

Addendum to Beth Torpey's March 2, 2017 Testimony:

I would like to thank the committee for allowing me to testify about S.75 on March 2, 2017.

Upon further consideration of the issues, I would like to provide additional comments.

In listening to the testimony from Christine Cano of Shadow Lake, the differences between the setting and resources of Shadow and Seymour Lakes was more pronounced. Please note that **Seymour is only one of two (Memphremagog) other lakes in the state (other than Champlain) at this time to have a "public" boat decontamination station.**

It should be noted that the volume of visits at Seymour is **four times** the number of visitors at Shadow Lake. In the 2016 season, we removed 28 confirmed invasive species fragments out of 43 vegetative intercepts. I believe that Shadow reported one invasive intercept. Although we didn't decontaminate one boat during the 2016 season, our visual inspection protocol continued to prove to be very effective and I wonder if the greeters would be as vigilant if they were washing each boat.

As testified previously boat washing may not remove a plant fragment from a pinch point (i.e. between watercraft and trailer) or unwind a fragment from the intake of a jetski impeller.

I would also like to emphasize that while pressure washing is the recommended method for removal of organisms that have become attached to the hull, we have had zero instances of this occurring in the 16 years of the program at Seymour. A watercraft has to be anchored for more than a few days in an impaired waterbody for attachment to the hull to occur.

Because our situation is less than optimal (described below), a legal requirement to wash each boat is not only scientifically unwarranted, but will place an undue burden upon a newly operational portion of our program. In addition, significant public frustration is likely to occur when it takes over an hour to launch a boat on a busy day.

If you review the frequency of visits to Seymour, as provided as Attachment A in the original testimony, you'll see there can be 10 boats launching in less than 15 minutes. If you estimate 10 minutes (optimal conditions – 15 minutes is more likely) per boat per wash, it would take **one hour and 40 minutes** to process this traffic through a boat wash process. A backup like this would continue for the rest of the day.

In addition to the public frustration, added personnel would be required and the budget of the program would skyrocket.

Changing the terminology from "boat wash" to "**targeted decontamination process**" is strongly recommended. This would acknowledge the site-specific conditions and varying level of resources amongst the different programs. As with Seymour, any targeted decontamination process could be developed as a standard operating procedure in conjunction with recommendations from VTDEC.

Seymour Challenges:

On top of having an adjacent utility pole providing electricity and telephone, Shadow has an infiltration pad for the infiltration of boat wash water. Seymour was not allowed, by permit from Fish and Game, to even take up a parking spot for our decontamination trailer in the parking lot of the fishing access. When the decontamination trailer was placed on the grass, we were told that we had to move it every two weeks so the grass could be mowed. While this may not seem like a big deal, it means fine-tuning the unit for each move as the piping for the intake water is cut to a certain length and the prime of the pump is lost with each disassembly. It's unlikely that an infiltration pad would be allowed on the property, according to the permit restrictions that we've experienced, and the volume of water would become problematic. The long-term efficacy of the battery operated pump, pulling water 250 feet from the lake at the anticipated volume for a boat wash, is also questionable.

Again, thank you for your time in considering this testimony.