Importance of Sequence: Does the order of management strategy improve cattail control while rehabilitating impacted ridges and sloughs?
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Active Marsh Improvement 3 (AMI 3) - Hypothesis

Purpose

• accelerate recovery of ridge/slough landscape
• get better efficacy in cattail control

Hypothesis - By burning off thatch first, we will provide better herbicide coverage to live cattail and thus obtain better control than our herbicide then burn strategy.
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Methods

Cattail control – imazamox herbicide
1. selective towards cattail
2. Rodgers and Black 2011
3. non-target species affected but recover

Assess Cattail control and desirable vegetation
1. After one and two growing seasons
2. 2x2 meter nested quadrat at random points
3. Frequency and live canopy % cover
4. Fisher’s exact test – differences among treatments
Results - 1st Season responses
Results

1st Season responses
• Fire plots – filled in within 3 months, highest density of plants
• Herbicide plots - significant thatch remaining
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Results

1st Season responses - 2017
• Submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) - present within FH and HF treatments
• Cattail frequency - 100% presence among treatments - no diff HF and FH
### Results - 2nd season responses - 2019

- Cattail presence significantly reduced with any treatment strategy
- No significance in cattail reduction between treatments
- No reduction in Ridge Sawgrass presence

#### Cattail and Sawgrass Frequency Two Seasons After Treatment Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Percent Frequency (+/- se)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- Typha - Ridge
- Typha - Slough
- Cladium - Ridge
- Cladium - Slough
Results - 2\textsuperscript{nd} season responses – SAV

- SAV significantly increased presence with all treatment strategies
- Fire then Herbicide not significantly better from Herbicide then Fire
- Herbicide then Fire only significant from Herbicide only treatment - ??
Herbicide Fire

Fire Herbicide
Conclusions

• Original hypothesis: Burning then spraying strategy will provide better herbicide coverage and thus obtain better cattail control than a herbicide then burn strategy.
  
  • Cattail control is similar
  • Sawgrass similarly affected
  • SAV – use of fire with herbicide promotes SAV more readily than herbicide alone.

Future

• What is an acceptable cattail % to target
• Effective cattail maintenance interval
Acknowledgements

My colleagues at the SFWMD for all their help and insight, FWC for prescription burning and HAI for herbicide application.