>8</i>	

1. Prevention (10%)**The degree to which the project implements a strategic prevention strategy for an AIS population.**

Additional tips:

Waterbody has a high priority for prevention or is a regionally isolated population.

A prevention strategy is in place

Participation in Clean Boats, Clean Waters, support for disinfection and decontamination, early detection monitoring, participation in other department-approved AIS prevention initiatives.

Comments:

0-3 points*there is some mention of 100hrs each year for CBCW activities mainly focusing on private launch. Volunteers would do early detection monitoring each season.***2****2. Strategy & Decision-making (20%)****The degree to which the project implements a strategic control strategy for an AIS population.**

Additional tips:

All projects must follow a management plan, but higher-scoring projects cite action triggers, strategies, and objectives from the plan.

The applicant has analyzed the efficacy of past control efforts and proposes to evaluate the efficacy and non-target effects of the proposed control project.

The applicant has demonstrated willingness to change their management strategy as a result of new information (e.g. species characteristics, control efficacy, habitat composition, water quality, non-target effects).

Higher-scoring projects identify the decision-making process guiding their efforts (e.g. adaptive management or scenario planning)

Comments:

0-6 points*the approach seems a little loose. I am not sure if this is an effort to allow for more flexibility? They mention a scenario based approach but do not lay out any scenarios***2****3. Ecosystem Benefit (20%)****The degree to which the project protects or restores the aquatic ecosystem's quality, integrity, diversity, or provision of services.**

Additional tips:

The applicant has taken steps to protect or improve the quality of the waterbody or watershed through planning and implementation in *addition* to work on AIS.

Higher-scoring projects are explicitly designed to maintain habitat quality, functional value, or other beneficial characteristics of the ecosystem.

Target population has documented adverse impacts in the specific project area.

Low-scoring projects will fail to provide evidence of adverse effects.

The project will improve conditions on a high-quality system.

E.g. [state natural area](#), O/ERW, sensitive area, critical habitat area, or an area of special natural resource interest.

Projects must provide specific justification of how the management will prevent damage to native communities or reduce the risk of damage.

Higher-scoring large-scale projects prioritize control efforts

E.g. starting with areas of greatest vulnerability, populations most tractably controlled, or other approach to maximize efficacy or benefit.

Higher-scoring projects will have larger beneficial effects.

Lower-scoring projects may make non-specific or generic mention of selective control activities.

Comments:	0-6 points
at current levels it is really unclear if the populations of EWM are having negative impacts on the lake ecosystem. There is little discussion about the impacts to recreation as well.	2

4. Population Extent (10%)

The degree to which the scale of the control activities is appropriate given the extent of the target population.

Additional tips:
The extent of the target population is clearly stated in the application, and the project intends to use current information on population extent to plan control activities.
Proposed control activities are scale-appropriate.
Project builds on successful past interventions to successively reduce population size. For example:
A small-scale project is proposed within 2 years of an early detection and response project.
A small-scale project proposed to control a small-scale population attained after a large-scale control effort.

Comments:	0-3 points
DASH approach seems appropriate given the target areas. A larger 2,4D treatment area seems like a better candidate. The ProcellaCOR treatment area of .66 acres does not seem like a good approach, but at 5PDU they are likely to have outside impacts.	1

5. External Support (5%)

The degree to which the project builds public or partner support, makes efficient use of resources and leverages additional funding.

Additional tips:
Support is committed in writing by entities external to the project. These entities are not receiving grant funding for any work provided.
Higher scoring projects will include written support from parties most affected by the project.
-Projects requiring landowner permission will include written support from landowners.
The grantee brings substantial external funding to the table to support the project (at least 10% of the required match amount, more points may be awarded for larger match).
The applicant conducted AIS control consistent with their department-approved plan in the previous season without financial assistance from the state.

Comments:	0-2 points
numerous letters of support, but only one monetary donation.	1

6. Probability of Successful Implementation (15%)

The degree to which the applicant is likely to successfully meet project objectives and accomplish project goals.

Additional tips:
Project objectives are clear, with activities associated with a date of implementation. Lower-scoring projects are generic with implementation plans that lack detail.
Applicant demonstrates a level of capacity appropriate for the scale of the project or has identified technical assistance resources to ensure successful implementation.

Applicant has a history of satisfactory performance under grant agreements or contracts, or otherwise provides evidence of their ability to successfully implement projects of a similar scale.

Comments:

0-5 points

the goals set forth do not seem unattainable and the applicant has utilizes state grants in the past.

3

7. Complementary Management (10%)

The degree to which the project will complement other management efforts by protecting or restoring surface waters by working effectively at the watershed scale.

Additional tips:

Higher-scoring projects will complement and be well-connected to a planning or implementation effort that is larger than the grantee's own (TMDL, adaptive management plan, 9Key Element plan, County Land and Water Resource Management Plan) conducted by the department, a local unit of government, or other partner.

Higher-scoring applicants will demonstrate a commitment to ecosystem protection and restoration. They will have implemented or significantly participated in one or more projects having broader beneficial effects on the ecosystems within the past 5 years.

Shoreland or wetland restoration

Healthy Lakes & Rivers

Sediment and nutrient loading reduction

Implementation of department-approved recommendations from a management plan to protect and restore surface waters, unrelated to AIS control

Comments:

0-3 points

there is little or no discussion pertaining to complimentary management in terms practices outside AIS management

0

8. OTHER**First-time AIS population management grant for the species and waterbody?**

YES, first-time AIS population management grant for the species and waterbody (1)

NO, not the first AIS population management grant for the species and waterbody (0)

0

Was biologist's feedback incorporated?

YES, project incorporated feedback provided during project development (0)

NO, the project DID NOT incorporate feedback provided during project development (-3)

NA, no feedback provided (0)

0

Public access?

Public boating access satisfies s. NR 1.91 by meeting access standards or public demand, or is a regional or river project (0)

0

Public boating access meets and exceeds 1.91 minimum standards (1)

Participant in DNR-sponsored research and demonstration project?

Yes, applicant is a participant in a DNR-sponsored research and demonstration project (1)

No, applicant is not a participant in a DNR-sponsored research and demonstration project (0)

0

OVERALL TOTAL:

11

TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE:

31

Additional Comments:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Technical comments:

Were goals and objectives clear? (No, Somewhat, Yes)

Issues to address prior to award, if any:

Other comments:

AIS POPULATION MANAGEMENT

\$50,000 (Small-scale) \$150,000 (Large-scale)

Applicant Name:

PROJECT SCORE

Project Title:	<i>Callahan Lake Protective Association, Inc</i>	12
Ranker ID:	<i>2024-25 Callahan and Mud Lakes EWM Management Project</i>	
	<i>9</i>	

1. Prevention (10%)

The degree to which the project implements a strategic prevention strategy for an AIS population.

Additional tips:

Waterbody has a high priority for prevention or is a regionally isolated population.

A prevention strategy is in place

Participation in Clean Boats, Clean Waters, support for disinfection and decontamination, early detection monitoring, participation in other department-approved AIS prevention initiatives.

Comments:

0-3 points

limited information about a prevention strategy currently in place (CLMN mentioned)

1

2. Strategy & Decision-making (20%)

The degree to which the project implements a strategic control strategy for an AIS population.

Additional tips:

All projects must follow a management plan, but higher-scoring projects cite action triggers, strategies, and objectives from the plan.

The applicant has analyzed the efficacy of past control efforts and proposes to evaluate the efficacy and non-target effects of the proposed control project.

The applicant has demonstrated willingness to change their management strategy as a result of new information (e.g. species characteristics, control efficacy, habitat composition, water quality, non-target effects).

Higher-scoring projects identify the decision-making process guiding their efforts (e.g. adaptive management or scenario planning)

Comments:

0-6 points

Goals align with APM Plan objectives but do not cite specific actions, progress, etc.; willingness to change management strategy, scenario-based management approach but does not identify potential scenarios

3

3. Ecosystem Benefit (20%)

The degree to which the project protects or restores the aquatic ecosystem's quality, integrity, diversity, or provision of services.

Additional tips:

The applicant has taken steps to protect or improve the quality of the waterbody or watershed through planning and implementation in *addition* to work on AIS.

Higher-scoring projects are explicitly designed to maintain habitat quality, functional value, or other beneficial characteristics of the ecosystem.

Target population has documented adverse impacts in the specific project area.

Low-scoring projects will fail to provide evidence of adverse effects.

The project will improve conditions on a high-quality system.

E.g. [state natural area](#), O/ERW, sensitive area, critical habitat area, or an area of special natural resource interest.

Projects must provide specific justification of how the management will prevent damage to native communities or reduce the risk of damage.

Higher-scoring large-scale projects prioritize control efforts

E.g. starting with areas of greatest vulnerability, populations most tractably controlled, or other approach to maximize efficacy or benefit.

Higher-scoring projects will have larger beneficial effects.

Lower-scoring projects may make non-specific or generic mention of selective control activities.

Comments:	0-6 points
Identifies planning/organization activities in addition to AIS work; does not cite how project will help ecosystem or greater watershed, low information on EWM adverse effects or how project will consider native community impact/damage	3

4. Population Extent (10%)

The degree to which the scale of the control activities is appropriate given the extent of the target population.

Additional tips:

The extent of the target population is clearly stated in the application, and the project intends to use current information on population extent to plan control activities.

Proposed control activities are scale-appropriate.

Project builds on successful past interventions to successively reduce population size. For example:

A small-scale project is proposed within 2 years of an early detection and response project.

A small-scale project proposed to control a small-scale population attained after a large-scale control effort.

Comments:	0-3 points
-----------	-------------------

Extent of target population is stated, scale appropriate; activities align with previous activities and knowledge	1
---	----------

5. External Support (5%)

The degree to which the project builds public or partner support, makes efficient use of resources and leverages additional funding.

Additional tips:

Support is committed in writing by entities external to the project. These entities are not receiving grant funding for any work provided.

Higher scoring projects will include written support from parties most affected by the project.

-Projects requiring landowner permission will include written support from landowners.

The grantee brings substantial external funding to the table to support the project (at least 10% of the required match amount, more points may be awarded for larger match).

The applicant conducted AIS control consistent with their department-approved plan in the previous season without financial assistance from the state.

Comments:	0-2 points
-----------	-------------------

High written support from external entities; low external funding (checklist states less than 10%)	1
--	----------

6. Probability of Successful Implementation (15%)

The degree to which the applicant is likely to successfully meet project objectives and accomplish project goals.

Additional tips:

Project objectives are clear, with activities associated with a date of implementation. Lower-scoring projects are generic with implementation plans that lack detail.

Applicant demonstrates a level of capacity appropriate for the scale of the project or has identified technical assistance resources to ensure successful implementation.

Applicant has a history of satisfactory performance under grant agreements or contracts, or otherwise provides evidence of their ability to successfully implement projects of a similar scale.

Comments:

0-5 points

Generic timeline of planning and implementation with generic actions; low detail of past project success or their future ability for success

2

7. Complementary Management (10%)**The degree to which the project will complement other management efforts by protecting or restoring surface waters by working effectively at the watershed scale.**

Additional tips:

Higher-scoring projects will complement and be well-connected to a planning or implementation effort that is larger than the grantee's own (TMDL, adaptive management plan, Key Element plan, County Land and Water Resource Management Plan) conducted by the department, a local unit of government, or other partner.

Higher-scoring applicants will demonstrate a commitment to ecosystem protection and restoration. They will have implemented or significantly participated in one or more projects having broader beneficial effects on the ecosystems within the past 5 years.

- Shoreland or wetland restoration

- Healthy Lakes & Rivers

- Sediment and nutrient loading reduction

- Implementation of department-approved recommendations from a management plan to protect and restore surface waters, unrelated to AIS control

Comments:

0-3 points

Goals align with County/external partner plans; no commitment with broad ecosystem protection/restoration outside of EWM action

1**8. OTHER****First-time AIS population management grant for the species and waterbody?**

YES, first-time AIS population management grant for the species and waterbody (1)

NO, not the first AIS population management grant for the species and waterbody (0)

0**Was biologist's feedback incorporated?**

YES, project incorporated feedback provided during project development (0)

NO, the project DID NOT incorporate feedback provided during project development (-3)

NA, no feedback provided (0)

0**Public access?**

Public boating access satisfies s. NR 1.91 by meeting access standards or public demand, or is a regional or river project (0)

0

Public boating access meets and exceeds 1.91 minimum standards (1)

Participant in DNR-sponsored research and demonstration project?

Yes, applicant is a participant in a DNR-sponsored research and demonstration project (1)

No, applicant is not a participant in a DNR-sponsored research and demonstration project (0)

0**OVERALL TOTAL:****12****TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE:****31**

Additional Comments:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Technical comments:

State how mapping/survey results will be used in future management

Were goals and objectives clear? (No, Somewhat, Yes)

Yes

Issues to address prior to award, if any:

Other comments: