

**APPENDIX D. WILMS LAKE MODEL SETUP AND RESULTS FOR THE UPPER FOX-WOLF BASINS
TMDL**

WiLMS Lake Model Setup and Results for the Upper Fox-Wolf Basins TMDL

April 6, 2018

Prepared by the Cadmus Group LLC for US EPA Region 5

1 Introduction

This report outlines the setup and results of Wisconsin Lake Modeling Suite (WiLMS) water quality models for 21 lakes in the Upper Fox and Wolf Basins (UFWB). The 21 lakes included in WiLMS modeling (Table 1) are either present on Wisconsin's draft 2016 Impaired Waters List for eutrophication-related impairments or were considered potentially impaired based on available data. These lakes were selected for phosphorus Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) development to address issues of nutrient enrichment.

The WiLMS water quality models were developed by The Cadmus Group, Inc. to support TMDL development efforts by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 5 and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). The WiLMS models use information on lake morphology, water inflows, and phosphorus loading to provide estimates of in-lake phosphorus concentrations to guide TMDL analysis.

Table 1. UFWB lakes included in WiLMS lake water quality modeling.

Lake Name	WBIC	County
Big Twin Lake	146500	Green Lake
Black Otter Lake	315600	Outagamie
Buffalo Lake	168000	Marquette
Collins Lake	270200	Portage
Crane Lake	388500	Forest
Green Lake	146100	Green Lake
Lake Emily	161600	Dodge
Little Green Lake	162500	Green Lake
Long Lake	321300	Shawano
Mason Lake	175700	Adams, Marquette
Old Taylor Lake	195000	Waupaca
Park Lake	180300	Columbia
Pine Lake	406900	Forest
Puckaway Lake	158700	Marquette, Green Lake
School Section Lake	283600	Waupaca
Shawano Lake	322800	Shawano
Spring Lake	267200	Portage
Swan Lake	179800	Columbia
Tree Lake	289400	Portage
Upper Post Lake	399200	Langlade, Oneida
White Clay Lake	326400	Shawano

2 WiLMS Description

WiLMS is a lake water quality modeling tool developed by WDNR. Key conceptual features of WiLMS are described in the WiLMS user manual (WDNR 2003) and summarized below:

- A lake is represented as a zero-dimensional, completely-mixed body of water with no horizontal or vertical variability in water quality;
- Water quality is modeled on an annual time step. Lake total phosphorus (TP) concentrations predicted by WiLMS are growing season averages for the year being modeled;
- Lake TP concentrations can be predicted using one of several empirical equations. The empirical equations used in WiLMS were derived from statistical analysis of field data from multiple lakes across the US.

Early versions of WiLMS were released as a Microsoft Excel workbook pre-programmed with formulas for predicting lake water quality. WiLMS has since been released as standalone software program with a graphical user interface for entering inputs and viewing outputs. Because the current effort involved setting up many models, the Excel version of WiLMS (version 2.01) was used. Formulas in the Excel version were updated to ensure that outputs were consistent with the most recent version of WiLMS available at the time of this report (version 3.3).

3 Model Setup

The WiLMS modeling effort consisted of applying the following steps for each of the 21 lakes listed in Table 1:

1. Compile water quality monitoring data for the years 2000 through 2013 and identify years in which total phosphorus concentrations were sampled in the lake. Divide the sample data period of record into a calibration period and a validation period.
2. Setup a WiLMS model file for the calibration period that simulates average conditions during calibration years;
3. Calibrate WiLMS output by calculating a calibration factor as the ratio of observed to predicted TP concentrations during the calibration period;
4. Setup a WiLMS model file for the validation period that simulates average conditions during validation years;
5. Evaluate model predictions by applying the adjustment factor calculated in step 3 to the predicted TP concentration for the validation period and comparing to the observed TP concentration.
6. Setup a WiLMS model for the TMDL baseline period (2009-2013) that simulates average conditions during the TMDL baseline period.
7. Evaluate the phosphorus loading capacity of the lake as the maximum allowable load predicted to result in a lake TP concentration that is equal to the lake's TP water quality target.

This section describes the sources of input data used to setup WiLMS models. Required inputs include lake morphology (surface area and volume), annual water inflow, and annual total phosphorus loading to the lake. Also described in this section are the observed total phosphorus concentration data used for model calibration and validation.

3.1 Lake Morphology

Lake surface area and volume for 17 of the 21 lakes were set to values reported on WDNR lake survey maps (<http://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/maps/>). Survey maps for Lake Emily, Pine Lake, and School Section Lake did not report surface area and volume. For these lakes, survey maps were digitized using Geographic Information System (GIS) software and surface area and volume were calculated using the digitized bathymetry. A survey map was not available for Black Otter Lake. The surface area of Black Otter Lake was set to the value reported on the WDNR lake information webpage (<http://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/lakepages/LakeDetail.aspx?wbic=315600>). The volume of Black Otter Lake was set to the value reported in the *Black Otter Lake Adaptive Lake Management Plan* (STS, 2008). Lake morphology parameter values are listed for each lake in Table 2.

3.2 Water Inflow

Annual water inflow to each lake (Table 3) was estimated using the SWAT model developed for the UFWB TMDL (The Cadmus Group, 2015). Of the 21 lakes included in WiLMS modeling, 16 lakes are located at the outlet of a SWAT subwatershed (i.e., the lake watershed boundary matches the SWAT subwatershed boundary; see Figure 1, left). For these lakes, annual flow rates from the SWAT reach output file were extracted and used as estimates of annual water inflow to the lake.




Figure 1. Examples of the location of modeled lakes within SWAT subwatersheds. In the example on the left, the lake is located at the SWAT subwatershed outlet and the lake watershed matches the SWAT subwatershed. In the example on the right, the lake is located upstream of the SWAT subwatershed outlet and the SWAT subwatershed extends beyond the lake watershed.

An alternative approach was used for deriving annual water inflows to Big Twin Lake, Lake Emily, Old Taylor Lake, Shawano Lake, and Spring Lake because these lakes are located upstream of a SWAT subwatershed outlet (i.e., the SWAT subwatershed boundary extends beyond the lake watershed boundary; see Figure 1, right). Annual lake inflows were estimated for these lakes using SWAT predictions of runoff from Hydrologic Response Units (HRUs). HRUs are unique land use-soil-slope

combinations within a subwatershed and are the fundamental land units of SWAT water balance calculations. Annual lake inflows were estimated by first extracting annual runoff rates from the SWAT HRU output file for all HRUs in the SWAT subwatersheds where Big Twin Lake, Lake Emily, Old Taylor Lake, and Spring Lake are located. For each subwatershed, annual HRU runoff volumes were then summed by major land use category and multiplied by an area adjustment factor. Area adjustment factors were calculated as the ratio of land use area in the lake watershed to land use area in the SWAT subwatershed. Separate adjustment factors were calculated for all lake-land use combinations. Area-adjusted runoff volumes calculated for each land use category in the lake watershed were then summed to estimate total annual flow into the lake.

An additional source of water inflow to a lake is direct precipitation onto the water surface. WiLMS allows users to input net precipitation onto the lake surface (net precipitation is total precipitation minus evaporation). Because evaporation data were not available for the modeled lakes, net precipitation was set to the default value stored in WiLMS for the county that each lake is located in (Table 2).

3.3 Phosphorus Loading

Annual phosphorus loading to each lake (Table 4) was also estimated using the SWAT model developed for the UFWB TMDL (The Cadmus Group, 2015). Methods for deriving annual phosphorus loads from SWAT output followed methods used for estimating water inflows. For the 16 lakes with a SWAT subwatershed outlet point at the lake outlet, annual phosphorus loads from the SWAT reach output file were extracted and used as annual phosphorus loads into the lake.

For Big Twin Lake, Lake Emily, Old Taylor Lake, Shawano Lake, and Spring Lake, annual phosphorus loads were estimated by extracting annual phosphorus loads from the SWAT HRU output file for all HRUs in the SWAT subwatersheds that the five lakes are located in. Annual HRU loads were then summed by major land use category and multiplied by area adjustment factors. Area adjustment factors were calculated as the ratio of land use area in the lake watershed to land use area in the SWAT subwatershed. Separate adjustment factors were calculated for all lake-land use combinations. Area-adjusted loads for each land use category in the lake watershed were then summed to estimate annual phosphorus loading into the lake.

The UFWB SWAT model does not explicitly simulate phosphorus loading to lakes from onsite wastewater treatment (septic) systems. Phosphorus loading from nearshore septic systems was therefore included as an additional source of phosphorus in each lake model. WiLMS includes the following equation for calculating phosphorus loading from septic systems:

$$L = E * P * (1 - R)$$

L = Annual phosphorus load from septic systems (kilograms/year)

E = Septic tank phosphorus export rate (kilograms/person/year)

P = Population using septic systems (persons)

R = Phosphorus retention coefficient (dimensionless)

In all WiLMS models, the phosphorus export rate from septic systems (E) was to the default WiLMS value of 0.8 kilograms/person/year.

The population using septic systems (P) was estimated for each lake using a count of homes that are within 500 feet of the lake shore and outside of municipal sanitary sewer service areas. Initial counts of homes with septic systems were derived using GIS map layers of land parcel boundaries, sanitary sewer system boundaries, and aerial photos. Initial counts were refined using input from county land planning department staff. Counts of homes with septic systems were multiplied by the county average number of persons per household from the 2010 US Census to convert to the number of persons using septic systems and multiplied by 0.75 to account for non-permanent residents.

The phosphorus retention coefficient (R) describes how much of the phosphorus that is exported from a septic system enters the lake. A value of 0 means that all of the exported phosphorus enters the lake, while a value of 1 means that none of the exported phosphorus enters the lake. Phosphorus retention depends on several factors, including the type and condition of the septic system, the properties of soils that the septic system drains to, the distance from the septic system to the lake, and the direction of groundwater flow in the vicinity of the septic system. The WiLMS user manual (WDNR 2003) states that phosphorus retention coefficients range from 0.80 to 0.98 for properly functioning septic systems.

Phosphorus retention coefficients for each lake were assigned based on a review of the properties of soils in the 500 foot buffer surrounding the lake. Retention coefficient values were selected based on soil texture and soil hydrologic group listed in the US Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service (USDA NRCS) Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) database for nearshore soils. Lakes with very high infiltration rates were assumed to have a lower phosphorus retention coefficient because they could allow rapid drainage of septic effluent into the lake. Soils with very low infiltration rates were also assumed to have a lower phosphorus retention coefficient because septic effluent could pond at the land surface and runoff into the lake during wet weather conditions. Lakes with predominantly sandy nearshore soils and high infiltration rates (hydrologic group A) were assigned a phosphorus retention coefficient of 0.8. Lakes with predominantly clayey nearshore soils and very low infiltration rates (hydrologic group C) were assigned a phosphorus retention coefficient of 0.8. Lakes with predominantly loamy nearshore soils and moderate to low infiltration rates (hydrologic groups B or C) were assigned a phosphorus retention coefficient of 0.9. Lakes with a mix of soils with varied textures and hydrologic groups were assigned a phosphorus retention coefficient of 0.85.

Septic system parameter values for each lake are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Lake morphology, net precipitation, and septic system parameter values used in WiLMS lake water quality models.

Lake Name	WBIC	Watershed Area (acres)	Surface Area (acres)	Volume (acre-feet)	Mean Depth (feet)	Net Precipitation (inches/year)	Septic Population (persons)	Septic P Retention
Big Twin Lake	146500	2,108	78	1,286	16	3.1	40.6	0.9
Black Otter Lake	315600	10,021	75	384	5	3.4	0	-
Buffalo Lake	168000	253,126	2,210	10,180	5	3	850.2	0.8
Collins Lake	270200	1,829	42	1,036	25	3.9	35.7	0.9
Crane Lake	388500	3,818	337	3,922	12	5.3	181.2	0.9
Green Lake	146100	65,871	7,346	761,277	104	3.1	352.8	0.9
Lake Emily	161600	1,562	270	1,414	5	2.4	99.9	0.9
Little Green Lake	162500	2,391	466	4,817	10	3.1	458.7	0.9
Long Lake	321300	6,080	86	1,601	19	4.6	5.4	0.8
Mason Lake	175700	18,897	856	5,784	7	2.8	284.6	0.85
Old Taylor Lake	195000	172	55	265	5	3.8	64	0.9
Park Lake	180300	34,139	312	2,187	7	2.4	296.1	0.9
Pine Lake	406900	13,075	1,692	16,976	11	5.3	462.9	0.9
Puckaway Lake	158700	495,816	5,039	15,327	3	3.05	631.6	0.8
School Section Lake	283600	1,644	37	678	19	3.8	12.5	0.9
Shawano Lake	322800	43,375	6,063	54,270	9	4.6	5.4	0.85
Spring Lake	267200	7,052	37	311	8	3.9	10.7	0.8
Swan Lake	179800	41,989	406	12,898	32	2.4	263.4	0.8
Tree Lake	289400	2,951	74	1,051	14	3.9	84	0.9
Upper Post Lake	399200	64,176	757	4,782	6	5.6	656.2	0.85
White Clay Lake	326400	2,701	234	3,166	14	4.6	10.7	0.85

Table 3. Estimated annual water inflow (in inches per year) compiled for WiLMS lake water quality modeling.

Lake Name	WBIC	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Big Twin Lake	146500	4.96	9.89	6.44	3.83	17.17	2.73	3.62	7.96	15.22	4.15	6.08	5.96	8.25	5.83
Black Otter Lake	315600	6.50	9.39	10.91	9.87	13.98	9.41	7.37	7.72	10.33	8.90	16.03	17.17	9.83	11.23
Buffalo Lake	168000	10.69	13.84	9.96	7.74	17.45	5.80	10.17	10.28	19.62	10.81	14.62	13.51	11.34	13.77
Collins Lake	270200	13.30	13.16	15.00	13.45	15.06	13.07	14.26	13.14	13.27	14.08	16.55	16.26	14.15	16.07
Crane Lake	388500	12.24	12.50	15.44	13.69	14.36	12.62	12.73	12.67	12.32	11.23	12.50	12.42	12.61	13.80
Green Lake	146100	6.16	11.27	7.39	4.37	18.41	3.63	4.70	8.77	16.79	5.43	7.01	7.28	9.17	7.07
Lake Emily	161600	7.38	9.96	6.67	4.24	13.49	2.08	6.35	7.29	15.04	6.39	10.47	8.98	6.85	8.86
Little Green Lake	162500	8.13	13.15	9.65	6.66	20.67	5.70	6.13	11.10	18.77	6.92	8.85	8.82	11.53	7.58
Long Lake	321300	7.24	7.13	7.29	7.08	9.61	7.79	7.17	6.59	7.29	6.75	9.29	10.71	7.25	9.41
Mason Lake	175700	11.57	13.73	10.24	8.61	18.10	7.63	10.78	10.48	20.52	11.82	15.11	13.80	12.29	13.95
Old Taylor Lake	195000	9.70	10.59	9.70	9.28	11.48	9.04	8.24	9.66	10.18	9.95	11.97	12.64	10.95	10.65
Park Lake	180300	11.31	15.52	10.09	6.80	20.71	3.04	10.98	11.23	23.44	9.81	16.28	14.17	10.87	15.39
Pine Lake	406900	9.98	9.81	12.66	11.71	11.44	10.39	11.24	11.17	10.93	10.21	9.81	11.57	9.54	9.20
Puckaway Lake	158700	10.30	13.59	9.86	7.54	17.32	5.87	9.62	10.19	19.10	10.51	13.88	13.04	11.28	13.09
School Section Lake	283600	9.33	9.15	9.74	8.46	10.37	6.97	6.40	5.66	9.12	8.30	11.37	9.28	6.85	9.26
Shawano Lake	322800	7.35	7.36	7.41	7.28	8.96	7.69	7.43	6.95	7.50	7.19	8.84	9.71	7.65	9.29
Spring Lake	267200	8.52	9.81	8.51	8.04	11.39	7.93	6.68	8.94	9.45	9.17	12.21	12.27	9.50	9.60
Swan Lake	179800	11.00	15.33	9.91	6.67	20.44	2.93	10.69	11.01	23.16	9.64	15.98	13.97	10.70	15.10
Tree Lake	289400	10.62	10.73	12.68	10.55	12.88	10.47	11.73	10.75	11.06	11.82	14.77	14.50	11.75	14.05
Upper Post Lake	399200	8.71	8.71	12.31	9.37	9.95	9.11	10.16	9.46	9.99	8.44	9.07	10.81	7.64	7.91
White Clay Lake	326400	11.03	10.38	10.12	10.08	13.38	10.69	10.32	9.34	10.80	10.27	13.84	14.76	9.66	14.17

Table 4. Estimated annual total phosphorus loading (in kilograms per hectare per year) compiled for WiLMS lake water quality modeling. Note that phosphorus loading from nearshore septic systems was included as an additional source of phosphorus in WiLMS models using septic parameters displayed in Table 2.

Lake Name	WBIC	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Big Twin Lake	146500	0.21	0.34	0.24	0.16	0.85	0.11	0.10	0.35	0.73	0.15	0.23	0.21	0.43	0.21
Black Otter Lake	315600	0.28	0.46	0.65	0.34	0.61	0.33	0.33	0.27	0.75	0.36	0.63	0.97	0.35	0.58
Buffalo Lake	168000	0.19	0.23	0.16	0.11	0.38	0.08	0.15	0.15	0.40	0.17	0.22	0.23	0.22	0.24
Collins Lake	270200	0.31	0.19	0.29	0.20	0.32	0.19	0.33	0.22	0.23	0.28	0.42	0.29	0.22	0.40
Crane Lake	388500	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
Green Lake	146100	0.21	0.31	0.22	0.14	0.63	0.09	0.10	0.25	0.57	0.12	0.19	0.18	0.31	0.17
Lake Emily	161600	0.32	0.34	0.20	0.14	0.69	0.07	0.25	0.22	0.67	0.21	0.34	0.28	0.31	0.30
Little Green Lake	162500	0.14	0.24	0.17	0.10	0.61	0.07	0.06	0.24	0.50	0.09	0.14	0.14	0.28	0.13
Long Lake	321300	0.12	0.15	0.16	0.14	0.21	0.16	0.14	0.13	0.19	0.15	0.17	0.23	0.14	0.21
Mason Lake	175700	0.23	0.28	0.20	0.12	0.48	0.10	0.14	0.16	0.54	0.21	0.24	0.30	0.28	0.30
Old Taylor Lake	195000	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.10	0.10
Park Lake	180300	0.33	0.38	0.23	0.16	0.66	0.08	0.28	0.26	0.71	0.24	0.38	0.35	0.35	0.38
Pine Lake	406900	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.10
Puckaway Lake	158700	0.20	0.25	0.18	0.12	0.42	0.10	0.16	0.18	0.44	0.18	0.23	0.24	0.25	0.24
School Section Lake	283600	0.23	0.21	0.34	0.19	0.27	0.16	0.19	0.14	0.37	0.20	0.26	0.28	0.16	0.34
Shawano Lake	322800	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.17	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.19	0.13	0.16	0.20	0.14	0.21
Spring Lake	267200	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.12	0.19	0.13	0.13	0.17	0.21	0.15	0.19	0.24	0.17	0.20
Swan Lake	179800	0.29	0.35	0.21	0.14	0.60	0.07	0.25	0.23	0.64	0.22	0.35	0.32	0.32	0.35
Tree Lake	289400	0.13	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.15	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.16	0.16	0.14	0.19
Upper Post Lake	399200	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.10	0.10
White Clay Lake	326400	0.11	0.14	0.15	0.12	0.20	0.15	0.13	0.11	0.20	0.14	0.17	0.22	0.11	0.24

3.4 Observed Total Phosphorus Concentrations

TP concentration samples collected from the 21 modeled lakes from 2000 through 2013 were acquired from the WDNR Surface Water Integrated Monitoring System (SWIMS) database. Data cleaning steps were applied to remove samples from monitoring stations that were not regularly sampled over several years.

The period of record for each lake was defined as years with TP samples collected in at least two growing season months (June through September). The period of record was divided into a model calibration period and a model validation period, with more recently sampled years assigned to the calibration period. Growing season samples were then averaged for the calibration period and the validation period for comparison to WiLMS TP concentration predictions. The following steps were applied to calculate growing season mean TP concentrations:

- Calculate the daily mean TP concentration for days with multiple TP samples;
- Calculate the monthly mean TP concentration for months with multiple TP samples;
- Calculate the growing season mean TP concentration from monthly means.

Table 5 lists the calibration and validation years for each lake and calculated growing season mean TP concentrations. Note that seven lakes had a limited monitoring record (6 years or less) that was not sufficient for defining a validation period (Big Twin Lake, Black Otter Lake, Buffalo Lake, Lake Emily, Old Taylor Lake, School Section Lake, and Spring Lake). Calibrated WiLMS predictions were therefore not compared to sample data for these lakes.

Table 5. Calibration and validation periods for each lake and mean growing season total phosphorus (TP) concentrations.

Lake Name	WBIC	Calibration Period	Validation Period	Calibration Period Growing Season Mean TP ($\mu\text{g/L}$)	Validation Period Growing Season Mean TP ($\mu\text{g/L}$)
Big Twin Lake	146500	2004-2006; 2009	None	43	-
Black Otter Lake	315600	2002; 2009-2013	None	100	-
Buffalo Lake	168000	2000-2001	None	135	-
Collins Lake	270200	2009-2013	2001; 2003; 2005-2008	27	23
Crane Lake	388500	2009-2013	2002-2006	32	28
Green Lake	146100	2009-2013	2004-2008	17	22
Lake Emily	161600	2005-2006; 2011-2013	None	64	-
Little Green Lake	162500	2011-2013	2000-2005	96	137
Long Lake	321300	2008-2013	2001-2007	35	30
Mason Lake	175700	2008-2013	2000-2002; 2004; 2006; 2007	125	101
Old Taylor Lake	195000	2003-2005	None	49	-
Park Lake	180300	2009; 2011-2013	2004; 2006; 2007	106	112
Pine Lake	406900	2009-2013	2004-2008	37	28
Puckaway Lake	158700	2009; 2011-2013	2004-2007	142	139
School Section Lake	283600	2009-2013	None	35	-
Shawano Lake	322800	2007-2013	2000-2006	44	32
Spring Lake	267200	2012-2013	None	30	-
Swan Lake	179800	2006-2007; 2009-2013	2000-2005	30	29
Tree Lake	289400	2010-2013	2007-2009	24	24
Upper Post Lake	399200	2010-2013	2001; 2007-2009	46	49
White Clay Lake	326400	2010-2013	2005; 2006; 2008	39	42

3.5 Empirical Model Selection

WiLMS includes several empirical regression equations to predict the TP concentration of a lake under alternative phosphorus loading magnitudes. These are referred to as “lake response models” because they quantify the relationship between phosphorus loading and in-lake phosphorus concentrations. This study focused on predictions from the Canfield-Bachmann response models. The Canfield-Bachmann models were developed from a database of 723 natural lakes and reservoirs throughout the United States, Canada, and northern Europe. The Canfield-Bachmann models are described in detail in Canfield and Bachmann (1981).

Two separate Canfield-Bachmann models are available for TP prediction; one derived from empirical analysis of data from natural lakes and one derived from analysis of artificial lakes. The Canfield-Bachmann model for natural lakes is:

$$P = \frac{L}{z \left[\left(0.162 \frac{L}{z} \right)^{0.458} + p \right]}$$

where P is lake growing season mean TP concentration, L is annual areal total phosphorus load into the lake, z is lake mean depth, and p is lake hydraulic flushing rate.

The Canfield-Bachmann model for artificial lakes is:

$$P = \frac{L}{z \left[\left(0.114 \frac{L}{z} \right)^{0.589} + p \right]}$$

Canfield and Bachmann (1981) report the characteristics of natural and artificial lakes in the dataset used to develop the empirical models, including residence time, mean depth, total phosphorus concentration, and areal phosphorus loading (i.e., phosphorus load per unit of lake surface area) (Table 6). These characteristics were used to determine whether the natural or artificial equation should be applied to each of the 21 lakes in this study. Nineteen (19) of the 21 lakes in this study matched the profile of natural lakes in the Canfield-Bachmann dataset, while 2 lakes (Black Otter Lake and Park Lake) better fit the profile of artificial lakes. The Canfield-Bachmann model for natural lakes was therefore applied for all lakes except for Black Otter Lake and Park Lake, which used the artificial lake model.

Table 6. Characteristics of natural and artificial lakes in the Canfield-Bachmann dataset (Canfield and Bahmann, 1981).

Lake Characteristic	Natural Lakes	Artificial Lakes
Residence Time (years)	Mean = 0.2 Range = 0.005 to 1,000	Mean = 0.003 Range = 0.001 to 53
Mean Depth (feet)	Mean = 42 Range = 0.7 to 1,007	Mean = 30 Range = 2 to 194
Areal TP Load (pounds per acre)	Mean = 25 Range = 0.3 to 678	Mean = 134 Range = 0.4 to 7,316
TP Concentration (micrograms per liter)	Mean = 120 Range = 4 to 2,600	Mean = 78 Range = 6 to 1,500

4 Model Results

4.1 Model Calibration

WiLMS model files were initially setup to predict growing season mean TP concentrations during the calibration period for the 21 lakes in this study. A calibration factor was then applied to the predicted TP concentration based on a comparison to the observed TP concentration during the calibration period. This approach was used as a form of model calibration to account the difference between each lake's individual loading response relationship and the generalized relationship represented by the Canfield-Bachmann model. The calibration factor was calculated for each lake as the ratio of the observed to predicted growing season mean TP concentration. Calibration factors are listed in Table 7.

Table 7. Comparison of observed and predicted growing season mean TP concentrations for the calibration period. Also displayed are calibration factors for each lake, calculated as the ratio of the observed to predicted TP concentration.

Lake Name	Observed TP ($\mu\text{g/L}$)	Predicted TP ($\mu\text{g/L}$)	Adjustment Factor
Big Twin Lake	43	62	0.68
Black Otter Lake	100	114	0.87
Buffalo Lake	135	57	2.38
Collins Lake	27	46	0.59
Crane Lake	32	13	2.49
Green Lake	17	14	1.26
Lake Emily	64	47	1.34
Little Green Lake	96	29	3.34
Long Lake	35	49	0.73
Mason Lake	125	53	2.36
Old Taylor Lake	49	23	2.08
Park Lake	106	67	1.58
Pine Lake	37	20	1.80
Puckaway Lake	142	64	2.21
School Section Lake	35	54	0.65
Shawano Lake	44	28	1.54
Spring Lake	30	63	0.48
Swan Lake	30	55	0.54
Tree Lake	24	31	0.75
Upper Post Lake	46	39	1.18
White Clay Lake	39	27	1.43

4.2 Model Validation

After calculating calibration factors, an additional set of WiLMS model files were setup to predict the growing season mean TP concentration during the validation period for each lake with validation data (note that Big Twin Lake, Black Otter Lake, Buffalo Lake, Lake Emily, Old Taylor Lake, School Section Lake, and Spring Lake did not have sufficient monitoring data for validation). The accuracy of TP predictions was then evaluated by:

1. Multiplying the predicted growing season mean TP concentration for the validation period by the lake's calibration factor listed in Table 7; and

2. Comparing the adjusted TP concentration calculated in step 1 to the observed growing season mean TP concentration for the validation period.

Table 8 lists observed and predicted growing season mean TP concentrations for the validation period. Predicted TP concentrations for ten of the fourteen lakes with validation data are within $\pm 20\%$ of observed TP concentrations. Lakes with a greater difference between predicted and observed TP concentrations are Crane Lake (predicted concentration is 21% higher than observed concentration), Little Green Lake (predicted concentration is 25% lower than observed concentration), and Pine Lake (predicted concentration is 32% higher than observed concentration), and Shawano Lake (predicted concentration is 28% higher than observed concentration). The differences between predicted and observed TP concentrations are likely due to a combination of:

- Input data – Errors in estimates of precipitation, evaporation, water inflow, and nutrient loading can result in inaccurate predictions of lake TP concentrations; and
- Monitoring data –The frequency of water quality sampling may not be sufficient for accurately characterizing average conditions.

Given the uncertainty associated with input and monitoring data, the differences between predicted and observed TP concentrations during the validation period are within an acceptable range for further application of the calibrated WiLMS models for phosphorus TMDL development.

Table 8. Comparison of observed and predicted growing season mean TP concentrations for the validation period. Note that predicted TP concentrations are adjusted by the calibration factors listed in Table 7.

Lake Name	Observed TP ($\mu\text{g/L}$)	Predicted TP ($\mu\text{g/L}$)	% Difference
Collins Lake	23	23	0%
Crane Lake	28	34	21%
Green Lake	22	22	0%
Little Green Lake	137	103	-25%
Long Lake	30	35	17%
Mason Lake	101	116	15%
Park Lake	112	113	1%
Pine Lake	28	37	32%
Puckaway Lake	139	149	7%
Shawano Lake	32	41	28%
Swan Lake	29	31	7%
Tree Lake	24	23	-4%
Upper Post Lake	49	49	0%
White Clay Lake	42	38	-10%

4.3 Loading Capacity Analysis

The pollutant loading capacity of a lake is defined as the maximum pollutant load that the lake can receive while still meeting water quality standards. WiLMS was applied to calculate the TP loading capacity of each lake by setting up an additional set of WiLMS model files to predict the growing season mean TP concentration during the TMDL baseline period (2009 through 2013). The model files were initially setup with water inflow volume and TP loading equal to the average of 2009 through

2013 estimates shown in Table 3 and Table 4. The modeled TP load was then incrementally reduced until the TP concentration predicted by the model (adjusted by factors listed in Table 7) was equal to the lake's TP water quality target. TP water quality targets and loading capacities for the 21 study lakes are listed in Table 9.

Table 9. TP water quality targets and loading capacities.

Lake Name	TP Water Quality Target ($\mu\text{g/L}$)	TP Loading Capacity (pounds/year)
Big Twin Lake	30	327
Black Otter Lake	40	1,749
Buffalo Lake	40	13,694
Collins Lake	20	359
Crane Lake	40	310
Green Lake	15	9,319
Lake Emily	40	207
Little Green Lake	40	134
Long Lake	30	812
Mason Lake	40	1,312
Old Taylor Lake	20	8
Park Lake	40	3,316
Pine Lake	40	1,533
Puckaway Lake	40	27,594
School Section Lake	30	297
Shawano Lake	40	5,619
Spring Lake	15	622
Swan Lake	30	11,402
Tree Lake	30	566
Upper Post Lake	40	5,485
White Clay Lake	30	319

5 Conclusions

Wisconsin Lake Modeling Suite (WiLMS) lake water quality models were developed for 21 lakes in the Upper Fox and Wolf Basins (UFWB). The WiLMS models are empirical lake response models that predict the growing season mean total phosphorus (TP) concentration in a lake given its annual TP load. The WiLMS models were calibrated by comparing observed and predicted TP concentrations during a calibration period and calculating a calibration factor as the ratio of the observed to predicted TP concentration. The accuracy of the calibrated model predictions was evaluated by comparing observed and predicted TP concentrations during a separate validation period. Ten of the fourteen lakes with validation data had predicted TP concentrations within $\pm 20\%$ of observed concentrations and predicted TP concentrations were within $\pm 21\text{-}32\%$ of observed concentrations for the remaining four lakes. The WiLMS models were applied for TMDL development to determine the phosphorus loading capacity that corresponds to attainment of numeric phosphorus water quality targets for each of the 21 lakes.

6 References

- Canfield, D. E., & Bachmann, R. W. (1981). Prediction of total phosphorus concentrations, Chlorophyll-a, and Secchi depths in natural and artificial lakes. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*(38), 414-423.
- STS. (2008). *Black Otter Lake Adaptive Lake Management Plan*. Available online at: http://blackotterlake.com/files/6-23-08_Update_Lake_Management_Plan.pdf.
- The Cadmus Group. (2016). *UFWB TMDL: SWAT Model Setup, Calibration, and Validation*.
- Wisconsin DNR. (2003). *Wisconsin Lake Modeling Suite Program Documentaion and User's Manual Version 3.3 for Windows*.