

# **Smith Lake Critical Habitat Designation Report**

*Bayfield County, WI*



Prepared by:  
Alex Smith, Critical Habitat Coordinator  
Scott Toshner, Fisheries Biologist  
Pamela Toshner, Water Resources Biologist  
Greg Kessler, Wildlife Biologist  
Jodi Lepsch, Water Resources Biologist

April 2013



## Critical Habitat Designation Program – Introduction

Wisconsin residents are concerned about the growing number of threats to sustainable healthy lakes in the state. Increases in shoreline development are changing lake ecosystems, and the conversion of natural lakeshore to residential development has greatly accelerated over the past 30 years. While many positive measures have been initiated within Wisconsin over the past few decades, habitat and water quality continue to be impacted.

Critical Habitat Designation is a program that includes formal designations of areas considered important to fish and wildlife. Critical Habitat is classified into three categories: sensitive areas, public rights features, and resource protection areas (uplands within the shoreline zone). These three elements combine to provide regulatory and management advice to the State of Wisconsin, counties, local units of governments, and others who are interested in protecting and preserving these unique habitats for future generations. Designation of Critical Habitat aims to serve four primary purposes:

- 1) Resource protection through science based regulatory review.
- 2) Community-based resource protection through community education, planning and zoning.
- 3) As a guide to land-trusts and others acquiring land and conservation easements.
- 4) A mechanism to track long-term changes in these habitats.


### Methods

Critical Habitat Designation occurred on Smith Lake in Bayfield County during 2007 and 2008. Smith Lake, which is a 31 acre lake with a max depth of 8 feet, is part of the Eau Claire Chain of Lakes and is located between Shunenberg Lake and Upper Eau Claire Lake. Access to Smith Lake is through navigable water from both Shunenberg Lake and Upper Eau Claire Lake.

Designations were conducted by a team consisting of the county fisheries biologist, water resources specialist, wildlife biologist, and critical habitat coordinator. Initially, DNR staff compiled and reviewed existing natural resource data that helped identify areas of focus related to fish, wildlife, endangered resources, and their habitats before going into the field. In the field, staff used existing natural resource data, delineation guidance, and professional judgment to establish the boundaries of the sites containing critical habitat. Critical Habitat Designation boundaries were recorded in the field using map grade Trimble Geo XM GPS Units. For each site, staff inventoried current shoreline management practices occurring along littoral, bank, riparian, and setback zones following standardized methods. Depending on the features of each area being delineated, standardized sampling of emergent and submergent aquatic vegetation, substrate, and woody habitat was also conducted.

Note: A detailed description of the Critical Habitat Designation program, associated methods, and the values of Critical Habitat can be found at <http://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/criticalhabitat/>. Detailed assessments of each Critical Habitat area including raw sampling data and GIS shape files are available by contacting your local DNR office.

Figure 1. Shoreline Management Zones



## Management Recommendations

**General Lakewide Recommendations:** most of these management guidelines will be good for the lake regardless if the site is within a designated critical habitat area or not. Emphasis of or exceptions to these general recommendations are discussed in more detail in the specific lakewide and site management recommendations. For example, planting native vegetation along shorelines will generally be beneficial to the lake and property owner. Shorelines that are dominated by established lawn, however, may be out of compliance with current zoning standards and higher priority for restoration since those areas tend to pollute the resource more while simultaneously being devoid of natural fish and wildlife habitat.

### *Permanent Land Protection*

Permanently protect designated critical habitat areas. Permanent land protection tools include: land acquisition, conservation easements, and mutual covenants. Competitive funding opportunities exist for parcels that are large and of particular conservation value. Voluntary protection or private funding sources may be the primary protection methods for smaller parcels. Specific lakewide and site recommendations emphasize priority areas for permanent land protection.

### *Shoreland Restoration*

Leave natural shorelines undisturbed in accordance with local shoreland zoning rules. If the shoreline buffer does not exist or is disturbed, it should be replanted with native vegetation. The Bayfield County Land & Water Conservation Department may provide shoreline restoration technical and funding assistance. Additionally, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources offers competitive shoreline restoration grants. Some local landscaping businesses may be able to assist landowners with site planning, including native plant selection.

### *Runoff Control*

Implement lake and river water quality protection tools like rainwater gardens, rain barrels, infiltration pits and trenches, grass swales, etc. that divert and/or infiltrate water before it enters the lake or river. Similar to shoreland restoration, the Bayfield County Land & Water Conservation Department may provide technical and funding assistance for these practices. Additionally, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources offers competitive lake protection grants. Some local landscaping businesses may be able to assist landowners with site planning, including plant selection.

### *Septic Systems*

Inspect and maintain septic systems to prevent excess nutrient addition while protecting present water quality conditions. Ideally, a public sanitary sewer system should be constructed. Septic systems are not designed to remove the nutrients (i.e., phosphorous and nitrogen) that pollute water resources. Furthermore, septic water quickly moves through the local sandy soils and speeds delivery of potentially polluted water to the lake or river.

### *In-Lake Habitat Protection*

Consider local recreational boating ordinances (i.e., slow-no-wake) within designated critical habitat areas. Specific lakewide and site recommendations emphasize priority areas for these ordinances.

In general, native aquatic plants should not be actively managed (i.e., no raking, herbicide use, or mechanized removal) and, if within a designated critical habitat site, will

require a permit for manual removal as well as chemical control. Lakewide and site specific recommendations describe exceptions to this general recommendation.

Near shore trees that fall into the water should be left in the water. Site specific recommendations discuss ideal locations for replacing lost woody habitat. There are opportunities with the DNR and Bayfield County Land & Water Conservation Department to implement a Fish Sticks project that replaces this valuable habitat.

**Specific Lakewide Recommendations:** these management guidelines would benefit all of Smith Lake and are recommended based on lake type, geographic location, data collection results, and lakewide management opportunities and threats.

Implement lakewide slow-no-wake ordinance. Lakes less than 50 acres with a public boat landing are automatically Slow-No-Wake by statute. While Smith Lake does not have a public boat landing, it would still benefit from minimizing habitat and water quality problems that result from motorboat use on small, fragile lakes. These problems include disturbing the lake bottom, re-suspending nutrients and sediment that fuel algae blooms, and propeller damage to aquatic plants.

Established lawns should be replanted with native vegetation to minimize erosion and pollution and improve fish and wildlife habitat.

Riprap is not necessary because the wave energy is low for the entire lake. Low-energy sites are typically not eligible/authorized for riprap permits. If shoreline erosion is a problem, overland runoff from rooftops, driveways, and lawns or reckless motorboat use are the most likely causes.


**Specific Site Recommendations:** these management guidelines are specific to the given site and only supersede general and specific lakewide recommendations if explicitly stated.

## Sites

Two areas are designated as Critical Habitat on Smith Lake for a total of 33.7 acres (Figure 1; Tables 1 and 2). Both areas are classified as Sensitive Areas.




Figure 2. Smith Lake Critical Habitat Map



Critical Habitat Polygon ID	Acres	Justification	Justification	Justification	Classification
SM1	32.2	2	3	4	Sensitive Area
SM2	1.5	3	4	11	Sensitive Area

Justifications	Justification Feature	Classification
1	Bio-diverse Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV)	Sensitive Area
2	SAV Important to Fish and Wildlife Habitat	Sensitive Area
3	Emergent and Floating Leaf Vegetation	Sensitive Area
4	Rush Beds	Sensitive Area
5	Wild Rice Bed	Sensitive Area
6	Extensive Riparian Wetland	Sensitive Area
7	Woody Habitat	Public Rights Feature
8	Spawning Substrate	Public Rights Feature
9	Water Quality (springs, etc)	Public Rights Feature
10	Natural Scenic Beauty	Public Rights Feature
11	Navigational Thoroughfare	Public Rights Feature

Figure 3. Smith Lake Area Wetlands Map



### **Smith Lake Critical Habitat Site SM1**

Critical habitat site SM1 is a Sensitive Area that was designated because of its Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Important to Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Emergent and Floating Leaf Vegetation, and Rush Beds. It is 32.2 acres in size and encompasses all of Smith Lake.

Designate site as Slow-No-Wake. Lakes less than 50 acres with a public boat landing are automatically Slow-No-Wake by statute. While Smith Lake does not have a public boat landing, it would still benefit from minimizing habitat and water quality problems that result from motorboat use on small, fragile lakes.

According to the shoreline inventory, there is some riprap in Site SM1. Riprap is not necessary because the wave energy is low for the entire lake. Low-energy sites are typically not eligible/authorized for riprap permits. If shoreline erosion is a problem, overland runoff from rooftops, driveways, and lawns or reckless motorboat use are the most likely causes.

Established lawn within 50 feet of the water's edge should be replanted with native vegetation to comply with Bayfield County shoreland zoning ordinance, minimize erosion and pollution, and improve fish and wildlife habitat.

Rushes are excellent natural shoreline erosion prevention tools. Do not remove rush beds and instead allow them to expand naturally. Place piers outside of rush beds, or extend piers beyond the rush beds to limit disturbance.

Implement Fish Sticks project. Contact local DNR Fisheries Biologist to investigate funding and technical assistance opportunities.

Table 5 summarizes the current management practices within the Setback, Riparian, Bank, and Littoral Zones of SM1.



Scientific Name	Common Name	Plant Type	FQI Coefficient	Relative Frequency
<i>Alnus sp</i>	Alder	Shrub	-	0.5
<i>Carex sp</i>	Sedges	Emergent	-	0.9
<i>Carex comosa</i>	Bristly sedge	Emergent	5	0.9
<i>Carex rostrata</i>	Beaked sedge	Emergent	10	1.8
<i>Chara</i>	Muskgrasses	Submergent	7	11.9
<i>Elodea canadensis</i>	Common waterweed	Submergent	3	3.7
<i>Heteranthera dubia</i>	Water star-grass	Submergent	6	1.8
<i>Iris versicolor</i>	Northern blue flag	Forb	5	0.5
<i>Lemna minor</i>	Small duckweed	Free Floating	5	0.9
<i>Lysimachia thysiflora</i>	Swamp loosestrife	Forb	7	0.5
<i>Myrica gale</i>	Sweet gale	Shrub	9	4.1
<i>Myriophyllum sibiricum</i>	Northern water-milfoil	Submergent	7	0.5
<i>Najas flexilis</i>	Bushy pondweed	Submergent	6	21.6
<i>Nymphaea odorata</i>	White water lily	Floating Leaf	6	6.0
<i>Potamogeton friesii</i>	Frie's pondweed	Submergent	8	0.9
<i>Potamogeton richardsonii</i>	Clasping-leaf pondweed	Submergent	5	10.1
<i>Potamogeton strictifolius</i>	Stiff pondweed	Submergent	8	1.8
<i>Potamogeton zosteriformis</i>	Flat-stem pondweed	Submergent	6	11.9
<i>Ranunculus aquatilis</i>	Stiff water crowfoot	Submergent	7	1.4
<i>Sagittaria sp</i>	Arrowhead	Emergent	-	0.5
<i>Schoenoplectus acutus</i>	Hardstem bulrush	Emergent	5	6.0
<i>Spirodela polyrhiza</i>	Large Duckweed	Free Floating	5	0.5
<i>Stuckenia pectinata</i>	Sogo pondweed	Submergent	3	8.3
<i>Vallisneria americana</i>	Wild celery	Submergent	6	3.2

<b>SUMMARY STATISTICS</b>	<b>SM1</b>
Total number of points sampled	178
Total number of sites with vegetation	124
Total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants	178
Frequency of occurrence at sites shallower than maximum depth of plants	69.66292
Simpson Diversity Index	0.895211
Maximum depth of plants (Feet)	8
Number of sites sampled using rake on Rope (R)	0
Number of sites sampled using rake on Pole (P)	178
Average number of all species per site (shallower than max depth)	1.22
Average number of all species per site (veg. sites only)	1.76
Average number of native species per site (shallower than max depth)	1.22
Average number of native species per site (veg. sites only)	1.76
Species Richness	24
Species Richness (including visuals)	25
Floristic Quality Index	28.15

Figure 4. SM1 Aquatic Plant Diversity Map






Figure 5. SM1 Rushes Map




Table 5. Shoreline Assessment of SM1				
Feature	Number	Density (per mile)	Shoreline Length (feet)	% of Shoreline
<b>Setback Zone</b>				
Homes	7	7.3		
Accessory Structures	6	6.2		
Commercial Buildings	0	0		
<b>Riparian Zone</b>				
Homes	0	0		
Accessory Structures	8	8.3		
Commercial Buildings	0	0		
Natural vegetation			4831	95.0
Shrub Layer Removed			33	0.6
Shrub & Ground Cover Removed			98	1.9
Established Lawn			115	2.3
Pastureland			0	0
Row Crop			0	0
Beach			0	0
Impervious Surface (road, parking lots, etc.)			0	0
Other: Paved Walkway			7	0.1
Not Visible			0	0
Total Shoreline			5084	100
<b>Bank Zone</b>				
Natural Bank			5045	99.2
Soft bioengineering			0	0
Hard bioengineering			0	0
Riprap			23	0.5
Pea Gravel Blanket			0	0
Established Lawn			16	0.3
Artificial Beach			0	0
Seawalls			0	0
Total Shoreline			5084	100
Boat Ramp	0	0		
Stormwater Outflow	0	0		
<b>Littoral Zone</b>				
Piers	8	8.3		
Boat Lifts	3	3.1		
Swims Rafts/ Trampolines	0	0		
Boathouses	0	0		
Mooring Buoys	0	0		
Dredge channels	0	0		
Commercial Marinas	0	0		
Bridges	0	0		
Plant removal devices	0	0		
Recreational/Public Beaches	0	0		



## Smith Lake Critical Habitat Site SM2

Critical habitat site SM2 is a Sensitive Area that was designated because of its Emergent and Floating Leaf Vegetation, Rush Beds, and Extensive Public Use. It is 1.5 acres in size and is located in the channel from Upper Eau Claire Lake to Smith Lake.

Enforce current Slow-No-Wake ordinance to prevent shoreline erosion and prevent damaging fish and wildlife habitat.

Established lawn within 50 feet of the water's edge should be replanted with native vegetation to comply with Bayfield County shoreland zoning ordinance, minimize erosion and pollution, and improve fish and wildlife habitat.

Rushes are excellent natural shoreline erosion prevention tools. Do not remove rush beds and instead allow them to expand naturally. Place piers outside of rush beds, or extend piers beyond the rush beds to limit disturbance.

Dredging should not be allowed.

Table 8 summarizes the current management practices within the Setback, Riparian, Bank, and Littoral Zones of SM2.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Plant Type	FQI Coefficient	Relative Frequency
<i>Carex sp</i>	Sedges	Emergent	-	2.6
<i>Equisetum fluviatile</i>	Water horsetail	Emergent	7	Visual
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	Common reed	Emergent	1	2.6
<i>Sagittaria sp</i>	Arrowhead	Emergent	-	2.6
<i>Schoenoplectus acutus</i>	Hardstem bulrush	Emergent	5	15.8
<i>Sparganium sp</i>	Bur-reed	Emergent	-	Visual
<i>Typha sp</i>	Cattail	Emergent	1	Visual
<i>Brasenia schreberi</i>	Watershield	Floating Leaf	7	2.6
<i>Nymphaea odorata</i>	White water lily	Floating Leaf	6	10.5
<i>Spirodela polyrhiza</i>	Large Duckweed	Free Floating	5	2.6
<i>Utricularia vulgaris</i>	Common bladderwort	Free Floating	7	2.6
<i>Chara</i>	Muskgrasses	Submergent	7	7.9
<i>Elodea canadensis</i>	Common waterweed	Submergent	3	5.3
<i>Heteranthera dubia</i>	Water star-grass	Submergent	6	Visual
<i>Megalodonta beckii</i>	Water marigold	Submergent	8	5.3
<i>Najas flexilis</i>	Bushy pondweed	Submergent	6	13.2
<i>Potamogeton gramineus</i>	Variable pondweed	Submergent	7	2.6
<i>Potamogeton richardsonii</i>	Clasping-leaf pondweed	Submergent	5	2.6
<i>Potamogeton robbinsii</i>	Robbins pondweed	Submergent	8	7.9
<i>Potamogeton zosteriformis</i>	Flat-stem pondweed	Submergent	6	2.6
<i>Stuckenia pectinata</i>	Sogo pondweed	Submergent	3	2.6
<i>Vallisneria americana</i>	Wild celery	Submergent	6	7.9

Table 7. SM2 Aquatic Plant Sampling Summary Statistics	
<b>SUMMARY STATISTICS</b>	<b>SM2</b>
Total number of points sampled	22
Total number of sites with vegetation	16
Total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants	22
Frequency of occurrence at sites shallower than maximum depth of plants	72.727
Simpson Diversity Index	0.9155
Maximum depth of plants (Feet)	3
Number of sites sampled using rake on Rope (R)	0
Number of sites sampled using rake on Pole (P)	22
Average number of all species per site (shallower than max depth)	1.73
Average number of all species per site (veg. sites only)	2.38
Average number of native species per site (shallower than max depth)	1.73
Average number of native species per site (veg. sites only)	2.38
Species Richness	18
Species Richness (including visuals)	22
Floristic Quality Index	23.86

Figure 6. SM2 Aquatic Plant Diversity Map




Figure 7. SM2 Rushes Map






Table 8. Shoreline Assessment of SM2				
Feature	Number	Density (per mile)	Shoreline Length (feet)	% of Shoreline
<b>Setback Zone</b>				
Homes	1	3.8		
Accessory Structures	0	0		
Commercial Buildings	0	0		
<b>Riparian Zone</b>				
Homes	0	0		
Accessory Structures	0	0		
Commercial Buildings	0	0		
Natural vegetation			1263	90.6
Shrub Layer Removed			0	0
Shrub & Ground Cover Removed			0	0
Established Lawn			131	9.4
Pastureland			0	0
Row Crop			0	0
Beach			0	0
Impervious Surface (road, parking lots, etc.)			0	0
Other			0	0
Not Visible			0	0
Total Shoreline			1394	100
<b>Bank Zone</b>				
Natural Bank			1394	100
Soft bioengineering			0	0
Hard bioengineering			0	0
Riprap			0	0
Pea Gravel Blanket			0	0
Established Lawn			0	0
Artificial Beach			0	0
Seawalls			0	0
Total Shoreline			1394	100
Boat Ramp	0	0		
Stormwater Outflow	0	0		
<b>Littoral Zone</b>				
Piers	0	0		
Boat Lifts	0	0		
Swims Rafts/ Trampolines	0	0		
Boathouses	0	0		
Mooring Buoys	0	0		
Dredge channels	0	0		
Commercial Marinas	0	0		
Bridges	0	0		
Plant removal devices	0	0		
Recreational/Public Beaches	0	0		

## **Appendix 1. Personnel and dates of Critical Habitat Designation, Smith Lake, Bayfield County**

Critical Habitat Designations were performed by Scott Toshner, Pamela Toshner, Greg Kessler, and Paul Cunningham on 6/26/2007.

Shoreline management inventories occurred on 6/16/2008 by Alex Smith and Paul Riordan.

Aquatic plant sampling occurred 7/23/2008 and 8/4/2008 by Alex Smith, Paul Riordan, and Debbie Konkel.

## **Appendix 2: Notice of Public Information Meeting and Hearing for Proposed Critical Habitat Designation**

The Department of Natural Resources has located areas that meet the criteria for Critical Habitat Designation on the Eau Claire Chain of Lakes in Bayfield and Douglas Counties. A public information meeting and hearing has been scheduled to discuss the proposed Critical Habitat Sites on Birch Lake, Bony Lake, Cranberry Lake, Devils Lake, Lower Eau Claire Lake, Middle Eau Claire Lake, Robinson Lake, Shunenberg Lake, Smith Lake, Sweet Lake, and Upper Eau Claire Lake in Bayfield and Douglas Counties.

Because the Critical Habitat Designations are in waters held in trust by the state for all citizens and may be adjacent to private lands, state law provides an opportunity for public input to the Department's decision.

The public informational meeting will be held Saturday, May 15, at 9:00 am at the Barnes Town Hall, 3360 Co Hwy N, Barnes, in Bayfield County. The informational meeting will be an open house format that will allow time to talk with DNR staff, ask questions, and provide written comments regarding the designations.

A public hearing will follow the informational meeting at 11:00 am for persons wishing to present oral testimony. During the hearing, the public can provide factual information about the waterway or the areas proposed for designations in light of the standards below.

Critical Habitat is of vital importance to water quality, hunting, fishing, and natural beauty of Wisconsin's lakes and streams. The Department has made a tentative determination that specific locations in the Eau Claire Chain of Lakes contain:

- Fish and wildlife habitat, including specific sites necessary for breeding, nesting, nursery, and feeding.
- Physical features that ensure protection of water quality.
- Reaches of bank, shore or bed that are predominately natural in appearance (not man-made or artificial) or that screen man-made or artificial features.
- Navigation thoroughfares or areas traditionally used for navigation during recreational boating, angling, hunting, or enjoyment of natural scenic beauty.
- Areas of aquatic vegetation offering critical or unique fish and wildlife habitat, including seasonal or lifestage requirements, or offering water quality or erosion control benefits to the body of water.

The identified locations are eligible for Critical Habitat Designation, and if approved, they will be sufficiently preserved to ensure healthy aquatic systems and protected to maintain the cultural/aesthetic value of lakes to Wisconsin.

Critical Habitat Designation means that special permit conditions or denial of permits may apply to landowners who wish to alter Critical Habitat Areas through activities such as dredging, installing or repairing riprap, grading, irrigation, building dams, or establishing culverts, piers, and docks. Furthermore, in designated Critical Habitat Areas, manual removal of aquatic plants may require a permit, and the chemical treatment or mechanical removal of native aquatic plants is unlikely to be approved.

Draft reports, maps, and more information on Critical Habitat Designations are all available at <http://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/criticalhabitat/> or by contacting Alex Smith at (715) 635-4124.

## **Response to Public Comments on Critical Habitat Designations**

Location: Eau Claire Chain of Lakes in Bayfield and Douglas Counties  
Public Hearing Held: May 15, 2010 at Barnes Town Hall, Barnes, WI  
Comment Period Ended: July 31, 2010

Thank you to everyone who took the time to submit oral and written comments. Seven individuals provided oral comments during the May 15 public hearing. Ten individuals submitted hearing forms but did not speak. During the comment period, the Department received 14 written comments. We organized descriptive comments into the general categories listed below, followed by specific comments and responses.

### ***Category #1 – Comments related to the boundaries and justifications for each Critical Habitat Area***

**Comment 1** – This comment is in regards to UEC 20 on Upper Eau Claire Lake. The person disagreed that the shoreline to the south of the channel leading to Birch Lake offers any spawning habitat. They went on to say that the area experiences very, very intense pressure from swimmers and boaters as it is primarily sand bottom in this area.

**Response 1** – The Barnes Conservation Club in cooperation with the Wisconsin DNR constructed an off shore spawning reef in this area. The intent of the designation in this area is to protect this off shore reef from becoming covered with silt and sand. Electrofishing surveys have documented walleye spawning in this site.

**Comment 2** – Some individuals requested that DNR add Critical Habitat Areas to include the Fish Sticks projects.

**Response 2** – Critical habitat sites were identified based on the features present during the survey. Fish Sticks projects are ongoing and will be captured if future surveys occur. Property owners who participate in Fish Sticks projects enter into agreements that the habitat structures will remain.

**Comment 3** – This comment is in regards to BON 5 on Bony Lake. It was suggested that the DNR add the justifications of Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Important to Fish and Wildlife Habitat and Extensive Riparian Wetland to this area.

**Response 3** – The aquatic plant sampling work done by the DNR and the Wetland Delineation work that was done on the Loon Echo Bay Condo property when a Bayfield County Conditional Use Permit was requested provide evidence to support adding these two justifications.

**Comment 4** – The submerged island off of Pickle barrel Point on Middle Eau Claire Lake should be added as a Critical Habitat Area because there used to be bulrushes growing there in the shallow water.

**Response 4** – A review of historical data and information did not result in evidence that would warrant adding this site. This comment will be considered for future reference



and surveys. DNR welcomes any maps, historical narratives, or other evidence documenting the habitat features.

## ***Category #2 – Comments related to our Management Recommendations***

**Comment 1** – One person would like to see the island on Upper Eau Claire Lake closed to camping due to the partying and erosion from foot traffic.

**Response 1** – In the report, we recommended that the foot paths and stairways be repaired to help mitigate the foot traffic and erosion issues. DNR promotes public access and recreational opportunities. This is the only public camping site in the Eau Claire Lakes area.

**Comment 2** – A few people commented on the excessive partying and swimming occurring at the mouth of the Eau Claire River and “Pickle Barrel Point,” both on Middle Eau Claire Lake.

**Response 2** – Swimming is a form of recreation protected by the Public Trust Doctrine. We cannot restrict this right as long as they are not trespassing. Law enforcement should be contacted if trespassing or rowdy behavior occurs.

**Comment 3** – A few individuals commented that they disagree that riprap should not be used in certain Critical Habitat Areas.

**Response 3** – Riprap is an unnatural structure that creates a physical barrier between the lake and upland areas, and often transfers erosion problems further along the shoreline. Even though properly installed riprap can prevent shoreline erosion, it often does not address the root causes of the shoreline erosion, usually disturbances and impervious surfaces upland from the lake. Naturally vegetated shorelines are the best for reducing erosion.

Natural shorelines along the lakes of Northern Wisconsin are wooded ecosystems. Terrestrial and aquatic animals have evolved with this ecosystem and it is essential to their life cycles. Shifting the near shore cover from vegetation to rock diminishes the ability of the ecosystem to sustain itself.

**Comment 4** – One person commented that we add into our Management Recommendations a recommendation that the rivers and channels between the lakes on the Eau Claire Chain be reclassified to a more protective classification.

**Response 4** – The Recommendations have been added to the reports.

## ***Category #3 – Comments related to the shoreline restorations that have occurred since the initial field work in 2008***

**Comment 1** – Some individuals requested that DNR update the shoreline data to reflect the shoreline restorations that have occurred since 2008. Rip rap and seawalls have been removed and some lawns have been replanted since DNR conducted field work.

**Response 1** – The recommendations regarding the removal of riprap have been removed from the reports. The riprap and lawn data remains in the tables however, and an asterisk has been added with a footnote stating that shoreline restoration work has occurred since the initial field work. This data is a snapshot in time, and we intend to revisit the lake in the future to make comparisons.

#### ***Category #4 – Comments related to navigable channel from Middle Eau Claire Lake to Bony Lake***

**Comment 1** – Some individuals commented that the channel from Middle Eau Claire Lake to Bony Lake needs to remain navigable as there is no public access on Bony Lake.

**Response 1** – The channel between Bony and Middle Eau Claire Lakes is considered navigable.

Public lakes, rivers, and streams that have a bottom (bed) and side (bank), and enough water to float any boat, skiff, or canoe of the shallowest draft on a reoccurring basis are considered navigable. Occasionally, barriers such as wood or plant debris may impede actual navigation, but waters are public even when multiple portages are required to get around obstructions. A waterway does not need to be regularly used for recreational or other general purposes, but is a public waterway based on its *capacity* to be navigable and public. Provided a small boat can float, it is considered navigable. In other words, there is no requirement that the channel provide navigability to large watercraft or boats with inboard motors.

#### ***Category #5 – Comments related to Private Property Rights and Current Regulation***

**Comment 1** – It was stated that government is consistently imposing new regulation, restrictions, laws and taxes on citizens and that Critical Habitat Designations are a ruse of propaganda by the DNR to make a new power grab and infringe on our property rights.

**Response 1** – The Critical Habitat Designation program is not designed to infringe upon the *private* rights of riparian citizens. Instead, the Designations are designed to protect the *public* rights held within the Public Trust Doctrine for all citizens, including those yet unborn.

Wisconsin law recognizes that owners of lands bordering lakes and rivers - "riparian" owners - hold rights in the water next to their property. These riparian rights include the use of the shoreline, reasonable use of the water, and a right to access the water. However, the Wisconsin State Supreme Court has ruled that when conflicts occur

between the rights of riparian owners and public rights, the public's rights are primary and the riparian owner's secondary.

**Comment 2** – County Zoning and the new statewide NR 115 Shoreland Zoning Ordinance are already in place to protect these lakes. If an effort was put into enforcing the regulations which are already on the books, the lakes would be protected.

**Response 2** – The county zoning ordinances are specifically for the shoreland zone above the ordinary high water mark (OHWM). The counties only have jurisdiction above the OHWM. The DNR, and thus Critical Habitat Designations, only have jurisdiction below the OHWM.

The counties can and are encouraged to use our reports to further protect terrestrial areas.

**Comment 3** - Why are some of the areas listed as “some of the most zoning non-compliant areas on the lake” and still be listed as Critical habitat areas with a long list of vegetation and fish habitat. Wouldn't those areas have been destroyed?

**Response 3** – Not necessarily. CHDs document in-lake habitat, scenic beauty, and wildlife features. It is correct that how people care for their properties can affect all of these things, but overall the Eau Claire Chain shoreline is in good shape. Eventually the cumulative impacts of unhealthy shoreline and land use management can tip the in-lake features out of balance. When this occurs, native fish and wildlife reproduction are reduced or stop altogether, natural scenic beauty diminishes, and water quality declines.

**Comment 4** – It is important property owners have a right to enjoy the lake, including having a swimming area.

**Response 4** – Property owners certainly deserve to enjoy the lakes. As such, DNR rules provide property owners an area up to 30 feet wide along their shoreline and out into the water where they may manually remove aquatic plants without a permit. Please note this 30-foot corridor correlates to the 30-foot access and viewing corridor that is allowed on the landward property through county zoning, as well.

### ***Category #6 – Comments related to the support for the Critical Habitat Designation***

**Comment 1** – Many individuals commented on how they support the Designation. Most commented on how much the lakes have changed since they first started visiting the chain and they fully support protecting what is left for future generations.

**Response 1** – Thank you for your support.

**Comment 2** – Over the last 30 years I have seen the water quality decline on the whole Eau Claire Chain, (Sweet Lake & Upper Eau Claire in particular). I am pleased to see a

proposal to maintain/improve shorelines/water quality for future generations. I feel that private property rights should not trump our children's right to clean lakes and rivers.

**Response 2** – As previously stated, the Critical Habitat Program is rooted in the Public Trust Doctrine, which protects the public rights of all citizens including those yet unborn. The science shows shoreline disturbance impacts lake health. Critical Habitat Designation is a tool to protect and improve lake health. The tool is more powerful with community support.

### ***Category #7 – Why did the DNR choose to Designate the Eau Claire Chain?***

**Comment 1** – Why did the DNR choose to do Critical Habitat Designations on the Eau Claire Chain of Lakes?

**Response 1** – There are multiple reasons to do the Critical Habitat Designations on the Eau Claire Chain. First of, the Department knows these lakes are really special and would like to keep them that way. The lakes are classified as Outstanding Resource Waters (ORW), muskellunge recruitment waters, walleye recruitment waters, and have exceptional water quality. Also, both the Town of Barnes Comprehensive Plan and the Eau Claire Lakes Management Plan contain recommendations to have a Critical Habitat Designation completed on the Eau Claire Chain of Lakes.

However, the Eau Claire Chain is not alone in the Critical Habitat Process. The DNR has done Sensitive Area Designations on many lakes statewide. Legislative Act 118, which changed the program from Sensitive Area Designations focusing only on aquatic plants to Critical Habitat Designations considering all public rights features. Currently, several lakes in the area are in the process of having Critical Habitat Designations done as well. Some of those lakes include Amnicon Lake, Upper St. Croix Lake, Gordon Flowage, Minong Flowage, Nancy Lake, Granite Lake, and Beaver Dam Lake.

### ***Closing Statement***

While the purpose of the Critical Habitat Designations is to guide state decisions for the public waterway and inform lakeshore owners about the high quality habitat in the lake, we value the input given from local citizens and organizations during the process. State statutes grant primary management responsibilities over navigable waters to the DNR (except planning, land, acquisition, and boating ordinance development, where local units of government hold authority). As such, the DNR reviews all state permit applications relating to shoreline activities. Since the Critical Habitat Designations affect the state permit process, it does not significantly affect regulations administered by local units of government unless they choose to alter their local regulations and ordinances to utilize the Designations.



