
Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program


Aquatic Plant Management Plan – Horsehead Lake

Prepared for:

Presque Isle Town Lakes Committee
Contact: Otto Novak
P.O. Box 37
Presque Isle, Wisconsin 54557

Prepared by:

White Water Associates, Inc.
Dean Premo, Ph.D.
429 River Lane, P.O. Box 27
Amasa, Michigan 49903



Date: 2022

Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program

Aquatic Plant Management Plan – Horsehead Lake

This plan is a product of a WDNR Lake Planning Grant awarded to:

Presque Isle Town Lakes Committee
P.O. Box 37
Presque Isle, Wisconsin 54557
Contact: Otto Novak
Phone: (715) 686-2628; E-mail: oandlnovak@gmail.com

Submitted to:

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Attention: Kevin Gauthier, Sr., Water Resource Management Specialist
8770 Hwy J
Woodruff, WI 54568
Phone: (715) 365-5211 ext. 214; Email: Kevin.GauthierSr@wisconsin.gov

Prepared by:

White Water Associates, Inc.
Dean Premo, Ph.D., Angie Stine, B.S., and Kent Premo, M.S.
429 River Lane, P.O. Box 27
Amasa, Michigan 49903
Phone: (906) 822-7889; E-mail: dean.premo@white-water-associates.com

Cite as: Premo, Dean, Angie Stine, and Kent Premo. 2022. Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program: Horsehead Lake Aquatic Plant Management Plan. White Water Associates, Inc.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. Study Area	4
Chapter 3. Purpose and Goal Statements	8
Chapter 4. Information and Analysis	9
Part 1. Watershed	9
Part 2. Aquatic Plant Management History	12
Part 3. Aquatic Plant Community Description	13
Part 4. Fish Community	17
Part 5. Water Quality and Trophic Status	17
Part 6. Water Use	18
Part 7. Riparian Area	18
Part 8. Wildlife	18
Part 9. Stakeholders	19
Chapter 5. Recommendations, Actions, and Objectives	20
Chapter 6. Contingency Plan for AIS	25
Appendix A – Literature Cited	
Appendix B – Tables and Figures	
Appendix C – Review of Lake Water Quality	
Appendix D – Horsehead Lake Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Monitoring Report	
Appendix E – Horsehead Lake Aquatic Invasive Species Report	

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The *Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program* results from the efforts of the Presque Isle Town Lakes Committee, an organization that has been active since 2005. The Lakes Committee views stewardship of lakes as an ongoing endeavor that is integrated, coordinated, and administered by the Lakes Committee. This broader perspective accommodates the appropriate range of geographic scales from which to approach lake stewardship: a discrete “lake specific” focus that goes hand-in-hand with waterscape-wide awareness.

This aquatic plant management plan addresses Horsehead Lake. Despite this specificity, it maintains the waterscape perspective crucial to effective lake stewardship. This is especially important when it comes to preventing introduction and establishment of aquatic invasive species (AIS). The closely related *Wilderness Waters Adaptive Management Plan* (Stine et al., 2022) provides additional overarching waterscape level examination that allows greater opportunity and efficiency in water resource management and education.

A systematic survey of aquatic plants using the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) “point-intercept” method was an important underpinning of this aquatic plant management plan. An analysis of the plant data along with water quality and other lake information allowed the preparation of the plan.

Aquatic plants rarely get the respect they merit, although this is slowly changing. We still call an aquatic plant bed a “weed bed.” Many aquatic plants have “weed” in their names (e.g., duckweed, pondweed, or musky weed). Likely this term was borrowed from “seaweed” and not intended as derogatory, but in today’s use, “weed” connotes an unwanted, aggressively growing plant. Such is not the case for the vast majority of aquatic plants. In fact, aquatic plants are a vital part of a lake ecosystem, recycling nutrients, providing vertical and horizontal structure, and creating habitat for animal life. Invertebrates, including crustaceans and insects, live on or within this “aquatic forest.” Fish find food and shelter within aquatic plant beds. Waterfowl eat parts of plants directly as well as feed on invertebrates associated with the plants. Muskrats eat aquatic plants and particularly love cattails and bulrushes. Otter and mink hunt invertebrates and small vertebrates within the shelter of submergent and emergent beds. In shallow water, great blue herons find fishes among the plants.

In lakes that receive an excess of nutrients (particularly from fertilizers or leaking septic tanks), plant growth can become too lush or dominated by only a few species. As these abundant plants die, their decomposition can depress dissolved oxygen levels and diminish suitability for fish. Algae can respond rapidly to nutrient influxes and create nuisance conditions. These phenomena can cause humans to view all aquatic plants in a negative light.

On another negative front, non-native plant species, transported on boats and trailers or dumped from home aquariums, private ponds and water gardens may come to dominate a water body to the exclusion of a healthy diversity of native species. Eurasian water-milfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*) is one of the better known examples of these so-called aquatic invasive plant species.

For most lakes, native aquatic plants are an overwhelmingly positive attribute, greatly enhancing the aesthetics of the lake and providing good opportunities for fishing, boating, swimming, snorkeling, sight-seeing, and hunting.

When it comes to aquatic plant management, it is useful to heed the mantra of the medical profession: “First, do no harm.” It is both a social and scientific convention that aquatic plant management is more effective and beneficial when a lake is considered as an entire and integrated ecosystem. Anyone involved in aquatic plant management should be aware that a permit may be required to remove, add, or control aquatic plants. In addition, anyone using Wisconsin’s lakes must comply with the “Boat Launch Law” that addresses transport of aquatic plants on boat trailers and other equipment. A good review of the laws, permits, and regulations that affect management and behavior surrounding aquatic plants can be found in the WDNR guidelines called *Aquatic Plant Management in Wisconsin*.¹

In preparing this plan, we followed guidelines in *Aquatic Plant Management in Wisconsin*. The resulting plan is an adaptive plan (Walters, 1986). Simply put, it will be modified as new information becomes available. The WDNR Guidance document outlines three objectives that may influence preparation of an aquatic plant management plan. Currently, the motivation for this plan lies in the first two objectives:

- **Protection** - preventing the introduction of nuisance or invasive species into waters where these plants are not currently present;
- **Maintenance** - continuing the patterns of recreational use that have developed historically on and around a lake; and

¹ <http://www4.uwsp.edu/cnr/uwexlakes/ecology/APM/APMguideFull2010.pdf>

-
- **Rehabilitation** - controlling an imbalance in the aquatic plant community leading to the dominance of a few plant species, frequently associated with the introduction of invasive non-native species.

During projects with the WDNR Planning Grant Program and through past efforts, Town Lakes Committee has followed the first five steps in the seven-step plan outlined in the Guidance Document for developing an aquatic plant management plan:


1. Goal setting – Getting the effort organized, identifying problems to be addressed, and agreeing on the goals;
2. Inventory – Collecting baseline information to define the past and existing conditions;
3. Analysis – Synthesizing the information, quantifying and comparing the current conditions to desired conditions, researching opportunities and constraints, and setting directions to achieving the goals;
4. Alternatives – Listing possible management alternatives and evaluating their strengths, weaknesses and general feasibility;
5. Recommendations – Prioritizing and selecting preferred management options, setting objectives, drafting the plan;
6. Implementation – Formally adopting the plan, lining up funding, and scheduling activities for taking action to achieve the goals;
7. Monitor & Modify – Developing a mechanism for tracking activities and adjusting the plan as it evolves.

Besides this introductory chapter, this plan is organized in six Chapters. The study area is described in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 states the purpose and goals for the plan. Chapter 4 presents an inventory and analysis of information that pertain to the plan including the results of the aquatic plant survey. Chapter 5 provides recommendations that support the overall goals and establish the stewardship component of plan. Finally, Chapter 6 presents actions and objectives for implementing the plan. Three appendices complete this document. Appendix A contains literature cited, Appendix B contains tables and figures for the aquatic plant survey, Appendix C contains a *Review of Horsehead Lake Water Quality*, Appendix D contains the *Lake Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Monitoring Report*, and Appendix E contains the *Aquatic Invasive Species Report*.


CHAPTER 2

Study Area

Presque Isle Township is one of the northern-most townships in Vilas County, Wisconsin. Presque Isle Township's northern border is shared with the State of Michigan. In fact some of the Presque Township lakes lie on the state border. The location of the subject of this APM Plan (Horsehead Lake) is shown in Exhibit 1 along with other lakes in Presque Isle Township that have had point-intercept aquatic plant surveys conducted. Exhibit 2 is an aerial view of Horsehead Lake.



“Almost an island” is the literal translation of the French phrase “Presque Isle.” Early French missionaries, perhaps disoriented by the preponderance of water in this north central Wisconsin landscape applied the name, “Presque Isle” to describe an area where the water seemed to dominate the land. The French visitors and Native Americans certainly recognized this landscape as special. Modern ecologists and recreationists share this view. The region that includes the Township of Presque Isle, Wisconsin is an ecological landscape marvelously rich in surface waters. Aerial photography reveals a concentration of lakes and streams that is unique in North America. Presque Isle Township has eighty-four lakes. The Presque Isle area could as easily be termed a “waterscape” as a “landscape.”




Descriptive parameters for Horsehead Lake are in Exhibit 3. It is a drainage lake of about 250 acres and maximum depth of 24 feet. It has an average shoreline development index compared to other 2019/2020 surveyed lakes. The shoreline development index (SDI) values for

six of the Wilderness Waters Program lakes surveyed in 2019/2020 ranged from 1.3 to 3.7 (average = 2.11). Horsehead Lake has an average SDI. The shoreline development index is a quantitative expression derived from the shape of the lake. It is defined as the ratio of the shoreline length to the length of the circumference of a circle of the same area as the lake. A perfectly round lake would have an index of 1. Increasing irregularity of shoreline development in the form of bays and projections of the shore is shown by numbers greater than 1. For example, fjord lakes with extremely irregularly shaped shorelines sometimes have SDI's exceeding 5. A higher shoreline development index indicates that a lake has relatively more productive littoral zone habitat.

Exhibit 3. Water Body Parameters	
Water Body Name	Horsehead
County	Vilas
Township/Range/Section	T43N-R06E-S2,3,11
Water Body Identification Code	2953100
Lake Type	Drainage
Surface Area (acres)	250
Maximum Depth (feet)	24
Maximum Length (miles)	0.8
Maximum Width (miles)	0.8
Shoreline Length (miles)	4.3
Shoreline Development Index	2.0
Total Number of Piers (2020 Shoreland)	40
Number of Piers / Mile of Shoreline	9.3
Total Number of Homes (2022 aerial)	36
Number of Homes / Mile of Shoreline	8.4

Horsehead Lake has one public access site. We observe a total of 40 piers on the shoreline of Horsehead Lake from a 2020 shoreland survey or about 9.3 piers per mile of shoreline. The riparian area consists of both upland and wetland areas (Exhibit 4).



CHAPTER 3

Purpose and Goal Statements

This plan approaches aquatic plant management with a healthy dose of humility. We do not always understand the causes of environmental phenomena or the effects of our actions to manage the environment. With that thought in mind, we have crafted a statement of purpose and goals for this plan:

Horsehead Lake has a native aquatic plant community that was documented by a point-intercept aquatic plant survey. This plant community is essential to, and part of, a high quality aquatic ecosystem that benefits the human community with its recreational and aesthetic features. The purpose of this aquatic plant management plan is to maintain the aquatic plant community in its present high quality state.

Supporting this purpose, the goals of this aquatic plant management plan are:

- (1) Monitor and protect the native aquatic plant community;*
- (2) Prevent establishment of AIS and nuisance levels of native plants;*
- (3) Promote and interpret APM efforts; and*
- (4) Educate riparian owners and lake users on preventing AIS introduction, reducing nutrient inputs that potentially alter the plant community, and minimizing physical removal of native riparian and littoral zone plants.*

The purpose and goals are the foundation for the aquatic plant management plan presented in this document. They inform the objectives and actions outlined in Chapter 5 and are the principal motivation of Horsehead Lake stewards.

CHAPTER 4

Information and Analysis

Our efforts in the Wilderness Waters Program have compiled information about historical and current conditions of the Horsehead Lake ecosystem and its surrounding watershed. Of particular importance to this aquatic plant management plan is the aquatic plant survey that was conducted using the *WDNR Protocol for Aquatic Plant Survey, Collecting, Mapping, Preserving, and Data Entry* (Hauxwell et al., 2010). The results of this comprehensive “point-intercept” survey along with relevant components of other information are presented in this chapter under nine respective subheadings: watershed, aquatic plant management history, aquatic plant community description, fish community, water quality and trophic status, water use, riparian area, wildlife, and stakeholders.

Part 1. Watershed

The Presque Isle Township waterscape sits on a large-scale watershed divide. Some of the water drains north through the Presque Isle River system and eventually enters Lake Superior. Some of the water drains into the Flambeau River system to the Mississippi River and to the Gulf of Mexico. In fact there are two federal hydrologic sub-basins (designated by 8-digit HUC codes) that include Presque Isle Township. The Black-Presque Isle Rivers sub-basin (HUC#04020101) drains north to Lake Superior and the Flambeau River sub-basin (HUC#0705002) drains southwesterly to the Mississippi River. The Black-Presque Isle Rivers sub-basin contains two federal hydrologic sub-watersheds within Presque Isle Township: the South Branch Presque Isle River sub-watershed (HUC#040201010303) and the Pomeroy Creek-East Branch Presque Isle River sub-watershed (HUC#040201010301). The Flambeau River sub-basin contains one sub-watershed within Presque Isle Township: the Rice Creek sub-watershed (HUC#07050020103). Exhibit 5 illustrates these watersheds and the watersheds of the water bodies subject to the Wilderness Waters Program studies. Horsehead Lake is contained within the South Branch Presque Isle River sub-watershed (Exhibit 5).





Exhibit 5. Watersheds of Presque Isle Township Area.

Description: Portions of 3 federal hydrologic sub-watersheds are illustrated: (1) S.Br. Presque Isle River (bounded by yellow), (2) Pomeroy Cr-E.Br. Presque Isle River (bounded by blue and yellow), and (3) Rice Cr. (bounded by green, yellow, and blue). Also shown are the smaller watersheds of individual water bodies subject to the Wilderness Waters studies (bounded by red and, in the case of Papoose Lake, bounded by white). White dots show outlet points for the smaller watersheds.

The elevation in Presque Isle Township ranges from around 1,550 feet above sea level to 1,750 feet above sea level. A digital elevation model is provided as Exhibit 6 and shows the relative elevations for the area with orange areas of the landscape being the highest elevations and greens and blues being the lowest elevations.



The watershed (drainage basin) is all of the land and water areas that drain toward a particular river or lake. A water body is greatly influenced by its watershed. Watershed size, topography, geology, land use, soil fertility and erodibility, and vegetation are all factors that influence water quality. The Horsehead Lake watershed is about 15,640 acres. The cover types in the watershed are presented in Exhibit 7. Forest and surface water comprise the largest components. Soil group B is most prevalent, followed by group D, while groups A and C make up a small percentage of the watershed. Soil group A has the highest infiltration capacity, and the lowest runoff potential. Conversely, soil group D has the lowest infiltration capacity, and the highest runoff potential. The watershed to lake area ratio is 62:1. Water quality often decreases with an increasing ratio of watershed area to lake area. As the watershed to lake area increases there are more sources and amounts of runoff. In larger watersheds, runoff water can leach more minerals and nutrients and carry them to the lake. The runoff to a lake (such as after a rainstorm or snowmelt) differs greatly among land uses. Forest cover is the most protective as it exports much less soil (through erosion) and nutrients (such as phosphorus and nitrogen) to the lake than agricultural or urban land use.

Exhibit 7. Cover Types and Soil Groups of the Horsehead Lake Watershed.			
Cover Type		Acres	Percent
Agriculture		0	0
Commercial		0	0
Forest		8644.5	55.3
Grass/Pasture		9.1	0.1
High-density Residential		0	0
Low-density Residential		1015.8	6.5
Water		5969.2	38.2
Total		15638.7	100.0
Soil Group	Acres	Percent	Hydrologic Soil Groups - Soils are classified by the Natural Resource Conservation Service into four Hydrologic Soil Groups* based on the soil's runoff potential. The four Hydrologic Soils Groups are A, B, C and D. Where A has the smallest runoff potential and D the greatest.
A	956.0	6.1	Group A is sand, loamy sand or sandy loam types of soils. It has low runoff potential and high infiltration rates even when thoroughly wetted. They consist chiefly of deep, well to excessively drained sands or gravels and have a high rate of water transmission.
B	8644.1	55.3	Group B is silt loam or loam. It has a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted and consists chiefly or moderately deep to deep, moderately well to well drained soils with moderately fine to moderately coarse textures.
C	361.8	2.3	Group C soils are sandy clay loam. They have low infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted and consist chiefly of soils with a layer that impedes downward movement of water and soils with moderately fine to fine structure.
D	5676.9	36.3	Group D soils are clay loam, silty clay loam, sandy clay, silty clay or clay. This soil has the highest runoff potential. They have very low infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted and consist chiefly of clay soils with a high swelling potential, soils with a permanent high water table, soils with a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface and shallow soils over nearly impervious material.

*(USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 1986)

Part 2. Aquatic Plant Management History

As far as we can determine, no systematic or large-scale plant management activity has ever taken place in Horsehead Lake. Over the years, no particular nuisance issues have demanded control action. In 2008, an aquatic plant survey was conducted on Horsehead Lake,

and again in the summer of 2013 and 2020. Findings from the 2008, 2013, and 2020 surveys are discussed in the next section (Part 3).

Part 3. Aquatic Plant Community Description

Why do lakes need aquatic plants? In many ways, they are underwater forests. Aquatic plants provide vertical and horizontal structure in the lake just like the many forms and variety of trees do in a forest. Imagine how diminished a forest's biodiversity becomes in the advent of a clear-cut. Similarly, a lake's biodiversity in large part depends on a diversity of plants.

Aquatic plants are beneficial in many ways. Areas with plants produce more food for fish (insect larvae, snails, and other invertebrates). Aquatic vegetation offers fish shelter and spawning habitat. Many submerged plants provide food for waterfowl and habitat for insects on which some waterfowl feed. Aquatic plants further benefit lakes by producing oxygen and absorbing nutrients (phosphorus and nitrogen) from runoff. Aquatic plants also protect shorelines and lake bottoms by dampening wave action and stabilizing sediments.

The distribution of plants within a lake is generally limited by light availability, which is, in turn, controlled by water clarity. Aquatic biologists often estimate the depth to which rooted aquatic plants can exist as about two times the average Secchi clarity depth. For example, if the average Secchi depth is eight feet then it is fairly accurate to estimate that rooted plants might exist in water as deep as sixteen feet. At depths greater than that (in our hypothetical example), light is insufficient for rooted plants to grow. In addition to available light, the type of substrate influences the distribution of rooted aquatic plants. Plants are more likely to be found in muddy or soft sediments containing organic matter, and less likely to occur where the substrate is sand, gravel, or rock. Finally, water chemistry influences which plants are found in a body of water. Some species prefer alkaline lakes and some prefer more acidic lakes. The presence of nutrients like phosphorous and nitrogen also influence plant community composition.

As mentioned earlier, non-native invasive plant species can reach high densities and wide distribution within a lake. This diminishes the native plant community and the related habitat. At times, even a native plant species can reach nuisance levels with respect to certain kinds of human recreation. These cases may warrant some kind of plant management.

Aquatic plant surveys have been conducted on Horsehead Lake by aquatic plant specialists in 2008, 2013, and 2020. In each of these surveys, WDNR point-intercept protocol and methodology was followed. This formal survey assesses the plant species composition on a grid of several hundred points distributed evenly over the lake. Using latitude-longitude coordinates

and a handheld GPS unit, scientists navigate to the points and use a rake mounted on a pole or rope to sample plants. Plants are identified, recorded and put into a dedicated spreadsheet for storage and data analysis. This systematic survey provides baseline data about the lake.

Because Horsehead Lake has been surveyed three times, we are able to examine differences and similarities in the plant community that have been documented over the years. Changes in a lake environment might manifest as loss of species, change in species abundance or distribution, difference in the relative composition of various plant life forms (emergent, floating leaf, or submergent plants), and/or appearance of an AIS or change in its population size. Monitoring can track changes and provide valuable insight on which to base management decisions. In the remainder of this section (Part 3) we provide a report of the findings of the 2020 point-intercept aquatic plant survey. Table 1 displays summary statistics for the survey and Table 2 provides a list of the species encountered, including common and scientific name along with summarizing statistics. We summarize the aquatic plant findings for the 2008, 2013 and 2020 surveys in Table 3. Supporting tables and figures for the aquatic plant surveys are provided in Appendix B.

Species richness refers to the total number of species recorded. In 2020, we recorded 38 species of aquatic plants.² Of these, 26 were collected at sampling sites and the others were observed from the boat. The number of species encountered at any given sample point ranged from 0 to 4 and 76 sample points were found to have aquatic vegetation present. The average number of species encountered at these vegetated sites was 2.03. The actual number of species encountered at each of the vegetated sites is graphically displayed on Figure 1. Plant density is estimated by a “rake fullness” metric (3 being the highest possible density). These densities (considering all species) are displayed for each sampling site on Figure 2 and reveal very low plant density.

The maximum depth of plant colonization in 2020 was 14 feet (Table 1 and Figure 3). Rooted vegetation was found at 76 of the 204 sample sites with depth \leq the maximum depth of plant colonization (37.25% of sites). These sites are displayed as a black dot within a circle on Figure 4. This indicates that although availability of appropriate depth may limit the distribution of plants, it is not the only habitat factor involved. Substrate is another feature that influences plant distribution (e.g., soft substrate often harbors more plants than hard substrate). Figures 5 presents the substrates encountered during the aquatic plant survey (mud, sand, or rock).

² If you are interested in learning more about the plant species found in the lake, visit the University of Wisconsin Stevens Point Freckmann Herbarium website at: <http://wisplants.uwsp.edu/> or obtain a copy of “Through the Looking Glass (A Field Guide to the Aquatic Plants in Wisconsin).”

Table 2 provides information about the frequency of occurrence of the plant species recorded in the lake. Several metrics are provided, including total number of sites in which each species was found and frequency of occurrence at sites \leq the maximum depth of rooted vegetation. This frequency metric is standardized as a “relative frequency” (also shown in Table 2) by dividing the frequency of occurrence for a given species by the sum of frequency of occurrence for all plants and multiplying by 100 to form a percentage. The resulting relative frequencies for all species total 100%. The relative frequencies for the plant species collected with a rake are graphically displayed in descending order on Figure 6 (data for both 2013 and 2020 are included for comparison). This display shows that wild celery (*Vallisneria americana*) had the highest relative frequency followed by fern pondweed (*Potamogeton robbinsii*) in 2020. The lowest relative frequencies are at the far right of the graph. Figure 7 shows the distribution of floating and emergent plant forms in the lake. As examples of individual species distributions, we show the occurrences of a few of the most frequently and least frequently encountered plants in Figures 8-15.

Species richness (total number of plants recorded at the lake) is a measure of species diversity, but it doesn’t tell the whole story. As an example, consider the plant communities of two hypothetical ponds each with 1,000 individual plants representing ten plant species (in other words, richness is 10). In the first pond each of the ten species populations is comprised of 100 individuals. In the second pond, Species #1 has a population of 991 individuals and each of the other nine species is represented by one individual plant. Intuitively, we would say that first pond is more diverse because there is more “even” distribution of individual species. The “Simpson Diversity Index” takes into account both richness and evenness in estimating diversity. It is based on a plant’s relative frequency in a lake. The closer the Simpson Diversity Index is to 1, the more diverse the plant community. The Simpson Diversity Index for Horsehead Lake aquatic plants is 0.90 (Table 1) which indicates a highly diverse aquatic plant community.

Another measure of floristic diversity and quality is the *Floristic Quality Index* (FQI). Floristic quality is an assessment metric designed to evaluate the closeness that the flora of an area is to that of undisturbed conditions (Nichols, 1999). Among other applications, it forms a standardized metric that can be used to compare the quality of different lakes (or different locations within a single lake) and monitor long-term changes in a lake’s plant community (an indicator of lake health). The FQI for a lake is determined by using the average *coefficient of conservatism* times the square root of the number of native plant species present in the lake. Knowledgeable botanists have assigned to each native aquatic plant a *coefficient of conservatism*

representing the probability that a plant is likely to occur in pristine environments (relatively unaltered from presettlement conditions). The coefficients range from 0 to 10, with 10 being assigned to those species most sensitive to disturbance. As more environmental disturbance occurs, the less conservative species become more prevalent.

Nichols (1999) analyzed aquatic plant community data from 554 Wisconsin Lakes to ascertain geographic (ecoregional) characteristics of the FQI metric. This is useful for considering how the Horsehead Lake FQI (35.1) compares to other lakes and regions. The statewide medians for number of species and FQI are 13 and 22.2, respectively. Horsehead Lake values are quite high compared to these statewide values. Nichols (1999) determined that there are four ecoregional-lake types groups in Wisconsin: (1) Northern Lakes and Forests lakes, (2) Northern Lakes and Forests flowages, (3) North Central Hardwoods and Southeastern Till Plain lakes and flowages, and (4) Driftless Area and Mississippi River Backwater lakes. Horsehead Lake is located in the Northern Lakes and Forests lakes group. Nichols (1999) found species numbers for the Northern Lakes and Forests lakes group had a median value of 13. Horsehead Lake data is consistent with that find. Finally, the Horsehead Lake FQI (35.1) is significantly higher than the median value for the Northern Lakes and Forests lakes group (24.3). These findings support the contention that the Horsehead Lake plant community is healthy and diverse.

There were small populations of yellow iris (*Iris pseudacorus*) observed in various spots in the southeastern bay of the lake. *Iris pseudacorus* is currently considered a restricted invasive species in Wisconsin. The only way to differentiate yellow iris from northern blue flag iris is by flower color. Because these species are not always in flower, it is difficult to know how many invasive iris plants were on the lake. Future monitoring and possibly control of yellow iris should be considered on Horsehead Lake. There should also be future monitoring for the aquatic forget-me-not, reed canary grass, and the narrow-leaved cattail.

Vasey's pondweed (*Potamogeton vaseyi*), a special concern species in Wisconsin, was found in a northwestern bay of Horsehead Lake. Special concern species are those species about which some problem of abundance or distribution is suspected but not yet proved (WDNR, 2022). It would be appropriate to periodically monitor the presence and distribution of this species in the lake.

Table 3 summarizes plant statistics for the three surveys (2008, 2013, and 2020) and reveals very similar plant communities existed during these three surveys. There are some changes in relative frequencies of individual species from one survey to the next. Common waterweed (*Elodea canadensis*) and fern pondweed (*Potamogeton robbinsii*) had the highest

relative frequencies in 2008. In 2013, however, neither of these species had the highest relative frequency. Instead, wild celery and flat-stem pondweed were the two most frequent species in 2013. In 2020 wild celery (*Vallisneria americana*) had the highest relative frequency followed by fern pondweed (*Potamogeton robbinsii*). These fluctuations seem to be typical of lakes we've examined in the region. The Simpson Diversity Index, takes into account both richness and evenness in estimating diversity and has been very steady and high across all three surveys. Horsehead Lake has a highly diverse aquatic plant community. Similarly, the FQI is consistently high and indicates a very healthy plant community and one that indicates very little impact from human activities.

Part 4. Fish Community

It was beyond the scope of the current Wilderness Waters project to characterize the fish community and fish habitat of this water body. The WDNR Lake Pages website (<http://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/lakepages/>) indicates that the bottom is comprised of 30% sand, 60% gravel, 5% rock, and 5% muck and that fish species present include musky, panfish, largemouth bass, smallmouth bass, northern pike, and walleye.

Part 5. Water Quality and Trophic Status

Horsehead Lake is a 250 acre drainage lake with a maximum depth of 24 feet. Existing water quality data was retrieved from the Wisconsin DNR SWIMS database in 1979, 1992, and from 1998 to 2020. In 2001, the Vilas County Lakes Association monitored the lake. In August, 2002, Lake Baseline Monitoring was conducted. In 2020, White Water Associates, Inc. monitored water quality. The water quality information is briefly summarized in this section, but more fully interpreted in Appendix C.

Lake temperatures showed stratification in Horsehead Lake at times in the ice-free season. Average water clarity is considered “good,” and user perception of Horsehead Lake aesthetic quality is generally regarded as “beautiful, could not be nicer.” Turbidity is generally low. The trophic state is mesotrophic. Water quality would be classified as “good” with respect to phosphorus concentrations. Nitrogen, chloride, alkalinity, conductivity, calcium, magnesium, and potassium are considered low. The pH of Horsehead Lake is neutral.

Part 6. Water Use

Horsehead Lake has one public access site, and is used by riparian owners and recreationists for a variety of activities. A small area of land at the public access is owned by the State of Wisconsin.

Part 7. Riparian Area

Part 1 (Watershed) describes the larger riparian area context of Horsehead Lake. The near shore riparian area can be appreciated by viewing Exhibits 2 and 4. The lake is lightly developed with a fairly intact forested riparian zone that extends for hundreds of feet back from the lake. The forest is a mixture of coniferous and deciduous trees and shrubs. Our review of 2022 aerial photography reveals 36 houses on the lake. This intact riparian area provides numerous important functions and values to the lake. It effectively filters runoff to the lake. It provides excellent habitat for birds and mammals. Trees that fall into the lake from the riparian zone contribute important habitat elements to the lake. Educating riparian owners as to the value of riparian areas is important to the maintenance of these critical areas.

Part 8. Wildlife

A study of wildlife was beyond the scope of the current study, but would be valuable to study and interpret in future iterations of the plan. This would be especially true of wetland and water oriented wildlife such as frogs, waterfowl, fish-eating birds, aquatic and semi-aquatic mammals, and invertebrate animals. In the future, it would be desirable to monitor indicator species of wildlife such as common loons, bald eagles, and osprey. Also of special importance would be monitoring for the presence of aquatic invasive wildlife species (for example, rusty crayfish, spiny water flea, or zebra mussel) and fish species (for example, rainbow smelt or common carp).

Horsehead Lake is currently designated as a *priority navigable water (PNW)* (WI Admin. Code, 2020). Priority Navigable Waters meet any of these standards: navigable waterways, or portions thereof, that are considered OWR/EWR or trout streams; lakes less than 50 acres in size; tributaries and rivers connecting to inland lakes containing naturally-reproducing lake sturgeon populations; waters with self-sustaining walleye populations in ceded territories; waters with self-sustaining musky populations; or perennial tributaries to trout streams (WI Admin. Code, 2020). Horsehead Lake is considered a PNW with self-sustaining musky and walleye populations.

Part 9. Stakeholders

At this juncture in the ongoing aquatic plant management planning process, the Town Lakes Committee has represented the Horsehead Lake stakeholders. Additional stakeholders and interested citizens are invited to participate as the plan is refined and updated in order to broaden input, build consensus, and encourage participation in stewardship. No contentious direct plant management actions (for example, harvesting or use of herbicides) are a component of the current plan. Nevertheless, we do recommend monitoring the yellow iris, reed canary grass, narrow-leaved cattail, and the aquatic forget-me-not populations and investigating the possibility of controlling this invasive species.

CHAPTER 5

Recommendations, Actions, and Objectives

In this chapter we provide recommendations for specific objectives and associated actions to support the APM Plan’s goals stated in Chapter 3 and re-stated here for convenient reference:

- (1) Monitor and protect the native aquatic plant community;*
- (2) Prevent establishment of AIS and nuisance levels of native plants;*
- (3) Ecologically evaluate plant management options (including no action); and*
- (4) Educate riparian owners and lake users on preventing AIS introduction, reducing nutrient inputs that potentially alter the plant community, minimizing physical removal of native riparian and littoral zone plants, and recreating in a lake whose natural state includes an abundance of native aquatic plants.*

Since Horsehead Lake is a healthy ecosystem, we could simply recommend an alternative of “no action.” In other words, Horsehead Lake continues without any effort or intervention on the part of lake stewards. Nevertheless, we consider the “no action” alternative imprudent. Many forces threaten the quality of the lake and Wilderness Waters Program and Town Lakes Committee feels a great responsibility to minimize the threats. One potential threat to the biodiversity of the lake is the yellow iris for which we have included an action in this section. We therefore outline in this section a set of actions and related management objectives that will actively engage lake stewards in the process of management.

The actions are presented in tabular form. Each “action” consists of a set of four statements: (1) a declarative “action” statement that specifies the action (2) a statement of the “objective” that the action serves, (3) a “monitoring” statement that specifies the party responsible for carrying out the action and maintaining data, and (4) a “status” statement that suggests a timeline/calendar and indicates status (not yet started, ongoing, or completed).

Recommended Actions for the Horsehead Lake APM Plan

Action #1: Formally adopt the Aquatic Plant Management Plan.

Objective: To provide foundation for long-term native plant community conservation and stewardship and to be prepared for response to AIS introductions.

Monitoring: The Lake Association and Town Lakes Committee oversees activity and maintains the plan.

Status: Planned for 2022.

Action #2: Monitor water quality.

Objective: Continue with collection and analysis of water quality parameters to detect trends in parameters such as nutrients, chlorophyll *a*, and water clarity.

Monitoring: The Lake Association or Town Lakes Committee oversees activity and maintains data.

Status: Ongoing.

Action #3: Monitor the lake for aquatic invasive plant species.

Objective: To understand the lake's biotic community, provide for early detection of AIS and continue monitoring any existing populations of AIS.

Monitoring: The Lake Association or Town Lakes Committee oversees activity and maintains data.

Status: Ongoing.

Action #4: Monitor the lake for aquatic invasive animal species.

Objective: To understand the lake's biotic community, provide for early detection of AIS and continue monitoring any existing populations of AIS.

Monitoring: The Lake Association or Town Lakes Committee oversees activity and maintains data.

Status: Ongoing.

Action #5: Form an Aquatic Invasive Species Rapid Response Team and interface with the Town Lakes Committee AIS Rapid Response Coordinator.

Objective: To be prepared for AIS discovery and efficient response.

Monitoring: The Lake Association and/or Town Lakes Committee coordinate activity.

Status: Planned for 2022.

Recommended Actions for the Horsehead Lake APM Plan

Action #6: Conduct quantitative plant survey every five years using WDNR Point-Intercept Methodology.

Objective: To watch for changes in native species diversity, floristic quality, plant abundance, and plant distribution and to check for the occurrence of non-native, invasive plant species.

Monitoring: Town Lakes Committee (Wilderness Waters Program) oversees and maintains data; copies to WDNR.

Status: Anticipated in 2025.

Action #7: Update the APM plan approximately every five years or as needed to reflect new plant information from plant surveys and monitoring.

Objective: To have current information and management science included in the plan.

Monitoring: Lake Association and/or Town Lakes Committee (Wilderness Waters Program) oversees and maintains data; copies to WDNR.

Status: Ongoing.

Action #8: Develop a Citizen Lake Monitoring Network to monitor for invasive species and develop strategies including education and monitoring activities (see <http://www.uwsp.edu/cnr/uwexplakes/clmn> for additional ideas).

Objective: To create a trained volunteer corps to monitor aquatic invasive species and to educate recreational users regarding AIS.

Monitoring: The Lake Association oversees activity and reports instances of possible introductions of AIS.

Status: Anticipated to begin in 2022.

Action #9: Become familiar with and recognize the water quality and habitat values of ordinances and requirements on boating, septic, and property development.

Objective: To protect native aquatic plants, water quality, and riparian habitat.

Monitoring: Lake residents and other stakeholders.

Status: Ongoing.

Recommended Actions for the Horsehead Lake APM Plan

Action #10: Promote adherence to, and enforcement of, the Town of Presque Isle's 200 foot no-wake ordinances (from shoreline and islands).

Objective: To minimize recreational impacts on the aquatic plant community and shoreline habitats, and promote safe boating.

Monitoring: Town Lakes Committee oversees activity and assesses effectiveness.

Status: Ongoing.

Action #11: Create an education plan for the property owners and other stakeholders that will address issues concerning aquatic and riparian plant communities.

Objective: To educate stakeholders about issues and topics that affect the lake's aquatic and riparian plant communities, including topics such as: (1) the importance of the aquatic plant community; (2) no or minimal mechanical removal of plants along the shoreline is desirable and that any plant removal should conform to Wisconsin regulations; (3) the value of a natural shoreline in protecting the aquatic plant community and lake health; (4) nutrient sources to the lake and the role excess nutrients play in degradation of the aquatic plant community; (5) the importance of reducing or eliminating use of fertilizers on lake front property; (6) the importance of minimizing transfer of AIS to the lake by having dedicated watercraft and cleaning boats that visit the lake.

Monitoring: Town Lakes Committee oversee(s) activity and assesses effectiveness.

Status: Anticipated to begin in 2022.

Action #12: Monitor the lake watershed for purple loosestrife, aquatic forget-me-not, narrow-leaved cattail, and reed canary grass.

Objective: Identify populations before they reach large size.

Monitoring: The Lake Association and/or Town Lakes Committee oversees activity.

Status: Anticipated in 2022.

Action #13: Monitor the population of yellow iris in the lake and investigate the possibility of control.

Objective: To minimize the threat that overabundance of this invasive species has to the biodiversity in the lake.

Monitoring: Town Lakes Committee oversees activity with assistance from professionals as needed.

Status: Anticipated in 2022.

Recommended Actions for the Horsehead Lake APM Plan

Action #14: Identify and highlight high quality areas of littoral zone and riparian areas through review of aquatic plant and shoreland assessment data through various reports and online tools.

Objective: To (1) educate lake users on the value of these areas and the importance of good stewardship to their maintenance, (2) recognize landowners who implement good practices (e.g., large percentage of buffer area intact; three vegetative layers intact – herbaceous, shrubs, trees; areas of high native aquatic plant diversity and abundance), and (3) encourage landowners to implement good practices.

Monitoring: Town Lakes Committee oversee(s) activity and assesses effectiveness

Status: Anticipated to begin in 2022.

Action #15: Lake leaders should encourage and assist landowners to take on shoreland and shallow water improvement projects to rehabilitate areas identified through formal shoreland/shallow water assessments and/or lake user observations (sites might include areas of active erosion, channelized flow, point source pollution, impervious surfaces, and lawns) Vilas County Land and Water Conservation Department looks for partners in this endeavor and can provide planning and sponsorship of projects. Funding for eligible projects is available from WDNR. Example projects on active lake stewards' properties would serve as valuable demonstration projects and encourage others to participate.

Objective: For high quality areas, maintain this condition through protection. For degraded areas, rehabilitate specific shoreland areas to improve natural functions and values.

Monitoring: Town Lakes Committee oversee(s) activity and assesses effectiveness.

Status: Anticipated to begin in 2022.

Action #16: Investigate WDNR programs such as “Fish Stix” to educate and provide direction and funding for habitat improvements.

Objective: To encourage good shallow water stewardship by lake users and improve the littoral zone quality of the lake in areas where warranted.

Outcome: Monitor by general awareness of landowners and changes to shallow water habitat.

Status: Anticipated to begin in 2022.

CHAPTER 6

Contingency Plan for AIS

Unfortunately, sources of aquatic invasive plants and other AIS are numerous in Wisconsin. Some infested lakes are quite close to Presque Isle Township. There is an increasing likelihood of accidental introduction of AIS to Presque Isle Township Lakes through conveyance of life stages by boats, trailers, and other vectors. It is important for the Town Lakes Committee and other lake stewards to be prepared for the contingency of aquatic invasive plant species colonization in a Presque Isle Township water body.

For riparian owners and users of a lake ecosystem, the discovery of AIS is a tragedy that elicits an immediate desire to “fix the problem.” Although strong emotions may be evoked by such a discovery, a deliberate and systematic approach is required to appropriately and effectively address the situation. An aquatic plant management plan (one including a contingency plan for AIS) is the best tool by which the process can be navigated. In fact the APM plan is a requirement in Wisconsin for some kinds of aquatic plant management actions. One of the actions outlined in the previous chapter was to establish an Aquatic Invasive Species Rapid Response Team. This team and its coordinator are integral to the management process. It is important for this team to be multi-dimensional (or at least have quick access to the expertise that may be required). AIS invade not just a single lake, but an entire region since the new infestation is an outpost from which the AIS can more easily colonize other nearby water bodies. For this reason it is strategic for the Rapid Response Team to include representation from regional stakeholders.

Exhibit 8 provides a flowchart outlining an appropriate rapid response to the suspected discovery of an aquatic invasive plant species. The response will be most efficient if an AIS Rapid Response Team has already been established and is familiar with the contingency plan. In the remainder of this chapter we further describe the approach.

When a suspect aquatic invasive plant species is found, either the original observer or a member of the Rapid Response Team (likely the coordinator) should collect an entire plant specimen including roots, stems, and flowers (if present). The sample should be placed in a sealable bag with a small amount of water to keep it moist. Place a label in the bag written in pencil with date, time, collector’s name, lake name, location, town, and county. Attach a lake


map to the bag that has the location of the suspect AIS marked and GPS coordinates recorded (if GPS is available). The sample should be placed on ice in a cooler or in a refrigerator. Deliver the sample to the WDNR Water Resource Management Specialist (Kevin Gauthier in Woodruff) or the Vilas County AIS Coordinator as soon as possible (at least within three days). The WDNR or their botanical expert(s) will determine the species and confirm whether or not it is an aquatic invasive plant species.

If the suspect specimen is determined to be an invasive plant species, the next step is to determine the extent and density of the population since the management response will vary accordingly. The Rapid Response Team should conduct (or have its consultant conduct) a survey to define the colony's perimeter and estimate density. If less than five acres (or <5% of the lake surface area), it is designated a "Pioneer Colony." If greater than five acres (or >5% of the lake surface area) then it is designated an "Established Population." Once the infestation is characterized, "at risk" areas should also be determined and marked on a map. For example, nearby boat landing sites and areas of high boat traffic should be indicated.

When "pioneer" or "established" status has been determined, it is time to consult with the WDNR Lakes Coordinator to determine appropriate notifications and management responses to the infestation. Determining whether hand-pulling or chemical treatment will be used is an important and early decision. Necessary notifications of landowners, governmental officials, and recreationists (at boat landings) will be determined. Whether the population's perimeter needs to be marked with buoys will be decided by the WDNR. Funding sources will be identified and consultants and contractors will be contacted where necessary. The WDNR will determine if a further baseline plant survey is required (depending on type of treatment). A post treatment monitoring plan will be discussed and established to determine the efficacy of the selected treatment.

Once the Rapid Response Team is organized, one of its first tasks is to develop a list of contacts and associated contact information (phone numbers and email addresses). At a minimum, this contact list should include: the Rapid Response Coordinator, members of the Rapid Response Team, County AIS Coordinator, WDNR Lakes Management Coordinator, Lake Association Presidents (or other points of contact), local WDNR warden, local government official(s), other experts, chemical treatment contractors, and consultant(s).

Exhibit 8. Aquatic Invasive Plant Species Rapid Response





Appendix A
Literature Cited

LITERATURE CITED

- Hauxwell, J., S. Knight, K. Wagner, A. Mikulyuk, M. Nault, M. Porzky and S. Chase. 2010. *Recommended baseline monitoring of aquatic plants in Wisconsin: sampling design, field and laboratory procedures, data entry and analysis, and applications*. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Bureau of Science Services, PUB-SS-1068 2010. Madison, WI.
- Nichols, Stanley A. 1999. *Floristic Quality Assessment of Wisconsin Lake Plant Communities with Example Applications*. *Journal of Lake and Reservoir Management* 15(2): 133-141.
- Stine, Angie, Dean Premo, and Kent Premo. 2022. *The Wilderness Waters Adaptive Management Plan (Presque Isle Township, Vilas County, Wisconsin) - The Wilderness Waters Program*. White Water Associates, Inc.
- US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. June 1986. *Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds*. Technical Release-55.
- Walters, C. 1986. *Objectives, constraints, and problem bounding*. In W.M. Getz, ed., *Adaptive Management of Renewable Resources*. Macmillan Publishing Company. New York, NY.
- Wisconsin Administrative Code NR-01-05, 06, 07. 2020. *Designated Waters*. Retrieved 2020. <https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/code/admin_code/nr/001/1/05>
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2022. *Wisconsin Natural Heritage Working List*. Retrieved 2022. <<http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/nhi/wlist.html>>
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2021. *Proposed Species Changes for NR40 Regulation*. Retrieved 2020. <<http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/invasives/documents/ProposedSpecies1028.pdf>>
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2014. *Aquatic Invasive Species Early Detection Monitoring Standard Operating Procedure*. Retrieved 2017. <<http://dnr.wi.gov/water/wsSWIMSDocument.ashx?documentSeqNo=99459630>>

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. May 27, 2016. *Draft Lake Shoreland & Shallows
Habitat Monitoring Field Protocol*. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Appendix B

Aquatic Plant Survey Tables and Figures

Table of Contents

Table 1. Summary statistics for point-intercept aquatic plant survey

Table 2. Plant species and distribution statistics

Table 3. Comparison of summary statistics, 2008, 2013, and 2020

Figure 1. Number of plant species recorded at sample sites

Figure 2. Rake fullness ratings for sample sites

Figure 3. Maximum depth of plant colonization

Figure 4. Sampling sites less than or equal to maximum depth of rooted vegetation

Figure 5. Substrate encountered at point-intercept plant sampling sites

Figure 6. Aquatic plant occurrences for 2013 and 2020 point-intercept survey data

Figure 7. Point-intercept plant sampling sites with emergent and floating aquatic plants

Figure 8-15. Distribution of plant species

Table 1. Summary statistics for the 2020 point-intercept aquatic plant surveys for Horsehead Lake.

Summary Statistic	Value	Notes
Total number of sites on grid	594	Total number of sites on the original grid (not necessarily visited)
Total number of sites visited	265	Total number of sites where the boat stopped, even if much too deep to have plants.
Total number of sites with vegetation	76	Total number of sites where at least one plant was found
Total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants	204	Number of sites where depth was less than or equal to the maximum depth where plants were found. This value is used for Frequency of occurrence at sites shallower than maximum depth of plants.
Frequency of occurrence at sites shallower than maximum depth of plants	37.25	Number of times a species was seen divided by the total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants.
Simpson Diversity Index	0.90	A nonparametric estimator of community heterogeneity. It is based on Relative Frequency and thus is not sensitive to whether all sampled sites (including non-vegetated sites) are included. The closer the Simpson Diversity Index is to 1, the more diverse the community.
Maximum depth of plants (ft.)	14.00	The depth of the deepest site sampled at which vegetation was present.
Number of sites sampled with rake on rope	29	
Number of sites sampled with rake on pole	230	
Average number of all species per site (shallower than max depth)	0.75	
Average number of all species per site (vegetated sites only)	2.03	
Average number of native species per site (shallower than max depth)	0.75	Total number of species collected. Does not include visual sightings.
Average number of native species per site (vegetated sites only)	2.03	Total number of species collected including visual sightings.
Species Richness	26	
Species Richness (including visuals)	38	
Floristic Quality Index (FQI)	35.1	

Table 2. Plant species recorded and distribution statistics for the 2020 Horsehead Lake aquatic plant survey.

Common name	Scientific name	Frequency of occurrence at sites less than or equal to maximum depth of plants	Frequency of occurrence within vegetated areas (%)	Relative Frequency (%)	Number of sites where species found	Number of sites where species found (including visuals)	Average Rake Fullness
Wild celery	<i>Vallisneria americana</i>	15.69	42.11	20.78	32	41	1
Fern pondweed	<i>Potamogeton robbinsii</i>	10.29	27.63	13.64	21	21	1
Muskgrasses	<i>Chara sp.</i>	9.80	26.32	12.99	20	21	1
Nitella	<i>Nitella sp.</i>	6.37	17.11	8.44	13	13	1
Slender naiad	<i>Najas flexilis</i>	3.92	10.53	5.19	8	12	1
Large-leaf pondweed	<i>Potamogeton amplifolius</i>	2.94	7.89	3.90	6	25	1
Common waterweed	<i>Elodea canadensis</i>	2.45	6.58	3.25	5	6	1.2
Hardstem bulrush	<i>Schoenoplectus acutus</i>	2.45	6.58	3.25	5	32	1
Watershield	<i>Brasenia schreberi</i>	1.96	5.26	2.60	4	15	1
Slender waterweed	<i>Elodea nuttallii</i>	1.96	5.26	2.60	4	4	1
Quillwort	<i>Isoetes sp.</i>	1.96	5.26	2.60	4	5	1
Spiral-fruited pondweed	<i>Potamogeton spirillus</i>	1.96	5.26	2.60	4	14	1
Water star-grass	<i>Heteranthera dubia</i>	1.47	3.95	1.95	3	5	1
Northern water-milfoil	<i>Myriophyllum sibiricum</i>	1.47	3.95	1.95	3	10	1
Variable pondweed	<i>Potamogeton gramineus</i>	1.47	3.95	1.95	3	13	1
Clasping-leaf pondweed	<i>Potamogeton richardsonii</i>	1.47	3.95	1.95	3	16	1
Flat-stem pondweed	<i>Potamogeton zosteriformis</i>	1.47	3.95	1.95	3	11	1
Water marigold	<i>Bidens beckii</i>	0.98	2.63	1.30	2	2	1
Needle spikerush	<i>Eleocharis acicularis</i>	0.98	2.63	1.30	2	2	1
Water horsetail	<i>Equisetum fluviatile</i>	0.98	2.63	1.30	2	6	1
White water lily	<i>Nymphaea odorata</i>	0.98	2.63	1.30	2	12	1
Spiny hornwort	<i>Ceratophyllum echinatum</i>	0.49	1.32	0.65	1	1	1
Spiny spored-quillwort	<i>Isoetes echinospora</i>	0.49	1.32	0.65	1	4	1
Small pondweed	<i>Potamogeton pusillus</i>	0.49	1.32	0.65	1	1	1

Frequency of occurrence within vegetated areas (%): Number of times a species was seen in a vegetated area divided by the total number of vegetated sites.

Table 2. Continued.

Common name	Scientific name	Frequency of occurrence at sites less than or equal to maximum depth of plants	Frequency of occurrence within vegetated areas (%)	Relative Frequency (%)	Number of sites where species found	Number of sites where species found (including visuals)	Average Rake Fullness
Vasey's pondweed	<i>Potamogeton vaseyi</i>	0.49	1.32	0.65	1	2	1
Narrow-leaved bur-reed	<i>Sparganium angustifolium</i>	0.49	1.32	0.65	1	2	1
Filamentous algae		6.86	18.42		14	14	1
Freshwater sponge		1.47	3.95		3	4	1
Pickerelweed	<i>Pontederia cordata</i>				Visual	8	
Swamp loosestrife	<i>Decodon verticillatus</i>				Visual	7	
Ribbon-leaf pondweed	<i>Potamogeton epihydrus</i>				Visual	5	
Spatterdock	<i>Nuphar variegata</i>				Visual	3	
American bur-reed	<i>Sparganium americanum</i>				Visual	3	
	<i>Lysimachia terrestris</i>				Visual	2	
Common arrowhead	<i>Sagittaria latifolia</i>				Visual	2	
Softstem bulrush	<i>Schoenoplectus tabernaemontani</i>				Visual	2	
	<i>Iris sp.</i>				Visual	1	
Small duckweed	<i>Lemna minor</i>				Visual	1	
Common reed	<i>Phragmites australis</i>				Visual	1	
Floating-leaf pondweed	<i>Potamogeton natans</i>				Visual	1	
Wild calla	<i>Calla palustris</i>				Boat Survey		
Common beaked sedge	<i>Carex utriculata</i>				Boat Survey		
Three-way sedge	<i>Dulichium arundinaceum</i>				Boat Survey		
Bald spikerush	<i>Eleocharis erythropoda</i>				Boat Survey		
Creeping spikerush	<i>Eleocharis palustris</i>				Boat Survey		
Couch grass	<i>Elymus repens</i>				Boat Survey		
Yellow iris	<i>Iris pseudacorus</i>				Boat Survey		
Aquatic forget-me-not	<i>Myosotis scorpioides</i>				Boat Survey		
Reed canary grass	<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>				Boat Survey		
Grass-leaved arrowhead	<i>Sagittaria graminea</i>				Boat Survey		
Woolgrass	<i>Scirpus cyprinus</i>				Boat Survey		
Narrow-leaved cattail	<i>Typha angustifolia</i>				Boat Survey		

Common name	Scientific name	Frequency of occurrence at sites less than or equal to maximum depth of plants	Frequency of occurrence within vegetated areas (%)	Relative Frequency (%)	Number of sites where species found	Number of sites where species found (including visuals)	Average Rake Fullness
Broad-leaved cattail	<i>Typha latifolia</i>				Boat Survey		

Frequency of occurrence within vegetated areas (%): Number of times a species was seen in a vegetated area divided by the total number of vegetated sites.

Dr. Feckmann (U.W. Stevens Point – Herbarium) verified the plant specimens January 2021.

Potamogeton vaseyi is considered a **Special Concern** species in Wisconsin.

Iris pseudocorus, *Myosotis scorpioides*, *Phalaris arundinacea*, and *Typha angustifolia* are considered restricted species in Wisconsin.

Table 3. Comparison of summary statistics for 2008, 2013, and 2020 point-intercept aquatic plant surveys in Horsehead Lake.

Summary Statistic	2008	2013	2020
Total number of sites on grid	594	594	594
Total number of sites visited		329	265
Total number of sites with vegetation		87	76
Total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants		168	204
Frequency of occurrence at sites shallower than maximum depth of plants	25.66	51.79	37.25
Simpson Diversity Index	0.91	0.90	0.90
Maximum depth of plants (ft.)	17.0	14.00	14.00
Number of sites sampled with rake on rope		39	29
Number of sites sampled with rake on pole		172	230
Average number of all species per site (shallower than max depth)	0.51	1.10	0.75
Average number of all species per site (vegetated sites only)	1.97	2.13	2.03
Average number of native species per site (shallower than max depth)	0.51	1.10	0.75
Average number of native species per site (vegetated sites only)	1.97	2.13	2.03
Species Richness	26	26	26
Species Richness (including visuals)		32	38
Floristic Quality Index (FQI)	32.2	35.1	35.1

Figure 1. Number of plant species recorded at Horsehead Lake sample sites (2020).





Figure 2. Rake fullness ratings for Horsehead Lake sample sites (2020).



**Rake fullness
(all species)**

- 1 (Yellow circle)
- 2 (Orange circle)
- 3 (Red circle)



**Figure 3. Maximum Depth of Plant Colonization,
Horsehead Lake, 2020**




Figure 4. Horsehead Lake sampling sites less than or equal to maximum depth of rooted vegetation (2020).



- Site less than or equal to maximum depth of plant colonization (MDC).
- Plant find(s) at site less than or equal to MDC.




Figure 5. Horsehead Lake substrate encountered at point-intercept plant sampling sites (2020).




Figure 6. Horsehead Lake, Plant Finds in 2013 and 2020.




Figure 7. Horsehead Lake point-intercept plant sampling sites with emergent and floating aquatic plants (2020).





Figure 8. Distribution of plant species, Horsehead Lake (2020).

Vallisneria americana,
Wild celery

● 1 (Rake fullness)

● 2

● 3

▼ Visual

✕ Not found

✕ Unsampled (depth)

✕ Non-navigable




Figure 9. Distribution of plant species, Horsehead Lake (2020).

Potamogeton robbinsii,
Fern pondweed

● 1 (Rake fullness)

● 2

● 3

▼ Visual

× Not found

× Unsampled (depth)

× Non-navigable




Figure 10. Distribution of plant species, Horsehead Lake (2020).



Chara sp.,
Muskgrasses

● 1 (Rake fullness)

● 2

● 3

▼ Visual

✕ Not found

✕ Unsampled (depth)

✕ Non-navigable




Figure 11. Distribution of plant species, Horsehead Lake (2020).



Nitella sp.,
Nitella

- 1 (Rake fullness)
- 2
- 3
- ▼ Visual
- ✕ Not found
- ✕ Unsampled (depth)
- ✕ Non-navigable




Figure 12. Distribution of plant species, Horsehead Lake (2020).



Najas flexilis,
Slender naiad

● 1 (Rake fullness)

● 2

● 3

▼ Visual

✕ Not found

✕ Unsampled (depth)

✕ Non-navigable




Figure 13. Distribution of plant species, Horsehead Lake (2020).

Potamogeton amplifolius,
Large-leaf pondweed

● 1 (Rake fullness)

● 2

● 3

▼ Visual

✕ Not found

✕ Unsampled (depth)

✕ Non-navigable




Figure 14. Distribution of plant species, Horsehead Lake (2020).

Elodea canadensis,
Common waterweed

● 1 (Rake fullness)

● 2

● 3

▼ Visual

× Not found

× Unsampled (depth)

× Non-navigable




Figure 15. Distribution of plant species, Horsehead Lake (2020).

Schoenoplectus acutus,
Hardstem bulrush

● 1 (Rake fullness)

● 2


● 3

▼ Visual

× Not found

× Unsampled (depth)

× Non-navigable





Appendix C
Horsehead Lake Water Quality Report

Appendix C

Review of Lake Water Quality

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Comparison of Horsehead Lake with other datasets.....	1
Temperature.....	1
Dissolved Oxygen.....	4
Water Clarity.....	5
Turbidity.....	6
Water Color.....	7
Water Level.....	8
User Perceptions.....	8
Chlorophyll <i>a</i>	9
Phosphorus.....	10
Trophic State.....	11
Nitrogen.....	12
Chloride.....	13
Sulfate.....	13
Conductivity.....	13
pH.....	13
Alkalinity.....	14
Hardness.....	15
Calcium and Magnesium Hardness.....	15
Sodium and Potassium.....	15
Dissolved Organic Carbon.....	15
Silica.....	16
Aluminum.....	16
Iron.....	16
Manganese.....	16
Sediment.....	16
Total Suspended Solids.....	17
Aquatic Invasive Species.....	17
Resources.....	18

Review of Horsehead Lake Water Quality

Prepared by Angie Stine, B.S., White Water Associates, Inc.


Introduction

Horsehead Lake is located in Vilas County, Wisconsin. It is a 250 acre drainage lake with a maximum depth of 24 feet. The Waterbody Identification Code (WBIC) is 2953100. The purpose of this study was to review and report existing baseline water quality data found in the Wisconsin DNR SWIMS database. Future water quality monitoring data can be compared to this baseline dataset in order to detect and understand long-term changes in water quality. Water quality data was retrieved from the Wisconsin DNR SWIMS database in 1979, 1992, and from 1998 to 2020. In 2001, the Vilas County Lakes Association monitored the lake. In August, 2002, Lake Baseline Monitoring was conducted. Secchi disk measurements were collected by Citizen Lake Monitoring Network (CLMN) volunteers from 1991 to 2020. Chlorophyll *a* and total phosphorus were collected from 2000-2020 by CLMN volunteers.

Comparison of Horsehead Lake with other datasets

Lillie and Mason's *Limnological Characteristics of Wisconsin Lakes* (1983) are a great source to compare lakes within our region to a subset of lakes that have been sampled in Wisconsin. Wisconsin is divided into five regions of sampling lakes. Vilas County lakes are in the Northeast Region (Figure 1) and were among 243 lakes randomly selected and analyzed for water quality.

Figure 1. Wisconsin regions in terms of water quality.



Temperature

Measuring the temperature of a lake at different depths will determine the influence it has on the physical, biological, and chemical aspects of the lake. Lake water temperature influences the rate of decomposition, nutrient recycling, lake stratification, and dissolved oxygen (D.O.) concentration. Temperature can also

affect the distribution of fish species throughout a lake. Figure 2 (May), Figure 3 (June), and Figure 4 (July), Figure 5 (August), and Figure 6 (October) indicate the changes in water temperature from years sampled between 2000 and 2020. In May and June, the temperatures show little stratification from surface to bottom. In July, the temperature begins to drop off at 10 to 15 feet. In August, there appears to be some mixing (Figure 5). In October the temperature is consistent from surface to bottom.





Figure 4. Horsehead Lake temperature profile July, 2000-2020.




Figure 5. Horsehead Lake temperature profile August, 2000-2019.






Figure 6. Horsehead Lake temperature profile, October 2000-2005.



Dissolved Oxygen

The dissolved oxygen (D.O.) content of lake water is vital in determining presence of fish species and other aquatic organisms. Dissolved oxygen also has a strong influence on the chemical and physical conditions of a lake. The amount of dissolved oxygen is dependent on the water temperature, atmospheric pressure, and biological activity. Oxygen levels are increased by aquatic plant photosynthesis, but reduced by respiration of plants, decomposer organisms, fish, and invertebrates. The amount of dissolved oxygen available in a lake, particularly in the deeper parts of a lake, is critical to overall health. Figure 7 displays three sample dates for dissolved oxygen. In July, 2020 the D.O. drops off at 14 ft. More dissolved oxygen profiles should be conducted at various times in the open-water season, from the surface to the bottom, in order to determine the dissolved oxygen is at various depths at different times of the open water season.

Figure 7. Horsehead Lake dissolved oxygen profile.




Water Clarity

Water clarity has two main components: turbidity (suspended materials such as algae and silt) and true color (materials dissolved in the water) (Shaw et al., 2004). Water clarity gives an indication of the overall water quality in a lake. Water clarity is typically measured using a Secchi disk (black and white disk) that is lowered into the water column on a tether. In simple terms, the depth at which the disk is no longer visible is recorded as the Secchi depth. Figure 8 shows the July and August mean Secchi depths from 1986 to 2020. The shallowest mean Secchi depth was 6.5 feet in 2009, and the deepest mean depth was 12.67 feet in 2002 (Figure 9). According to Table 1, the 2020 Horsehead Lake’s water clarity can be considered “good.”

Table 1. Water clarity index (Shaw et al., 2004).

Water clarity	Secchi depth (ft.)
Very poor	3
Poor	5
Fair	7
Good	10
Very good	20
Excellent	32

Figure 8. Horsehead Lake Secchi depth averages (July and August only).



Past secchi averages in feet (July and August only).

(WDNR, 2021)

Figure 9. Horsehead Lake’s July and August Secchi Data: Mean, Min, Max, and Secchi Count (1991-2020).

Year	Secchi Mean	Secchi Min	Secchi Max	Secchi Count
1991	10.82	7.5	13.5	7
1992	11.25	10	12.5	2
1998	9.34	5.25	13	8
1999	9.75	5.75	12	6
2000	8.92	6	10.5	6
2001	9.19	5	12.5	4
2002	12.67	10.25	14.75	3
2003	12.25	11.25	13.25	2
2004	8.63	6.25	11	2
2005	10.5	8	13	2
2006	10.25	7.25	13.25	2
2007	9	7	12	3
2008	9.83	8	12	3
2009	6.5	6	7	2
2010	11	10	12	2
2011	9	7	11	2
2012	9.25	8	10.5	2
2013	12.5	12	13	2
2014	10.5	10	11	2
2015	11	7	15	2
2016	11.5	11	12	2
2017	9.75	8.5	11	2
2018	12	12	12	1
2019	9.5	6	13	2
2020	11.67	10	15	3

Report Generated: 04/27/2021


(WDNR, 2021)

Turbidity

Turbidity is another measure of water clarity, but is caused by suspended particulate matter rather than dissolved organic compounds (Shaw et al., 2004). Particles suspended in the water dissipate light and reduce the depth at which the light can penetrate. This affects the depth at which plants can grow. Turbidity also affects the aesthetic quality of water. Water that runs off the watershed into a lake can increase turbidity by introducing suspended materials. Turbidity caused by algae is the most common reason for low Secchi readings (Shaw et al., 2004). In terms of biological health of a lake ecosystem, measurements less than 10 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) represent healthy conditions for fish and other organisms. Turbidity was sampled in Horsehead Lake in August, 1979 and had a value of 1.8 NTU. Further analysis should be done to better understand the current turbidity values of Horsehead Lake.

CLMN volunteers also provided their opinion on the lake’s water clarity and described it as “clear” or “murky.” From 1998 to 2020, 89% of volunteers said Horsehead Lake appeared “clear” (Figure 10).


Figure 10. Horsehead Lake water appearance, 1998-2020.



Water Color


Color of lake water is related to the type and amount of dissolved organic chemicals. Its main significance is aesthetics, although it may also influence light penetration and in turn affect aquatic plant and algal growth. Many lakes have naturally occurring color compounds from decomposition of plant material in the watershed (Shaw et al., 2004). Units of color are determined from the platinum-cobalt scale and are therefore recorded as Pt-Co units. Shaw states that a water color between 0 and 40 Pt-Co units is low. Horsehead Lake was analyzed for color on August 18, 2000 and had a value of 15 Pt-Co. The CLMN have also recorded their perceptions of water color in Horsehead Lake. Since 1998, 67% of volunteers indicated the water appeared “blue,” 30% said the water looked “green,” and 3% said it appeared “brown” (Figure 11).

Figure 11. Horsehead Lake CLMN color percentage, 1998-2020.



Water Level

CLMN volunteers also recorded their perceptions of the lake level as “high,” “normal,” or “low.” Figure 12 indicates that in 2007, 100% of volunteers viewed the water level in Horsehead Lake as “low.” In 2005, 2006, 2011, and 2020 100% of volunteers indicated the lake levels to be “normal.”



User Perceptions

The CLMN volunteers also recorded their perceptions of the water, based on the physical appearance and the recreational suitability. These opinions can be compared to water quality parameters to see how the lake user would experience the lake at that time. When interpreting the transparency data, we see that when the Secchi depth decreases, the rating of the lake’s physical appearance also decreases. These perceptions of recreational suitability are displayed by year in Figure 13. In 1992, 100% of CLMN volunteers recorded Horsehead Lake to have “very minor aesthetic problems.” In 2000, 2004-2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2018-2020 100% of the volunteers said the lake was “beautiful, could not be nicer.”


Figure 13. Horsehead Lake aesthetic quality, 1991-2020.



Chlorophyll *a*

Chlorophyll *a* is the photosynthetic pigment that makes plants and algae green. Chlorophyll *a* in lake water is therefore an indicator of the amount of algae. Chlorophyll *a* concentrations greater than 10 µg/L are perceived as a mild algae bloom, while concentrations greater than 20 µg/L are perceived as a nuisance. Chlorophyll *a* was analyzed in 1979 and in every open-water season from 2000 to 2020 (Figure 14). As we can see, the October chlorophyll *a* levels were generally higher than in other months. The highest chlorophyll *a* sample was collected in August, 2009 (27.9 µg/L). To compare, the Secchi reading in 2009 was the lowest ever taken, at 6 feet. The most recent chlorophyll *a* levels (2020) were in comparison to the Northeast Wisconsin Lakes and the Wisconsin Natural Lakes.

Figure 14. Horsehead Lake chlorophyll *a*.



Phosphorus

In more than 80% of Wisconsin's lakes, phosphorus is the key nutrient affecting the amount of algae and plant growth. If phosphorus levels are high, excessive aquatic plant growth can occur.

Phosphorus originates from a variety of sources, many of which are related to human activities. Major sources include human and animal wastes, soil erosion, detergents, septic systems and runoff from farmland or lawns (Shaw et al., 2004). Phosphorus provokes complex reactions in lakes. An analysis of phosphorus often includes both soluble reactive phosphorus and total phosphorus. Soluble reactive phosphorus dissolves in the water and directly influences plant growth (Shaw et al., 2004). Its concentration varies in most lakes over short periods of time as plants take it up and release it. Total phosphorus is considered a better indicator of a lake's nutrient status than soluble reactive phosphorus because its levels remain more stable (Shaw et al., 2004). Total phosphorus includes soluble phosphorus and the phosphorus in plant and animal fragments suspended in lake water. Ideally, soluble reactive phosphorus concentrations should be 10 µg/L or less at spring turnover to prevent summer algae blooms (Shaw et al., 2004). A concentration of total phosphorus below 20 µg/L for lakes should be maintained to prevent nuisance algal blooms (Shaw et al., 2004).

The majority of August, September and October total phosphorus values were above 20 µg/L (Figure 15). Horsehead Lake total phosphorus values were considered “good” to “very good” during most of May, June, and July, but were considered “fair” to “good” in August, Sept, and October (Figures 16). The total phosphorus levels were low in 2020 compared to Northeastern Wisconsin lakes and all Wisconsin natural lakes.





Figure 16. Total phosphorus concentrations for Wisconsin’s natural lakes and impoundments (Shaw et al., 2004).




Trophic State

Trophic state is another indicator of water quality (Carlson, 1977). Lakes can be divided into three categories based on trophic state – oligotrophic, mesotrophic, and eutrophic. These categories reflect a lake’s nutrient and clarity levels (Shaw et al., 2004).

Trophic State Index (TSI) was calculated by the WDNR using Secchi (1991-2020), chlorophyll *a* and total phosphorus (2000-2020) data collected by the CLMN (Figure 17). The July and August average TSI values were: Secchi TSI 42; chlorophyll *a* TSI - 42 and total phosphorus TSI - 50; classifying Horsehead Lake as “mesotrophic” (Table 2).

Figure 17. Horsehead Lake Trophic State Index (1984-2020) (WDNR, 2021).



30-40	Oligotrophic: clear, deep water; possible oxygen depletion in lower depths; few aquatic plants or algal blooms; low in nutrients; large game fish usual fishery
40-50	Mesotrophic: moderately clear water; mixed fishery, esp. panfish; moderate aquatic plant growth and occasional algal blooms; may have low oxygen levels near bottom in summer
50-60	Mildly Eutrophic: decreased water clarity; anoxic near bottom; may have heavy algal bloom and plant growth; high in nutrients; shallow eutrophic lakes may have winterkill of fish; rough fish common
60-70	Eutrophic: dominated by blue-green algae; algae scums common; prolific aquatic plant growth; high nutrient levels; rough fish common; susceptible to oxygen depletion and winter fishkill
70-80	Hypereutrophic: heavy algal blooms through most of summer; dense aquatic plant growth; poor water clarity; high nutrient levels

(WDNR, February 2014)

Researchers use various methods to calculate the trophic state of lakes. Common characteristics used to make the determination are: total phosphorus (important for algae growth), chlorophyll *a* concentration (a measure of the amount of algae present), and Secchi disk readings (an indicator of water clarity) (Shaw et al., 2004) (Table 3).

Table 3. Trophic classification of Wisconsin Lakes based on chlorophyll *a*, water clarity measurements, and total phosphorus values (Shaw et al., 2004).

Trophic class	Total phosphorus µg/L	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> µg/L	Secchi Disk (ft.)
Oligotrophic	3	2	12
	10	5	8
Mesotrophic	18	8	6
	27	10	6
Eutrophic	30	11	5
	50	15	4

Nitrogen

Nitrogen is second only to phosphorus as an important nutrient for aquatic plant and algae growth (Shaw et al., 2004). Human activities on the landscape greatly influence the amount of nitrogen in a lake. Nitrogen may come from lawn fertilizer, septic systems near the lake, or from agricultural activities in the watershed. Nitrogen may enter a lake from surface runoff or groundwater sources.

Nitrogen exists in lakes in several forms. Horsehead Lake was analyzed for total Kjeldahl nitrogen (0.43 mg/L in August, 2000), ammonium (0.13 in August, 1979), organic nitrogen (0.22 mg/L in August, 1979), nitrite (0.003 mg/L in August, 1979), nitrate (0.02 mg/L in August, 1979), and nitrate-nitrite (not detected in August, 2000). Nitrogen is a major component of all organic (plant and animal) matter. Decomposing organic matter releases ammonia, which is converted to nitrate if oxygen is present (Shaw et al., 2004). All inorganic forms of nitrogen can be used by aquatic plants and algae (Shaw et al., 2004). If these inorganic forms of nitrogen exceed 0.3 mg/L (as N) in spring, there is sufficient nitrogen to

support summer algae blooms (Shaw et al., 2004). Elevated concentrations of ammonium, nitrate, and nitrite, derived from human activities, can stimulate or enhance the development, maintenance and proliferation of primary producers (phytoplankton, benthic algae, macrophytes), contributing to the widespread phenomenon of the cultural (human-made) eutrophication of aquatic ecosystems (Camargo et al., 2007). The nutrient enrichment can cause important ecological effects on aquatic communities, since the overproduction of organic matter, and its subsequent decomposition, usually lead to low dissolved oxygen concentrations in bottom waters, and sediments of eutrophic and hypereutrophic aquatic ecosystems with low turnover rates (Camargo et al., 2007). Long term monitoring should be conducted to determine any trends in nitrogen.

Chloride

The presence of chloride (Cl^-) where it does not occur naturally indicates possible water pollution (Shaw et al., 2004). Chloride does not affect plant and algae growth and is not toxic to aquatic organisms at most of the levels found in Wisconsin (Shaw et al., 2004). Chloride concentrations in Horsehead Lake were well below the generalized distribution gradient of chloride found in surface waters in Wisconsin. Horsehead Lake was analyzed for chloride in August, 1979 and had a value of 3 mg/L and July, 2020 with a value of 1.75 mg/L.

Sulfate

Sulfate in lake water is primarily related to the types of minerals found in the watershed, and to acid rain (Shaw et al., 2004). Sulfate concentrations are noted to be less than 10 mg/L in Vilas County (Lillie and Mason, 1983). Sulfate levels were not detected on July 17, 2020.

Conductivity

Conductivity is a measure of the ability of water to conduct an electric current. Conductivity is reported in micromhos per centimeter ($\mu\text{mhos/cm}$) and is directly related to the total dissolved inorganic chemicals in the water. Usually, values are approximately two times the water hardness, unless the water is receiving high concentrations of human-induced contaminants (Shaw et al., 2004). Horsehead Lake conductivity levels were sampled in August, 1979 with a conductance of 87 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ and on July 17, 2020 with a conductance of 65.6 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$.

pH

The acidity level of a lake's water regulates the solubility of many minerals. A pH level of 7 is considered neutral. The pH level in Wisconsin lakes ranges from 4.5 in acid, bog lakes to 8.4 in hard water, marl lakes (Shaw et al., 2004). Natural rainfall in Wisconsin averages a pH of 5.6. Some minerals become available under low pH (especially aluminum, zinc, and mercury) and can inhibit fish reproduction and/or survival. Mercury and aluminum are not only toxic to many kinds of wildlife, but also to humans (especially those that eat tainted fish). The pH scale is logarithmic, so every 1.0 unit change in pH increases the acidity tenfold. Water with a pH of 6 is 10 times more acidic than water with pH of 7. A lake's pH level is important for the release of potentially harmful substances and affects plant growth, fish reproduction and survival. A lake with neutral or slightly alkaline pH is a good lake for fish

and plant survival. pH was sampled in Horsehead Lake in August, 1979 and was 7.2 and July 17, 2020 with a pH of 7.26, indicating that the lake is close to neutral. Further analysis should be done to better understand the current pH values of Horsehead Lake.

Table 4 displays the effects pH levels less than 6.5 will have on fish. While moderately low pH does not usually harm fish, the metals that become soluble under low pH can be important. In low pH waters, aluminum, zinc, and mercury concentrations increase if they are present in lake sediment or watershed solids (Shaw et al., 2004).

Table 4. Effects of acidity on fish species (Olszyk, 1980).

<i>Water pH</i>	<i>Effects</i>
6.5	Walleye spawning inhibited
5.8	Lake trout spawning inhibited
5.5	Smallmouth bass disappear
5.2	Walleye & lake trout disappear
5	Spawning inhibited in most fish
4.7	Northern pike, sucker, bullhead, pumpkinseed, sunfish & rock bass disappear
4.5	Perch spawning inhibited
3.5	Perch disappear
3	Toxic to all fish

Alkalinity

Alkalinity levels in a lake are affected by the soil minerals, bedrock type in the watershed, and frequency of contact between lake water and these materials (Shaw et al., 2004). Alkalinity is important in a lake to buffer the effects of acidification from the atmosphere. Acid rain has long been a problem with lakes that have low alkalinity levels and high potential sources of acid deposition. Alkalinity was analyzed in Horsehead Lake in August, 1979 and had a value of 28 mg/L and on July 17, 2020 with a value of 29.3 mg/L. Based on this value, Horsehead Lake is not sensitive to acid rain, although new samples should be collected (Table 5).

Table 5. Sensitivity of Lakes to Acid Rain (Shaw et al., 2004)	
<i>Sensitivity to acid rain</i>	<i>Alkalinity value (mg/L or ppm CaCO₃)</i>
High	0-2
Moderate	2-10
Low	10-25
Non-sensitive	>25

Hardness

Hardness levels in a lake are affected by the soil minerals, bedrock type in the watershed, and frequency of contact between lake water and these materials (Shaw et al., 2004). One method of evaluating hardness is to test for calcium carbonate (CaCO_3). Horsehead Lake hardness was 28.21 mg/L in August, 1979. Table 6 indicates Horsehead Lake to be “soft” to borderline “moderately hard” water.

Soft water	0-60
Moderately hard water	61-120
Hard water	121-180
Very hard water	>180

Calcium and Magnesium Hardness

The carbonate system provides acid buffering through two alkaline compounds: bicarbonate and carbonate. These compounds are usually found with two hardness ions: calcium and magnesium (Shaw et al., 2004). Calcium is the most abundant cation found in Wisconsin lakes. Its abundance is related to the presence of calcium-bearing minerals in the lake watershed (Shaw et al., 2004). Aquatic organisms such as native mussels use calcium in their shells. The aquatic invasive zebra mussel tends to need calcium levels greater than 20 mg/L to maintain shell growth. Horsehead Lake had a calcium level of 8 mg/L (August, 1979) and 9.9 mg/L (August, 2000) which is an indication that zebra mussels may not flourish. Magnesium was 2 mg/L (1979) and 2.7 mg/L (2000), which is lower than other lakes in the region. Further analysis should be done to better understand the current calcium and magnesium values of Horsehead Lake.

Sodium and Potassium

Sodium and potassium are possible indicators of human pollution in a lake, since naturally occurring levels of these ions in soils and water are very low. Sodium is often associated with chloride and gets into lakes from road salting, fertilizations, and human and animal waste (Shaw et al., 2004). Potassium is the key component of commonly-used potash fertilizer, and is abundant in animal waste. Both of these elements are held by soils to a greater extent than is chloride or nitrate; therefore, they are not as useful as indicators of pollution impacts (Shaw et al., 2004). Although not normally toxic themselves, they provide a strong indication of possible contamination by more damaging compounds (Shaw et al., 2004). In August, 1979 sodium (13 mg/L) and potassium (0.9 mg/L) were sampled in Horsehead Lake.

Dissolved Organic Carbon

Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC) is a food supplement, supporting growth of microorganisms, and plays an important role in global carbon cycle through the microbial loop (Kirchman et al., 1991). In general, organic carbon compounds are a result of decomposition processes from dead organic matter such as

plants. When water contacts highly organic soils, these components can drain into rivers and lakes as DOC. DOC is also important in the transport of metals in aquatic systems. Metals form extremely strong complexes with DOC, enhancing metal solubility while also reducing metal bioavailability. Baseflow concentrations of DOC in undisturbed watersheds generally range from 1 to 20 mg/L carbon. DOC has not been tested in Horsehead Lake, and should be included in future water quality sampling.

Silica

The earth's crust is abundant with silicates or other compounds of silicon. The water in lakes dissolves the silica and pH can be a key factor in regulating the amount of silica that is dissolved. Silica concentrations are usually within the range of 5 to 25 mg/L. Generally, lakes that are fed by groundwater have higher levels of silica. Horsehead Lake silica has not been tested, and should be included in future water quality sampling.

Aluminum

Aluminum occurs naturally in soils and sediments. In low pH (acidic) environments aluminum solubility increases greatly. With a low pH and increased aluminum values, fish health can become impaired. This can have impacts on the entire food web. Aluminum also plays an important role in phosphorus cycling in lakes. When aluminum precipitates with phosphorus in lake sediments, the phosphorus will not dissolve back into the water column as readily. Horsehead Lake aluminum has not been tested, and should be included in future water quality sampling.

Iron

Iron also forms sediment particles that bind with and store phosphorus when dissolved oxygen is present. When oxygen concentration gets low (for example, in winter or in the deep water near sediments) the iron and phosphorus dissolve in water. This phosphorus is available for algal blooms. Horsehead Lake iron levels were analyzed in August, 1979 and had a value of 0.08 mg/L.

Manganese

Manganese is a mineral that occurs naturally in rocks and soil. In lakes, manganese is usually in particulate form. When the dissolved oxygen levels decrease, manganese can convert from an insoluble form to soluble ions. A manganese concentration of 0.05 mg/L can cause color and staining problems. Manganese was analyzed in Horsehead Lake in August, 1979 and had a value of 0.03 mg/L.

Sediment

Lake bottom sediments are sometimes analyzed for chemical constituents that they contain. This is especially true for potentially toxic metals such as mercury, chromium, selenium, and others. Lake sediments also tend to record past events as particulates settle down and become part of the sediment. Biological clues for the historic conditions in the lake can be gleaned from sediment samples. Examples include analysis of pollen or diatoms that might help understand past climate or trophic states in the lake. Sediment data was not collected for Horsehead Lake, and future sampling should include this parameter.

Total Suspended Solids

Total suspended solids are all particles suspended in lake water. Silt, plankton, and wastes are examples of these solids and can come from runoff of agricultural land, erosion, and can be produced by bottom-feeding fish. As the suspended solid levels increase, they absorb heat from sunlight which can increase the water temperature. They can also block the sunlight that plants need for photosynthesis. These events can in turn affect the amount of dissolved oxygen in the lake. Lakes with total suspended solids levels less than 20 mg/L are considered “clear,” while levels between 40 and 80 mg/L are “cloudy.” Total suspended solids data is unknown for Horsehead Lake, so future water quality sampling should include this parameter.

Aquatic Invasive Species

There were small populations of yellow iris observed in various spots in the southeastern bay of the lake. The yellow iris is currently considered a non-regulated invasive species in Wisconsin, but has been proposed to be listed as a restricted species (WDNR, 2021). The only way to differentiate yellow iris from northern blue flag iris is by flower color. Because these species are not always in flower, it is difficult to know how many invasive iris plants were on the lake. Future monitoring or removal of these invasive species should be considered. On May 28, 2020 White Water Associates biologist conducted a AIS survey on Horsehead Lake and found the narrow-leaf cattail, reed canary grass, aquatic forget-me-not, rusty crayfish and the yellow iris. A detailed report is found in Appendix E.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison’s Aquatic Invasive Species Smart Prevention program classifies Horsehead Lake as “Not Suitable” for zebra mussels, based on calcium and conductivity levels found in the lake (UW-Madison). Aquatic Invasive Species Early Detection monitoring was conducted on August 8 and 13, 2013. A zooplankton tow was taken along with snorkeling looking for invasives. No invasive species were observed during this search.

Clean Boats, Clean Waters (CBCW) is a program that inspects boats for aquatic invasive species and in the process educates the public on how to help stop the spread of these species. Clean Boats, Clean Waters has not been implemented on Horsehead Lake but it would be beneficial to begin a program.

Resources

Camargo, Julio A., Álvaro Alonso (Lead Author); Raphael D. Sagarin (Topic Editor). 02 April 2007.

Inorganic nitrogen pollution in aquatic ecosystems: causes and consequences. In: Encyclopedia of Earth. Eds. Cutler J. Cleveland (Washington, D.C.: Environmental Information Coalition, National Council for Science and the Environment). Retrieved 2015.

<http://www.eoearth.org/article/Inorganic_nitrogen_pollution_in_aquatic_ecosystems:_causes_and_consequences>

Carlson, R.E. 1977. *A Trophic State Index for Lakes*. *Limnology and Oceanography*. 22: 361-369.

Kirchman, David L.; Suzuki, Yoshimi, Garside, Christopher, Ducklow, Hugh W. (15). 1991. *High turnover rates of dissolved organic carbon during a spring phytoplankton bloom*. *Nature* 352 (6336): 612–614. Doi:10.1038/352612a0. Retrieved 2015.

<<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v352/n6336/abs/352612a0.html>>

Lillie, R. A. and J. W. Mason. 1983. *Limnological Characteristics of Wisconsin Lakes*. Wis. Dept. of Natural Resources Tech. Bull. Page 138. Madison, WI.

Olszyk, D. 1980. *Biological Effects of Acid Rain*. Testimony, Wis. Public Service Commission Docket No. 05-EP-2. 5 pp.

Shaw, B. Mechenich, C, and Klessig, L. 2004. *Understanding Lake Data (G3582)*. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System. Madison, WI.

University of Wisconsin-Madison, Center for Limnology, Vander Zanden Lab. *Aquatic Invasive Species Smart Prevention*. Retrieved 2015. <<http://www.aissmartprevention.wisc.edu/>>

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2021. *Surface Water Integrated Monitoring Systems (SWIMS) Database*. Retrieved 2021. <<http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/surfacewater/swims/>>

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2014. *Proposed Species Changes for NR40 Regulation*. Retrieved 2015.


<<http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/invasives/documents/ProposedSpecies1028.pdf>>



Appendix D
Horsehead Lake Shoreland and Shallows
Habitat Monitoring Report

Horsehead Lake (Vilas County, Wisconsin)

Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Monitoring Report



Riparian, bank, and littoral zones covered by the *Shoreland & Shallows Habitat Monitoring Field Protocol* (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources 2016)



Date: 2020

INTRODUCTION

White Water Associates, Inc. is retained by the Presque Isle Town Lakes Committee (PITLC) as a consultant for the *Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program*. A recent Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) lake planning grant to the PITLC included an assessment of the shoreland area and shallows habitat for Horsehead Lake (Vilas County, Wisconsin). The assessment was conducted using the *Lake Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Monitoring Field Protocol* (WDNR 2016)¹. This protocol provides a standard methodology for surveying, assessing, and mapping habitat in lakeshore areas, including the riparian buffer, bank, and littoral zone (WDNR 2016). This information will be useful to local and regional resource managers, community stakeholders, and others interested in protecting and enhancing Wisconsin's lakes and rivers (WDNR 2016).

METHODS

There are three principal components to the shoreland and shallows habitat monitoring: (1) obtain georeferenced photos of the entire lake shoreline area, (2) assess the riparian, bank, and littoral habitat by ownership parcel, and (3) count and map all pieces of large woody material in water less than 2 feet deep. In this section, we describe each of these components.

The photographic component of the monitoring documented shoreland habitat conditions around the lake at the time of the survey. Results may be referred to in future years (WDNR 2016). Digital photos were taken with the intent to slightly overlap, thus capturing the entire shoreline. The survey crew used the boat to circumnavigate the lake at a distance of approximately 50 feet perpendicular from shore where conditions permitted. This standardized relative position on the lake allowed the photos to include the water's edge and understory vegetation 35 feet inland. A digital camera with an internal GPS was used to capture the photos. An example shoreland photograph is shown on next page. In the laboratory, photos were processed, georeferenced, and provided as part of the data package to the WDNR.

¹ Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. May 27, 2016. *Draft Lake Shoreland & Shallows Habitat Monitoring Field Protocol*. WDNR 2016.



The shoreline habitat assessment was conducted for every ownership parcel on the lake. To facilitate this effort, parcel data was obtained March 2019 via the Wisconsin Statewide Parcel Map, which can be found at <https://maps.sco.wisc.edu/Parcels/>. Parcel IDs and shoreline lengths were derived from these spatial data files. Parcel IDs and parcel lines, together with a “riparian buffer” line at 35 feet from the shoreline, were layered onto aerial photography maps saved as a georeferenced image file viewed on the Avenza Maps application on an Apple® iPad Pro 9.7 equipped with GPS for offline navigation. The GPS function of the iPad allowed the survey crew to know their position relative to the shoreline and specific parcels. The map is provided as Exhibit 1. Data sheets were prepared that included parcel ID numbers and frontage feet of each parcel (an example data sheet is shown in Exhibit 2). Exhibit 2 also shows the categories that were documented for each parcel. Back in the laboratory, data recorded on field data sheets were input to a Microsoft Office Excel spreadsheet and later conveyed to the WDNR as part of the data package to be included in a publicly available database.

The woody habitat component of the assessment was conducted on a separate circumnavigation of the lake. Before starting, a Secchi depth was measured. The protocol specifies that if the Secchi depth is less than two feet, no woody habitat survey will be conducted due to poor visibility (WDNR 2016). In addition to the Secchi depth, lake water level was documented relative to the lake's *high water level* (HWL). As the lake was circumnavigated, large wood was enumerated. The protocol defines "large wood" as wood greater than 4 inches in diameter somewhere along its length and at least 5 feet long. Eligible large wood was that which was located between the high water level and the 2 foot depth contour and the large wood section must be in the water or below the high water level. Tree "branchiness" ranking was recorded as "0" (no branches), "1" (few branches), or "2" (tree trunk with full crown). Additional details on eligible large wood are provided in the protocol document (WDNR 2016). A GPS was used to document each eligible piece of large wood. A datasheet entry corresponded to each large wood piece. An example datasheet is provided as Exhibit 3.

FINDINGS

The data and photos for the assessment of shoreland area and shallows habitat for Horsehead Lake have been delivered to the WDNR. Any user can view the results in the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Lakes and AIS Mapping Tool found at: <https://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/viewer/>. In this section we summarize a few of the data and provide some example maps that illustrate the findings from the assessment.

The assessment was conducted on May 28, 2020. At the time of the survey there were 46 ownership parcels on Horsehead Lake. The shoreline perimeter of Horsehead Lake is 4.852 miles. Exhibit 4 summarizes some of the Horsehead Lake data. Exhibits 5 through 13 provide maps of findings on Horsehead Lake. Any interested party can access the data in the database and create maps of this type or maps specific to detailed areas of shoreland and shallow water habitat. Exhibit 14 provides instructions for navigating the WDNR AIS Mapping Tool.

In general, the assessment shows the shoreland and shallow water habitat of Horsehead Lake to be of high quality. There is excellent tree canopy coverage as well as shrub and herbaceous coverage. That being said, there is evidence of human influence in the

riparian buffer zone and bank zone. The number of large wood pieces per mile of shoreline is average.

It should be noted that this report has summarized only some of the data collected during the assessment in order to exemplify how the data might be investigated. This only hints at the possibilities and interested stakeholders can sort through more shoreland data on the WDNR data base (see Exhibit 14 for instructions).

LAKE STRATEGY

Horsehead Lake is a high quality lake with good shallow water habitat and intact riparian area. Lake stewardship could primarily be directed toward protection of the current conditions and monitoring to detect changes over time. Although Horsehead Lake is in a mostly natural state, there are a few parcels that could undertake some restoration to ameliorate possible runoff and erosion issues. These areas can be identified by investigating the 2020 monitoring data in maps and tables in this report as well as in the WDNR database (link given previously). The Healthy Lakes program in Wisconsin provides simple, practical, and inexpensive best practices that improve habitat and water quality on lakeshore property (see <https://healthylakeswi.com/> for additional information and guidance on funding projects). Horsehead Lake large woody habitat is average and could be augmented with the “fish sticks” best practice.

Habitat Assessment Data Sheet (one per parcel)

Date _____ Lake name _____ WBIC _____
 Parcel ID _____ Observers _____

RIPARIAN BUFFER ZONE		
Percent Cover	Percent	
Canopy	_____ (0-100)	
Shrub <input type="checkbox"/> Herbaceous <input type="checkbox"/>		
Shrub/Herbaceous	_____	
Impervious surface	_____	
Manicured lawn	_____	
Agriculture	_____	
Other (e.g. duff, soil, mulch)	_____	
} sum=100		
description: _____		
Human Structures	Number	
Buildings	_____	
Boats on shore	_____	
Fire pits	_____	
Other	_____	
description: _____		
Runoff Concerns	Present in	Present out
in Riparian or Entire Parcel	Riparian	of Riparian
Point source	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Channelized water flow/gully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Stair/trail/road to lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lawn/soil sloping to lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bare soil	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sand/silt deposits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
description: _____		

Notes:

BANK ZONE	Length (ft)
Vertical sea wall	_____
Rip rap	_____
Other erosion control structures	_____
Artificial beach	_____
Bank erosion > 1 ft face	_____
Bank erosion < 1 ft face	_____

LITTORAL ZONE	
Human Structures	Number
Piers	_____
Boat lifts	_____
Swim rafts/water trampolines	_____
Boathouses (over water)	_____
Marinas	_____
Other	_____
description: _____	
Aquatic Plants	Present
Emergents	<input type="checkbox"/>
Floating	<input type="checkbox"/>
Plant Removal	<input type="checkbox"/>

If Applicable (low water level): EXPOSED LAKE BED ZONE	
Plants	Present
Canopy	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shrubs	<input type="checkbox"/>
Herbaceous	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disturbed	
Plants (mowed or removed)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sediment (tilled or dug)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Exhibit 2. Example habitat assessment data sheet.

Exhibit 3. Coarse woody habitat inventory data sheet.

Date _____ Lake name _____ WBIC _____

Observers _____

Present water level is Below At Above the High Water Level

Secchi depth _____ ft

ID	Branch	Touch Shore	In Water	ID	Branch	Touch Shore	In Water	ID	Branch	Touch Shore	In Water	ID	Branch	Touch Shore	In Water
1				26				51				76			
2				27				52				77			
3				28				53				78			
4				29				54				79			
5				30				55				80			
6				31				56				81			
7				32				57				82			
8				33				58				83			
9				34				59				84			
10				35				60				85			
11				36				61				86			
12				37				62				87			
13				38				63				88			
14				39				64				89			
15				40				65				90			
16				41				66				91			
17				42				67				92			
18				43				68				93			
19				44				69				94			
20				45				70				95			
21				46				71				96			
22				47				72				97			
23				48				73				98			
24				49				74				99			
25				50				75				100			

Branch: 0 = no branches, 1 = a few branches, 2 = full tree crown

Touch Shore: 0 = entirely below High Water Level (HWL), 1 = crosses HWL


In Water: 0 = less than 5 ft of log is currently underwater, 1 = at least 5 ft of log is currently underwater

Exhibit 4. Summary of shoreland and shallow water habitat for Horsehead Lake.

Date of Survey: May 28, 2020	Miles of shoreline: 4.852	
Number of ownership parcels: 46	Mean parcel frontage feet: 572	
Riparian Buffer Zone	# of parcels	% of parcels
Impervious surfaces	38	83
Manicured lawn	31	67
Agriculture	0	0
Other (duff, soil, mulch)	4	9
Human structures (buildings, boats on shore, fire pit, other)	37	80
Broad runoff concerns (incl. point source; channelized water flow; straight stair, trail, or road to lake; lawn or soil sloping; bare soil; sand/silt deposits; other erosion). Note: Exhibit 10 is less inclusive.	33	72
Bank Zone	# of parcels	% of parcels
Concerns in the bank zone (e.g., vertical sea wall, rip rap, other erosion control structures, artificial beach, active erosion)	3	7
Littoral Zone	# of parcels	% of parcels
Human structures in littoral zone (e.g., piers, boat lifts, swim rafts, water trampolines, boat houses over water, marinas, other)	34	74
Emergent and/or floating aquatic plants	41	89
Evidence of aquatic plant removal	0	0
Large Wood Habitat		
Total Number of large wood pieces	252	
Number of large wood pieces per mile of shoreline	50.06	



Exhibit 5. Horsehead Lake Riparian Coverage - % Canopy - 2020



Legend

Percent Canopy

- 0 - 20
- 21 - 40
- 41 - 60
- 61 - 80
- 81 - 100

Shoreland Parcels

County Boundary

Municipality

State Boundaries

County Boundaries

Major Roads

- Interstate Highway
- State Highway
- US Highway

County and Local Roads

- County HWY
- Local Road

Railroads

Tribal Lands


Rivers and Streams

Intermittent Streams

Open Water

Great Lakes

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

DISCLAIMER: The information shown on these maps has been obtained from various sources, and are of varying age, reliability and resolution. These maps are not intended to be used for navigation, nor are these maps an authoritative source of information about legal land ownership or public access. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made regarding accuracy, applicability for a particular use, completeness, or legality of the information depicted on this map. For more information, see the DNR Legal Notices web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/legal/>

Notes



Exhibit 6. Horsehead Lake Riparian Coverage - % Shrub Herbaceous - 2020



Legend

Percent Shrub Herbaceous

- 0 - 20
- 21 - 40
- 41 - 60
- 61 - 80
- 81 - 100

Shoreland Parcels

County Boundary

Municipality

State Boundaries

County Boundaries

Major Roads

- Interstate Highway
- State Highway
- US Highway

County and Local Roads

- County HWY
- Local Road

Railroads

Tribal Lands


Rivers and Streams

Intermittent Streams

Open Water

Great Lakes

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

DISCLAIMER: The information shown on these maps has been obtained from various sources, and are of varying age, reliability and resolution. These maps are not intended to be used for navigation, nor are these maps an authoritative source of information about legal land ownership or public access. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made regarding accuracy, applicability for a particular use, completeness, or legality of the information depicted on this map. For more information, see the DNR Legal Notices web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/legal/>

Notes



Exhibit 7. Horsehead Lake Riparian Coverage - % Impervious - 2020



Legend

Percent Impervious

- 1 - 5
- 6 - 15
- 16 - 35
- 36 - 100

Shoreland Parcels

County Boundary

Municipality

State Boundaries

County Boundaries

Major Roads

- Interstate Highway
- State Highway
- US Highway

County and Local Roads

- County HWY
- Local Road

Railroads

Tribal Lands


Rivers and Streams

Intermittent Streams

Open Water

Great Lakes

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

DISCLAIMER: The information shown on these maps has been obtained from various sources, and are of varying age, reliability and resolution. These maps are not intended to be used for navigation, nor are these maps an authoritative source of information about legal land ownership or public access. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made regarding accuracy, applicability for a particular use, completeness, or legality of the information depicted on this map. For more information, see the DNR Legal Notices web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/legal/>

Notes



Exhibit 8. Horsehead Lake Riparian Coverage - % Manicured Lawn - 2020



Legend

Percent Manicured Lawn

- 1 - 25
- 26 - 50
- 51 - 75
- 76 - 100

Shoreland Parcels

County Boundary

Municipality

State Boundaries

County Boundaries

Major Roads

- Interstate Highway
- State Highway
- US Highway

County and Local Roads

- County HWY
- Local Road

Railroads

Tribal Lands


Rivers and Streams

Intermittent Streams

Open Water

Great Lakes

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

DISCLAIMER: The information shown on these maps has been obtained from various sources, and are of varying age, reliability and resolution. These maps are not intended to be used for navigation, nor are these maps an authoritative source of information about legal land ownership or public access. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made regarding accuracy, applicability for a particular use, completeness, or legality of the information depicted on this map. For more information, see the DNR Legal Notices web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/legal/>

Notes




Exhibit 9. Horsehead Lake Bank Erosion and Modifications - 2020



Legend

- Bank Erosion >1ft
- Bank Erosion <1ft
- Vertical Sea Wall**
 - 1 - 50 ft
 - 51 - 100 ft
 - 101 - 200 ft
 - 200 + ft
- Rip Rap**
 - 1 - 50 ft
 - 51 - 100 ft
 - 101 - 200 ft
 - 200+ ft
- Other Bank Modifications**
 - 10 - 50 ft
 - 51 - 100 ft
 - 101 - 200 ft
 - 200+ ft
- Artificial Beach**
 - 0 - 50 ft
 - 51 - 100 ft
 - 101 - 200 ft
 - 200+ ft
- Shoreland Parcels
- County Boundary
- Municipality
- State Boundaries

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

DISCLAIMER: The information shown on these maps has been obtained from various sources, and are of varying age, reliability and resolution. These maps are not intended to be used for navigation, nor are these maps an authoritative source of information about legal land ownership or public access. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made regarding accuracy, applicability for a particular use, completeness, or legality of the information depicted on this map. For more information, see the DNR Legal Notices web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/legal/>

Notes



Exhibit 10. Horsehead Lake Runoff Concerns - 2020



Legend

- Channelized Flow
- Point Source
- Shoreland Parcels
- County Boundary
- Municipality
- State Boundaries
- County Boundaries
- Major Roads**
- Interstate Highway
- State Highway
- US Highway
- County and Local Roads**
- County HWY
- Local Road
- + Railroads
- Tribal Lands
- Rivers and Streams
- Intermittent Streams
- Open Water
- Great Lakes

1: 15,840



0.5 0 0.25 0.5 Miles


NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

DISCLAIMER: The information shown on these maps has been obtained from various sources, and are of varying age, reliability and resolution. These maps are not intended to be used for navigation, nor are these maps an authoritative source of information about legal land ownership or public access. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made regarding accuracy, applicability for a particular use, completeness, or legality of the information depicted on this map. For more information, see the DNR Legal Notices web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/legal/>

Notes




Exhibit 11. Horsehead Lake Littoral Zone - Aquatic Plants - 2020



Legend

- Aquatic Plant Removal
- Floating & Emergent Plants
- Emergent Plants
- Floating Plants
- Shoreland Parcels
- County Boundary
- Municipality
- State Boundaries
- County Boundaries
- Major Roads**
 - Interstate Highway
 - State Highway
 - US Highway
- County and Local Roads**
 - County HWY
 - Local Road
- Railroads
- Tribal Lands
- Rivers and Streams
- Intermittent Streams
- Open Water
- Great Lakes

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

DISCLAIMER: The information shown on these maps has been obtained from various sources, and are of varying age, reliability and resolution. These maps are not intended to be used for navigation, nor are these maps an authoritative source of information about legal land ownership or public access. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made regarding accuracy, applicability for a particular use, completeness, or legality of the information depicted on this map. For more information, see the DNR Legal Notices web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/legal/>

Notes




Exhibit 12. Horsehead Lake Littoral Zone - Human Structures - 2020



Legend

- Swim Rafts**
 - 1 (light blue circle)
 - 2 (medium blue circle)
 - 3-5 (dark blue circle)
 - 6+ (darkest blue circle)
- Boat Lifts**
 - 1 (light purple circle)
 - 2 (medium purple circle)
 - 3-5 (dark purple circle)
 - 6+ (darkest purple circle)
- Piers**
 - 1 (light pink circle)
 - 2 (medium pink circle)
 - 3-5 (dark pink circle)
 - 6+ (darkest pink circle)
- Boat Houses**
 - 1 (light orange circle)
 - 2 (medium orange circle)
 - 3-5 (dark orange circle)
 - 6+ (darkest orange circle)
- Marinas**
 - 1 (light green circle)
 - 2 (medium green circle)
 - 3-5 (dark green circle)
 - 6+ (darkest green circle)
- Shoreland Parcels

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

DISCLAIMER: The information shown on these maps has been obtained from various sources, and are of varying age, reliability and resolution. These maps are not intended to be used for navigation, nor are these maps an authoritative source of information about legal land ownership or public access. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made regarding accuracy, applicability for a particular use, completeness, or legality of the information depicted on this map. For more information, see the DNR Legal Notices web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/legal/>

Notes




Exhibit 13. Horsehead Lake Woody Habitat - 2020



Legend

- WH Branchiness**
 - No branches (Small orange circle)
 - Few branches (Medium brown circle)
 - Full tree crown (Large dark brown circle)
- WH Touching Shore (Green square)
- WH In Water (Blue triangle)
- Shoreland Parcels (Thin black outline)
- County Boundary (Dashed black line)
- Municipality (Yellow fill)
- State Boundaries (Dotted black line)
- County Boundaries (Thick yellow outline)
- Major Roads**
 - Interstate Highway (Thick orange line)
 - State Highway (Medium orange line)
 - US Highway (Thin orange line)
- County and Local Roads**
 - County HWY (Thin orange line)
 - Local Road (Thin grey line)
- Railroads (Black line with cross-ticks)
- Tribal Lands (Brown hatched area)
- Rivers and Streams (Blue line)
- Intermittent Streams (Dashed blue line)
- Open Water (Light blue fill)
- Great Lakes (Dark blue fill)

1: 15,840



NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

DISCLAIMER: The information shown on these maps has been obtained from various sources, and are of varying age, reliability and resolution. These maps are not intended to be used for navigation, nor are these maps an authoritative source of information about legal land ownership or public access. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made regarding accuracy, applicability for a particular use, completeness, or legality of the information depicted on this map. For more information, see the DNR Legal Notices web page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/legal/>

Notes

Exhibit 14. Exploring the Wisconsin DNR AIS Mapping Tool for shoreland and shallow water habitat data for specific lakes.

For stakeholders interested in mining the trove of shoreland and shallow water habitat data that has been collected for specific lakes, the Wisconsin DNR AIS Mapping Tool is the portal for entry. The following steps have been outlined to facilitate your experience.

1. <https://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/viewer/>
2. Click on **Proceed** – it will take a while to load.
3. Click on **I Accept**
4. On top grey menu go to **Find Location**
5. Right below grey menu **Find Locations** click on **Find Locations**
6. Bottom Left – Click on **Lakes and Open Waters** then scroll down click on **Find**
7. Search Type – you can put **Name of Lake** or **WBIC** (Water Body Identification Code)
8. **Value** – put **Lake Name** or **WBIC** then click on **Find**
9. If using **Lake Name** then also select the **County**
10. If you know where your lake is you do not need to use the tool above; you can just go on the map and find your location by holding the left button on your mouse and scrolling to the location you want to view. You can use the Zoom In and Zoom Out on the menu bar or use your mouse.
11. The lake should show up – Then on the white menu bar click on **Show Layers**
12. Under Layers - Uncheck all boxes that have a black check mark except **surface waters** and **basemap**
13. Check (click on) the **Shoreland Habitat Monitoring** box
14. Click on the grey + symbol next to it
15. All of the categories that were mapped show up here.
16. Check (click on) the box you want to view. For example, check the box in front of the category **Riparian Coverage**
17. Then check (click on) the sub category **Percent Canopy**. The display will show up on the map to the right.
18. Each Heading there is a + sign on you need to click on the + sign to make it a – sign to see the categories underneath. The Main Sub Heading needs to be checked to see the sub categories. To go onto the next category, you need to uncheck the one you were just on. If there are no colors that show up on the map that would indicate it wasn't indicated on the data sheet and entered. So, if you click on Rip Rap and the map is clear then there is no rip rap by definition of the protocol.
19. If you want to find more info on a certain section on the top menu under basic tools click on **Get Info**. Then go to the parcel you want information on and click once- to the left you will see information on this parcel. You then have to click on the > to find the info and you may have to > again. To close out of the info use the < back arrow. To close out of that click on the X to right of **Identify Results**.
20. You can use your mouse to hold and move the **Lake Map** or use it to scroll in or out to make the map smaller or larger.




Appendix E

Horsehead Lake Aquatic Invasive Species Report

Horsehead Lake (Vilas County, Wisconsin)

Aquatic Invasive Species

Report



Date: 2020

INTRODUCTION

White Water Associates, Inc. has been retained by Wilderness Waters: through a Lake Planning Grant on Horsehead Lake (Vilas County, Wisconsin). Some tasks for this grant focused on aquatic invasive species (AIS). Efforts are intended to increase the understanding of AIS as well as native species in Horsehead Lake. This work prepares Horsehead Lake stakeholders to conduct actions that serve lake health. A portion of this project monitored Horsehead Lake for AIS using Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) protocol. This approach assesses the lake as to its vulnerability to AIS and documents any AIS detected. Findings from the survey were entered into the SWIMS database. A *floating workshop* on lake health, riparian ecology, and AIS was not offered due to Covid-19 concerns in 2020 and 2021.

AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES EARLY DETECTION MONITORING

In order to determine if other aquatic invasive species (AIS) were present in study areas, biologists followed the *Aquatic Invasive Species Early Detection Monitoring Standard Operating Procedure* (WDNR, 2014). This procedure outlines several types of monitoring techniques, including: boat landing searches, sample site searches, targeted searches, waterflea tows and/or a Ponar dredge, and a meander search. The Horsehead Lake Survey took place May 28, 2020.

Five sites around the lake shoreline were thoroughly searched and a meander search was conducted while traveling from one site to another. The public boat landing was surveyed for 15 minutes by checking the dock and walking 200 feet of shoreline. The other four shoreline sites were randomly selected and are identified in Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2. Snorkeling was not used to search for AIS due to the temperature of the air and water. A long rake was used to collect any suspicious aquatic plants for closer inspection and identification. A D-net was used to collect invertebrate animals to look for AIS. Any invasive species observed were recorded. In the event of a new AIS record, specimens are collected for verification.

Spiny water fleas are aquatic invasive zooplankton found in several nearby lakes in Wisconsin. They can be monitored by way of plankton tow nets or by an examination of sediment for dead waterflea exoskeleton fragments. In Horsehead Lake, a zooplankton net was used at three locations (Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 3). The sample was brought back to the lab and filtered to look for spiny water fleas under magnification. No AIS were found.

There were no known AIS that were established in Horsehead Lake prior to this survey. During the survey there were five new invasive species that were noted including the rusty crayfish (Exhibit 4), aquatic forget-me-not (*Myosotis scorpioides*) (Exhibit 5), reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) (Exhibit 6), the narrow-leaf cattail (*Typha angustifolia*) (Exhibit 7), and the yellow iris (*Iris pseudacoris*). The locations of the invasives can be found in Exhibit 1 and 2. A voucher specimen of the aquatic forget-me-not, narrow-leaf cattail, and reed canary grass were collected during the aquatic plant survey and sent to Dr. Freckmann (U.W. Steven's Point) and they were confirmed November, 2020. Site 1, 2, 3 and the boat landing had no AIS present.




Exhibit 2. AIS Survey on Horsehead Lake 5/28/2020.			
Density (1-5), and live (L) or dead (D).			
Site	Latitude	Longitude	Species found
1	46.23050	-89.71988	No AIS
2	46.23889	-89.72163	No AIS
3	46.23531	-89.71211	No AIS
4	46.22764	-89.70586	Rusty crayfish 1 (D)
BL	46.23386	-89.71003	No AIS
MS1	46.23721	-893.71948	Rusty crayfish 2 (L) 2 (D)
MS2	46.23320	-89.722920	Yellow iris 2 (L)
MS3	46.22801	-89.710718	Aquatic forget-me-not 1 (L)
MS4	46.23135	-89.721866	Reed canary grass 1 (L)
MS5	46.230582	-89.706450	Narrow-leaf cattail 1 (L)
MS6	46.230212	-89.705921	Narrow-leaf cattail 1 (L)
MS7	46.229103	-89.705395	Narrow-leaf cattail1 (L)

Exhibit 3. Spiny Water Flea Zooplankton Tows from Horsehead Lake			
Date: 5/28/2020	GPS Coordinates		Depth of sample (feet)
Site 1	46.23231	-89.71336	17
Site 2	46.23245	-89.71736	15
Site 3	46.23412	-89.72002	15



Exhibit 4. Rusty Crayfish 2020 (White Water Associates, photo).




Exhibit 5. Aquatic forget-me-not 2020 (White Water Associates, photo).




Exhibit 6. Reed Canary Grass 2020 (White Water Associates, photo).




Exhibit 7. Narrow-leaf cattail 2020 (White Water Associates, photo).

Rusty crayfish are native to parts of Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky and Indiana, and were likely introduced to Wisconsin waters by fishermen using the crayfish as bait (Gunderson, 2014). Rusty crayfish negatively affect other native crayfish species, cause destruction to aquatic plant beds, reduce fish populations by eating eggs, and cause shoreland owners' recreational problems (Gunderson, 2014). It is illegal to possess both live crayfish and angling equipment simultaneously on any inland Wisconsin water (except Mississippi River) (WDNR, 2018). It is also illegal to release crayfish into a water body without a permit (WDNR, 2018).

Aquatic Forget-me-not (*Myosotis scorpioides*) grows in shallow water along the shoreline. It is an aggressively growing plant that can crowd out native plant species. It can form large monocultures, especially in situations where it is in or near a stream (WDNR, 2019). This plant is restricted in Wisconsin.

Reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) has been found in nearly every county in Wisconsin. It is on the *Restricted* species list. It forms dense, monocultured stands in wetland and riparian areas (Czarapata, 2005). It reproduces by spreading rhizomes, and seeds (Czarapata, 2005). It is one of the first grasses to sprout in the spring, increasing its chances of out-competing other plants.

Narrow-leaved cattail (*Typha angustifolia*) is another perennial wetland plant that can grow very tall. It has a flowering spike of male flowers with another section of female flowers just below it (Czarapata, 2005). It grows along shorelines, roadsides, marshes, and wet meadows. Narrow-leaved cattails form monocultures that push out native plant species and can alter the hydrology and wildlife habitat (Czarapata, 2005).

The yellow iris (*Iris pseudacoris*) is a perennial aquatic plant native to Europe, western Asia and North Africa. It was first introduced to North America in the 1800s as an ornamental plant. Over time, the plant has spread to many wetlands and proliferated to the detriment of native plants and animals. Yellow iris is present on numerous Wisconsin lake margins and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources has listed this species as “Restricted” which prevents its sale, transfer, transportation and intentional cultivation. Yellow iris can reduce habitat needed by fish and waterfowl (Thomas, 1980).

The Wisconsin DNR has a very informative website that educates on invasive species. The Horsehead Lake stakeholders are the ones that frequent the lake and play a big role in protecting the lake. Stopping the spread of AIS and early detection is important when it comes to invasives. Please feel free to take the time to browse through the many links provided: <https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/>.

Literature Cited

Czarapata, Elizabeth. 2005. *Invasive Plants of the Upper Midwest: An Illustrated Guide to Their Identification and Control*. University of Wisconsin Press.

Gunderson, Jeff. 2014. *Rusty Crayfish: A Nasty Invader*. Minnesota Sea Grant. Retrieved 2017. <http://www.seagrant.umn.edu/ais/rustycrayfish_invader>

Kipp, R.M., A.J. Benson, J. Larson, and A. Fusaro. 2015. *Cipangopaludina chinensis malleata*. USGS Nonindigenous Aquatic Species Database, Gainesville, FL. Retrieved 2017. <<http://nas.er.usgs.gov/queries/factsheet.aspx?SpeciesID=1045>>

Thomas, Lindsey Kay, Jr. 1980. The impact of three exotic plant species on a Potamic island. National Park Service Scientific Monograph Series No. 13. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. 179 p.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2014. *Aquatic Invasive Species Early Detection Monitoring Standard Operating Procedure*. Retrieved 2017. <<http://dnr.wi.gov/water/wsSWIMSDocument.ashx?documentSeqNo=99459630>>

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2018. *Rusty Crayfish*. Retrieved 2019. <<http://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/invasives/AISDetail.aspx?roiseq=22588740>>

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2019. *Aquatic Forget-me-not*. Retrieved 2019. <<https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/fact/AquaticForgetMeNot.htm>>