# Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program

## Aquatic Plant Management Plan – Big 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: 2021**

# Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program

## Aquatic Plant Management Plan – Big Lake

**This plan is a product of a WDNR Large Scale 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. 2021. Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program: Big Lake Aquatic Plant Management Plan. White Water Associates, Inc.*

WHITE WATER
ASSOCIATES, INC.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

# 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 Big 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 Big Lake Water Quality*, Appendix D (*Lake Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Monitoring Report), and* Appendix E (*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 (Big 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 Big 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.”



Exhibit 2. Aerial photo of Big Lake.

Descriptive parameters for Big Lake are in Exhibit 3. It is a drainage lake of about 835 acres and maximum depth of 61 feet. 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). Big Lake has an above average SDI compared to other 2019/2020 surveyed lakes, at 2.4. 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 | Big |
| County | Vilas |
| Township/Range/Section | T43N-R6E-S 31, 32, 33 and T42-R6E-S 4, 5, 6 |
| Water Body Identification Code | 2963800 |
| Lake Type | Drainage |
| Surface Area (acres) | 835 |
| Maximum Depth (feet) | 61 |
| Maximum Length (miles) | 1.3 |
| Maximum Width (miles) | 1.4 |
| Shoreline Length (miles) | 9.6 |
| Shoreline Development Index | 2.4 |
| Total Number of Piers (2020 Shoreland) | 45 |
| Number of Piers / Mile of Shoreline | 4.69 |
| Total Number of Homes (2021 aerial) | 49 |
| Number of Homes / Mile of Shoreline | 5.10 |

Big Lake has two public access sites. We observe a total of 45 piers on the shoreline of Big Lake from a 2020 shoreland survey or about 4.69 piers per mile of shoreline.  The riparian area consists of both upland and wetland areas (Exhibit 4).



Exhibit 4. Topographic Map of Big Lake Area.

# 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:

> ***Big 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 Big Lake stewards.

# CHAPTER 4

# Information and Analysis

Our efforts in the Wilderness Waters Program have compiled information about historical and current conditions of the Big 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. Big Lake is contained within the Rice Creek sub-watershed.




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 red and orange areas of the landscape being the highest elevations and greens and blues being the lowest elevations.



Exhibit 6. Digital Elevation Model of Presque Isle Township Area.

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 Big Lake watershed is about 16,400 acres. The cover types in the watershed are presented in Exhibit 7. Forest and surface water comprise the largest components. Soil groups A, B and D are present in the watershed. Soil group A makes up approximately 28% of the watershed, while groups B and D make up 41% and 31% respectively. Soil group A has a high infiltration capacity whereas D has very low infiltration capacity. The watershed to lake area ratio is 20:1. 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 Big Lake Watershed. | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cover Type | Acres | Percent |
| Agriculture | 0 | 0 |
| Commercial | 1.0 | 0.01 |
| Forest | 9604.8 | 58.47 |
| Grass/Pasture | 33.9 | 0.21 |
| High-density Residential | 2.7 | 0.02 |
| Low-density Residential | 755.9 | 4.60 |
| Water | 6027.8 | 36.70 |
| Total | 16426.0 | 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 | 4526.6 | 27.6 | **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 | 6805.4 | 41.4 | **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 | 0 | 0 | **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 | 5094.0 | 31.0 | **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 Big Lake. Over the years, no particular nuisance issues have demanded control action. Formal aquatic plant surveys were conducted on Big Lake in 2007, 2013, and 2020. Findings from these 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 Big Lake by aquatic plant specialists in 2007, 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 Big Lake has been surveyed for aquatic plants three times, we can compare the plant communities present in 2007, 2013, and 2020. 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 is a list of the species encountered, including common and scientific name along with summarizing statistics. Supporting tables and figures for the aquatic plant surveys are provided in Appendix B. We also summarize the aquatic plant findings for the 2007, 2013 and 2020 surveys. Table 3 provides a comparison of statistics from all three survey years.

Species richness refers to the total number of species recorded. In 2020, we documented 42 species of aquatic plants[2] at sampling sites. No additional species were observed during the boat survey. The number of species encountered at any given sample point ranged from 0 to 6 and 90 sample points were found to have aquatic vegetation present. The average number of species encountered at these vegetated sites was 2.63. 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. With a few exceptions, the density values in 2020 were at the lowest level.

The maximum depth of plant colonization in 2020 was 14.5 feet (Table 1 and Figure 3). Rooted vegetation was found at 90 of the 189 sample sites with depth ≤ the maximum depth of plant colonization (47.62 % 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). Figure 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 in 2020. Several metrics are provided, including total number of sites in which each species was found and frequency of occurrence at sites ≤ the maximum depth of rooted vegetation. This frequency metric is standardized as a “relative frequency” (Table 2) by dividing the frequency of occurrence for a species by the sum of frequency of occurrence for all species 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 2013 and 2020 are included for comparison). This display shows that coontail (*Ceratophyllum demersum)* had the highest relative frequency followed by wild celery (*Vallisneria americana*). The lowest relative frequencies are at the far right of the graph. Figure 7 shows the distribution of floating and emergent plants in the lake. As examples of species distributions, we show 2020 occurrences for 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 Big Lake aquatic plants in 2020 was 0.91 (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 Big Lake FQI (33.1) compares to other lakes and regions. The statewide medians for number of species and FQI are 13 and 22.2, respectively. Big Lake values are 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. Big 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. Big Lake data is much higher than that median. Finally, the Big Lake 2020 FQI (33.1) is higher than the median value for the Northern Lakes and Forests Lake group (24.3). These findings support the contention that the Big Lake plant community is healthy and diverse and reflects a relatively undisturbed aquatic ecosystem.

We observed no aquatic plants in Big Lake that would be considered a nuisance-level population density/distribution. We did document, however, small populations of narrow-leaved cattail (*Typha angustifolia),* aquatic forget-me-not (*Myosotis scorpioides*), and the yellow iris (*Iris pseudacorus*) in areas around the shore during the AIS survey and the aquatic plant survey.

We found Northern naiad (Najas gracillima) which is a special concern species in Wisconsin along with Northern wild rice (*Zizania palustris*) which was visually observed at two sites. Wild rice is an important food source for many waterfowl and animals. It also has great cultural significance to the Anishinaabe (Chippewa or Ojibwa), who call it *manoomin* (GLIFWC, *Wild Rice* brochure).

Data from the three plant surveys on Big Lake (2007, 2013, and 2020) reflect a stable, diverse, and healthy plant community over that time period. The average number of species found at vegetated sites has been fairly high and relatively stable (Table 3)[3]. The depth to rooted vegetation has decreased yet the water transparency readings (Secchi depths) have not shown a decrease over the same time period. The frequency of occurrence of plants at sites shallower than the maximum depth of plants was 31.72% in 2007, 37.95% in 2013, and 47.62% in 2020

[3] The 2007 aquatic plant statistics included filamentous algae, which, according to WDNR protocol, should not be included. Because of this, species number, average species per site, SDI and relative frequencies will vary.

indicating an increase in the distribution of rooted vegetation in the lake. The several plant species with the highest relative frequencies in 2013 and 2020 have shown little change over that time period (Figure 6). The Simpson Diversity Index, which takes into account both richness and evenness, was 0.91 in 2007, 0.90 in 2013, and 0.91 in 2020 (Table 3). This indicates a highly diverse and stable plant community. Similarly, the Floristic Quality Indices over the three survey years document a high quality and stable plant community. Table 3 (Appendix B) provides comparisons of the aquatic plant statistics over the three aquatic plant survey years.

## 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 60% sand, 15% gravel, 10% rock, and 15% muck and that fish species present include musky, panfish, largemouth bass, smallmouth bass, northern pike and walleye.

## Part 5. Water Quality and Trophic Status

Big Lake is an 835 acre drainage lake with a maximum depth of 61 feet. Existing water quality data was retrieved from the Wisconsin DNR SWIMS database from 1984 to 2021. In May, 2003 baseline monitoring was performed by the WDNR. Secchi disk measurements were collected by Citizen Lake Monitoring Network (CLMN) volunteers from 1991 to 2020. The water quality information is interpreted in Appendix C.

Temperature and dissolved oxygen showed stratification in Big Lake in the ice-free season. Water clarity is considered "good." Water color is generally low. The trophic state is mesotrophic. Water quality can be classified as "good" with respect to phosphorus concentrations. Chlorophyll *a* (measures the amount of algae), nitrogen, chloride, sulfate, calcium, magnesium, sodium, and potassium are low. The pH of Big Lake is alkaline.

## Part 6. Water Use

Big Lake has two public access sites and is used by riparian owners and recreationists for a variety of activities. Much of the land surrounding Big Lake is owned by the State of Wisconsin.

## Part 7. Riparian Area

Part 1 (Watershed) describes the larger riparian area context of Big 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 2013 aerial photography reveals 38 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.

The WDNR, in 2016, formulated a protocol called *Lake Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Monitoring* (WDNR, 2016). It provides a standard methodology for surveying, assessing, and mapping habitat in lakeshore areas, including the Riparian buffer, Bank, and Littoral Zones (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). Part of the shallow water habitat survey includes documenting woody habitat. A more detailed report can be found in Appendix D.

## 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 the populations of aquatic invasive animal species that already exist in the lake (rusty crayfish, banded mystery snail, and Chinese mystery snail). Finally, it is essential to monitor Big Lake for the presence of new aquatic invasive animal species (for example, spiny water flea, zebra mussels, rainbow smelt, etc.).

Big Lake is currently designated as a *priority Navigable Water (PNW)* (WI Admin. Code, 2014). Priority Navigable Waters meet any of these standards: navigable waterways, or portions thereof, that are considered ORW/ERW 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, 2014). Big 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 Big 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.

# 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 Big Lake is a healthy ecosystem, we could simply recommend an alternative of "no action." In other words, Big Lake continues without any effort or intervention on part of the 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. 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 Big Lake APM Plan |
| --- |
| ***Action #1:*** Formally adopt the Aquatic Plant Management Plan.<br>***Objective:*** To provide foundation for long-term native plant community conservation and stewardship and to be prepared for response to AIS introductions.<br>***Monitoring:*** The Lake Association and the Presque Isle Town Lakes Committee (PITLC) oversees activity and maintains the plan.<br>***Status:*** Planned for 2022. |
| ***Action #2:*** Monitor water quality.<br>***Objective***: Continue with collection and analysis of water quality parameters to detect trends in parameters such as nutrients, chlorophyll *a*, and water clarity.<br>***Monitoring:*** The Lake Association or the PITLC oversees activity and maintains data.<br>***Status:*** Ongoing. |
| ***Action #3:*** Monitor the lake for aquatic invasive plant species.<br>***Objective***: To understand the lake's biotic community, provide for early detection of AIS and continue monitoring any existing populations of AIS.<br>***Monitoring:*** The Lake Association or the PITLC oversees activity and maintains data.<br>***Status:*** Ongoing. |
| ***Action #4:*** Monitor the lake for aquatic invasive animal species.<br>***Objective***: To understand the lake's biotic community, provide for early detection of AIS and continue monitoring any existing populations of AIS.<br>***Monitoring:*** The Lake Association or the PITLC oversees activity and maintains data.<br>***Status:*** Ongoing. |
| ***Action #5:*** Form an Aquatic Invasive Species Rapid Response Team and interface with the Town Lakes Committee AIS Rapid Response Coordinator.<br>***Objective:*** To be prepared for AIS discovery and efficient response.<br>***Monitoring:*** The Lake Association and/or the PITLC coordinate activity.<br>***Status:*** Planned for 2022. |

| Recommended Actions for the Big Lake APM Plan |
|---|
| ***Action #6:*** Conduct quantitative plant survey every five years using WDNR Point-Intercept Methodology.<br>***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.<br>***Monitoring:*** The PITLC oversees and maintains data; copies to WDNR.<br>***Status:*** Anticipated in 2025. |
| ***Action #7:*** Periodically update the APM plan approximately every five years or as needed to reflect new plant information from plant surveys and monitoring.<br>***Objective:*** To have current information and management science included in the plan.<br>***Monitoring:*** Lake Association and/or PITLC oversees and maintains data; copies to WDNR.<br>***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/uwexlakes/clmn for additional ideas).<br>***Objective:*** To create a trained volunteer corps to monitor aquatic invasive species and to educate recreational users regarding AIS.<br>***Monitoring:*** The Lake Association oversees activity and reports instances of possible introductions of AIS.<br>***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.<br>***Objective:*** To protect native aquatic plants, water quality, and riparian habitat.<br>***Monitoring:*** Lake residents and other stakeholders.<br>***Status:*** Ongoing. |

## Recommended Actions for the Big 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:*** The PITLC 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:*** The PITLC oversees activity and assesses effectiveness.

***Status:*** Anticipated to begin in 2022.

***Action #12:*** Monitor the lake watershed for purple loosestrife, yellow iris, and aquatic forget-me-not.

***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 narrow-leaved cattail (*Typha angustifolia*) observed during the 2013 aquatic plant survey.

***Objective:*** Determine whether management of this is warranted or feasible at this site.

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

***Status:*** Anticipated in 2022.

## Recommended Actions for the Big 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 and/or lake association promotes and oversees activity.

***Status:*** Anticipated to begin in 2022.

***Action #15:*** Lake leaders should encourage and assist landowners to take on lake shore/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* looks for partners in this endeavor and can provide planning and sponsorship of projects.

***Objective:*** To rehabilitate specific areas of shoreland to improve natural functions and values.

***Monitoring:*** Lake groups and lake leaders monitor and report progress to Town Lakes Committee.

***Status:*** Anticipated to begin in 2022.

***Action #16:*** As part of an education program, encourage commitment from property owners to adopt practices that maintain/improve health of shoreland areas. In many cases, these are "practices" that mean less or no work (e.g., no mowing, no weed wacking, no leaf blowing, no removing large woody material).

***Objective:*** To engage landowners in simple practices that improve/maintain health of the lake and shoreland.

***Monitoring:*** Each landowner can monitor changes in the shoreland over time by simple means (e.g., annual mid-summer photographs or a catalog of plants and animals seen over time).

***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


Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission (GLIFWC). *Wild Rice. Ecology. Harvest. Management.* [Brochure].

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.

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.

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.

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. p. 13+.

Wisconsin Administrative Code NR-01-05, 06, 07. Revised 2014. *Designated Waters.* Retrieved 2015. <https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/code/admin_code/nr/001/1/05>

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2012. *Invasive Rule – NR 40 Terminology*. Retrieved 2015. <http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/terminology.html>

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 the 2020 point-intercept aquatic plant surveys for Big Lake.**

| Summary Statistic | Value | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| Total number of sites on grid | 685 | Total number of sites on the original grid (not necessarily visited) |
| Total number of sites visited | 238 | Total number of sites where the boat stopped, even if much too deep to have plants. |
| Total number of sites with vegetation | 90 | Total number of sites where at least one plant was found |
| Total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants | 189 | 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 | 47.62 | Number of times a species was seen divided by the total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants. |
| Simpson Diversity Index | 0.91 | 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.) | 14.50 | The depth of the deepest site sampled at which vegetation was present. |
| Number of sites sampled with rake on rope | 42 | |
| Number of sites sampled with rake on pole | 191 | |
| Average number of all species per site (shallower than max depth) | 1.25 | |
| Average number of all species per site (vegetated sites only) | 2.63 | |
| Average number of native species per site (shallower than max depth) | 1.25 | Total number of species collected. Does not include visual sightings. |
| Average number of native species per site (vegetated sites only) | 2.63 | Total number of species collected including visual sightings. |
| Species Richness | 29 | |
| Species Richness (including visuals) | 42 | |
| Floristic Quality Index (FQI) | 33.1 | |

**Table 2. Plant species recorded and distribution statistics for the 2020 Big 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coontail | *Ceratophyllum demersum* | 19.58 | 41.11 | 15.61 | 37 | 41 | 1.27 |
| Wild celery | *Vallisneria americana* | 15.87 | 33.33 | 12.66 | 30 | 37 | 1.03 |
| Flat-stem pondweed | *Potamogeton zosteriformis* | 14.81 | 31.11 | 11.81 | 28 | 44 | 1.00 |
| Northern water-milfoil | *Myriophyllum sibiricum* | 13.23 | 27.78 | 10.55 | 25 | 36 | 1.04 |
| Slender naiad | *Najas flexilis* | 12.70 | 26.67 | 10.13 | 24 | 28 | 1.00 |
| Common waterweed | *Elodea canadensis* | 9.52 | 20.00 | 7.59 | 18 | 23 | 1.00 |
| Fern pondweed | *Potamogeton robbinsii* | 8.99 | 18.89 | 7.17 | 17 | 18 | 1.47 |
| Nitella | *Nitella sp.* | 5.29 | 11.11 | 4.22 | 10 | 10 | 1.00 |
| Variable pondweed | *Potamogeton gramineus* | 3.17 | 6.67 | 2.53 | 6 | 12 | 1.00 |
| Muskgrasses | *Chara sp.* | 2.65 | 5.56 | 2.11 | 5 | 10 | 1.00 |
| Northern naiad | *Najas gracillima* | 2.12 | 4.44 | 1.69 | 4 | 4 | 1.00 |
| Water marigold | *Bidens beckii* | 1.59 | 3.33 | 1.27 | 3 | 4 | 1.00 |
| White water lily | *Nymphaea odorata* | 1.59 | 3.33 | 1.27 | 3 | 23 | 1.00 |
| Large-leaf pondweed | *Potamogeton amplifolius* | 1.59 | 3.33 | 1.27 | 3 | 11 | 1.00 |
| Small pondweed | *Potamogeton pusillus* | 1.59 | 3.33 | 1.27 | 3 | 5 | 1.00 |
| Clasping-leaf pondweed | *Potamogeton richardsonii* | 1.59 | 3.33 | 1.27 | 3 | 17 | 1.00 |
| *Chara braunii* | *Chara braunii* | 1.06 | 2.22 | 0.84 | 2 | 2 | 1.00 |
| Needle spikerush | *Eleocharis acicularis* | 1.06 | 2.22 | 0.84 | 2 | 2 | 1.00 |
| Water star-grass | *Heteranthera dubia* | 1.06 | 2.22 | 0.84 | 2 | 3 | 1.00 |
| Hardstrem bulrush | *Schoenoplectus acutus* | 1.06 | 2.22 | 0.84 | 2 | 10 | 1.00 |
| Common bladderwort | *Utricularia vulgaris* | 1.06 | 2.22 | 0.84 | 2 | 3 | 1.00 |
| Creeping spikerush | *Eleocharis palustris* | 0.53 | 1.11 | 0.42 | 1 | 6 | 1.00 |
| Spatterdock | *Nuphar variegata* | 0.53 | 1.11 | 0.42 | 1 | 6 | 1.00 |
| Berchtold’s pondweed | *Potamogeton berchtoldii* | 0.53 | 1.11 | 0.42 | 1 | 2 | 1.00 |
| Illinois pondweed | *Potamogeton illinoensis* | 0.53 | 1.11 | 0.42 | 1 | 7 | 1.00 |
| White-stem pondweed | *Potamogeton praelongus* | 0.53 | 1.11 | 0.42 | 1 | 11 | 1.00 |
| Stiff pondweed | *Potamogeton strictifolius* | 0.53 | 1.11 | 0.42 | 1 | 1 | 1.00 |

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Crested arrowhead | *Sagittaria cristata* | 0.53 | 1.11 | 0.42 | 1 | 2 | 1.00 |
| Northern wild rice | *Zizania palustris* | 0.53 | 1.11 | 0.42 | 1 | 2 | 1.00 |
| Filamentous algae | | 1.59 | 3.33 | | 3 | 3 | 1.00 |
| Freshwater sponge | | 0.53 | 1.11 | | 1 | 1 | 1.00 |
| Small duckweed | *Lemna minor* | | | | Visual | 3 | |
| Softstem bulrush | *Shoenoplectus tabernaemontani* | | | | Visual | 3 | |
| Watershield | *Brasenia schreberi* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Cypress-like sedge | *Carex pseudocyperus* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Marsh cinquefoil | *Comarum palustre* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Water horsetail | *Equisetum fluviatile* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Northern bugleweed | *Lycopus uniflorus* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Watercress | *Nasturtium officinale* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Pickerelweed | *Pontederia cordata* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Short-stemmed bur-reed | *Sparganium emersum* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Common bur-reed | *Sparganium eurycarpum* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Large duckweed | *Spirodela polyriza* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Sago pondweed | *Stuckenia pectinate* | | | | Visual | 1 | |
| Wild calla | *Calla palustris* | | | | Boat Survey | | |
| Canadian reedgrass | *Calamagrostis canadensis* | | | | Boat Survey | | |
| Common beaked sedge | *Carex utriculata* | | | | Boat Survey | | |
| Yellow iris | *Iris pseudarcorus* | | | | Boat Survey | | |
| Swamp candles | *Lysimachia terrestris* | | | | Boat Survey | | |
| Aquatic forget-me-not | *Myosotis scorpioides* | | | | Boat Survey | | |
| Fries' pondweed | *Potamogeton friesii* | | | | Boat Survey | | |
| Arum-leaved arrowhead | *Sagittaria cuneata* | | | | Boat Survey | | |
| Common arrowhead | *Sagittaria latifolia* | | | | Boat Survey | | |
| Woolgrass | *Scirpus cyprinius* | | | | Boat Survey | | |

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mosquito bulrush | *Scirpus hattorianus* | | | | Boat Survey | | |
| Narrow-leaf cattail | *Typha angustifolia* | | | | 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. Freckmann (U.W. Stevens Point – Herbarium) verified the plant vouchers January 2021.

*Najas gracillima* is a special concern species in Wisconsin.

*Iris pseudacorus, Myosotis scorpioides, and Typha angustifolia* are considered a **Restricted** species in Wisconsin.

**Table 3. Comparison of summary statistics for 2007, 2013, and 2020 point-intercept aquatic plant surveys in Big Lake.**

| Summary Statistic | 2007[1] | 2013 | 2020 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number of sites on grid | 685 | 685 | 685 |
| Total number of sites visited | | 350 | 238 |
| Total number of sites with vegetation | | 74 | 90 |
| Total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants | | 195 | 189 |
| Frequency of occurrence at sites shallower than maximum depth of plants | 31.72 | 37.95 | 47.62 |
| Simpson Diversity Index | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.91 |
| Maximum depth of plants (ft.) | 20.00 | 16.00 | 14.50 |
| Number of sites sampled with rake on rope | | 66 | 42 |
| Number of sites sampled with rake on pole | | 178 | 191 |
| Average number of all species per site (shallower than max depth) | 0.79 | 1.10 | 1.25 |
| Average number of all species per site (vegetated sites only) | 2.52 | 2.89 | 2.63 |
| Average number of native species per site (shallower than max depth) | 0.79 | 1.10 | 1.25 |
| Average number of native species per site (vegetated sites only) | 2.52 | 2.89 | 2.63 |
| Species Richness | 28 | 24 | 29 |
| Species Richness (including visuals) | | 28 | 42 |
| Floristic Quality Index (FQI) | 33.1 | 27.7 | 33.1 |

[1] The 2007 aquatic plant statistics included filamentous algae, which, according to WDNR protocol, should not be included. Because of this, statistics will vary.

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


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





Figure 3. Maximum Depth of Plant Colonization,
Big Lake, 2020
# Sites
Depth Bin (feet)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
1 3 5 7 9 11 13 15 17 19 21 23 25 27 29 31 33 35 37 39

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



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




Figure 6. Big Lake, Plant Finds in 2013 and 2020.
Relative Frequency (%)
20
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
2013
2020
Ceratophyllum demersum
Vallisneria americana
Potamogeton zosteriformis
Myriophyllum sibiricum
Najas flexilis
Elodea canadensis
Potamogeton robbinsii
Nitella sp.
Potamogeton gramineus
Chara sp.
Najas gracillima
Bidens beckii
Nymphaea odorata
Potamogeton amplifolius
Potamogeton pusillus
Potamogeton richardsonii
Chara braunii
Eleocharis acicularis
Heteranthera dubia
Schoenoplectus acutus
Utricularia vulgaris
Eleocharis palustris
Nuphar variegata
Potamogeton berchtoldii
Potamogeton illinoensis
Potamogeton praelongus
Potamogeton strictifolius
Sagittaria cristata
Zizania palustris
Potamogeton foliosus
Potamogeton illinoensis x P. gramineus
Ranunculus aquatilis
Sparganium sp. 2

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



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



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



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




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



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



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



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




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



# Appendix C

# Big Lake Water Quality Report

**Appendix C**

**Review of Lake Water Quality**

## Table of Contents

# Review of Big Lake Water Quality

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

## Introduction

Big Lake is located in Vilas County, Wisconsin. It is an 835 acre drainage lake with a maximum depth of 61 feet. The Waterbody Identification Code (WBIC) is 2334700. The purpose of this study is to develop baseline data. Our goal is to collect existing water quality data to give us a starting point, and continue to monitor Big Lake for a comparison of environmental and human changes. Water quality data was retrieved from the Wisconsin DNR SWIMS from 1984 to 2021. In May, 2003 baseline monitoring was performed by the WDNR and in July 2020 White Water Associates conducted water quality. Secchi disk measurements were collected by Citizen Lake Monitoring Network (CLMN) volunteers from 1991 to 2020. Chlorophyll *a* and total phosphorus were also collected in October, 1985; May, 2003 and 2003-2020 by CLMN volunteers.

## Comparison of Big Lake with other datasets

Lillie and Mason's *Limnological Characteristics of Wisconsin Lakes* (1983) is 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 2-6 indicates the changes in water temperature from various months and years sampled from 2003 to 2020. In May, the temperatures began to stratify from surface to bottom (Figure 2). In June (Figure 3) and July (Figure 4) you can see a thermocline forming at around 12 feet. The temperature profiles begin to shift in August and September (Figure 5 and 6).

**Figure 2. Big Lake temperature profiles, April/May.**




**Figure 3. Big Lake temperature profiles, June.**



**Figure 4. Big Lake temperature profiles, July.**




**Figure 5. Big Lake temperature profiles, August.**



**Figure 6. Big Lake temperature profiles, September/October.**




**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. Dissolved oxygen was taken at the surface once in 1985 and a profile was taken twice in 2003 and once in 2020 (Figure 7). The levels were between 8 mg/L and 10 mg/L at the surface.




## 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 9.4 feet in 2014, and the deepest average depth was 14.63 feet in 1988 (Figure 8 and 9). According to Table 1, the 2020 average Secchi depth classifies Big Lake as "good," with respect to water clarity.

**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. Big Lake Secchi depth averages (July and August only).




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

*(WDNR, 2021)*

## Figure 9. Big Lake's July and August Secchi Data: Mean, Min, Max, and Secchi Count (1986-2020).

| Year | Secchi Mean | Secchi Min | Secchi Max | Secchi Count |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1986 | 10.43 | 7.5 | 13.5 | 7 |
| 1987 | 13.17 | 11.5 | 14.5 | 6 |
| 1988 | 14.63 | 12 | 17.5 | 6 |
| 1989 | 9.94 | 8.5 | 11.25 | 8 |
| 1990 | 9.75 | 9 | 11 | 7 |
| 1991 | 9.69 | 8.5 | 10.5 | 8 |
| 1992 | 9.5 | 8.5 | 11 | 7 |
| 1993 | 10.75 | 9 | 13 | 6 |
| 1994 | 11.5 | 10.5 | 13 | 5 |
| 1995 | 10.75 | 8.5 | 12 | 4 |
| 1996 | 9.75 | 9 | 10.5 | 4 |
| 1997 | 10.88 | 10.25 | 11.5 | 4 |
| 1998 | 9.94 | 9.25 | 10.5 | 4 |
| 1999 | 10 | 8 | 11.5 | 4 |
| 2001 | 10.5 | 10 | 11 | 2 |
| 2002 | 14.13 | 13.75 | 14.5 | 2 |
| 2003 | 11.97 | 10.8 | 12.5 | 6 |
| 2004 | 10.9 | 8.8 | 13 | 2 |
| 2005 | 12 | 10.8 | 13 | 5 |
| 2006 | 11.7 | 10.6 | 12.8 | 2 |
| 2007 | 11.83 | 9 | 13.3 | 4 |
| 2008 | 11.83 | 8.8 | 13.7 | 3 |
| 2009 | 10 | 8.5 | 11.5 | 2 |
| 2010 | 12.31 | 10.25 | 17 | 4 |
| 2011 | 10.45 | 9.9 | 11 | 2 |
| 2012 | 10.85 | 10 | 12.5 | 5 |
| 2013 | 11.2 | 9.25 | 12.5 | 5 |
| 2014 | 9.4 | 7.5 | 12 | 5 |
| 2015 | 12.25 | 11.5 | 13 | 2 |
| 2016 | 9.17 | 8 | 10 | 6 |
| 2017 | 11.6 | 11 | 12 | 5 |
| 2018 | 10.63 | 9.5 | 12.5 | 4 |
| 2019 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 1 |
| 2020 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 2 |

Report Generated: 03/23/2021

*(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. Big Lake turbidity has not been tested, and should be included in future water quality sampling. While checking Secchi depth, CLMN volunteers also rated water clarity and describe the water as "clear" or "murky." From 1986 to 2019, 98% of volunteers rated Big Lake to have "clear" water (Figure 10).

Figure 10. Big Lake water appearance, 1986-2019.




**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. In October, 1985 Big Lake had a color value of 20 Pt-Co. In August, 2003 the color level was also 20 Pt-Co.

The CLMN have also recorded their perceptions of water color in Big Lake. Since 1986, 83% of volunteers indicated the water appeared "blue," 11% indicated the water appeared "brown" and 6% indicated it appeared "green" (Figure 11).




**Water Level**

When CLMN volunteers collect Secchi depth readings, they also record the lake level as "high," "normal," or "low" (Figure 12). In 1987, 1988, 1998, 1999 and 2009 the water level in Big Lake was considered "low." In 2014, 2016-2019, the volunteers viewed Big Lake water levels as "high."




**User Perceptions**

When Secchi depth readings are collected, the CLMN record their perceptions of the water, based on the physical appearance and the recreational suitability. These perceptions 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 Secchi depth decreases, the rating of the lake's physical appearance also decreases. These perceptions of recreational suitability are displayed in Figure 13. From 1988 to 2001, the majority of volunteers viewed Big Lake as having "very minor aesthetic problems." In 2002, 100% of the volunteers recorded the lake to be "beautiful, could not be nicer", there was also a Secchi of 14 which was the clearest since 1989. Unfortunately, in 2006 and 2007, 100% of volunteers said their "enjoyment was substantially impaired (algae)." In 2004, 2008, 2009, 2011 and 2012 over half of the volunteers said they "would not swim, but boating OK (algae)." In 2013 the majority of the time volunteers stated they "would not swim but boating OK (algae) or "enjoyment substantially impaired (algae)." Since 2014, the majority of the volunteers said "beautiful, could not be nicer."




**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* values are shown in Figure 14. Chlorophyll *a* values in Big Lake were below nuisance levels and well below the average levels for Wisconsin natural lakes except in July of 2016. It would be beneficial to continue to monitor chlorophyll *a* to determine any trends in Big Lake.




**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).

Big Lake total phosphorus ranged from 27 µg/L to 14 µg/L, with an average of 21 µg/L (Figure 15). According to Figure 16, the average total phosphorus for Big Lake classifies it as "good."




**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 measurements (1986-2013), chlorophyll *a* (1984 and 2003), and total phosphorus (2003) collected from the CLMN. The July and August average Secchi TSI (43.5), chlorophyll *a* TSI (51.7) and total phosphorus TSI (48) (Figure 14) classify Big Lake as "mesotrophic" (Table 2).

| Table 2. Trophic State Index. | |
|---|---|
| **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 fish kill |
| **70-80** | **Hypereutrophic:** heavy algal blooms through most of summer; dense aquatic plant growth; poor water clarity; high nutrient levels |

*(WDNR, 2013)*

**Figure 17. Big Lake Trophic State Index (1984-2020).**



*(WDNR, 2021)*

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 *a* 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. Big Lake was analyzed for total Kjeldahl nitrogen (0.6 mg/L surface and 1.8 mg/L bottom (10/15/1985) and 0.39 mg/L (8/4/2003), ammonium (0.06 mg/L surface and 1.5mg/L bottom on 10/15/1985, and nitrate-nitrite was 0.02 mg/L surface and bottom on 10/15/1985 and not detected 8/4/2003. Nitrogen is a major component of all organic (plant and animal) matter. Decomposing organic matter releases ammonia, which is converted to nitrate if oxygen if 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, marcrophytes), 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).

## 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). Big Lake chloride levels are displayed in Figure 18. Chloride in Big Lake was well below the generalized distribution gradient in Wisconsin surface waters.




**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). Big Lake was sampled for sulfate 10/15/1985 and had a value of 3 surface and 9 mg/L bottom. On 7/15/2020 Big Lake sulfate was 4.13 mg/L.

**Conductivity**

Conductivity is a measure of the ability of water to conduct an electric current. Conductivity is reported in micromhos per centimeter **(**µmhos/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). Big Lake conductivity levels are displayed in Figure 19.




**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. Figure 20 displays the years and values pH was sampled indicating that the lake is slightly alkaline.




Table 4 shows the effects pH levels less than 6.5 will have on fish. Since Big Lake is alkaline, it is unlikely the pH would have negative effects any fish species. 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).**

| *Water pH* | *Effects* |
|---|---|
| 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 8/4/2003 (56 mg/L) and 7/15/2020 (55.1 mg/L). Based on this value, Big 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). | |
|---|---|
| ***Sensitivity to acid rain*** | ***Alkalinity value (mg/L or ppm $CaCO_3$)*** |
| 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 ($CaCO_3$). Big Lake hardness was 58.9 and 61.4 mg/L in October, 1985. Table 6 suggests Big Lake has “soft” to “moderately hard” water.

| Table 6. Categorization of hardness (mg/L of calcium carbonate ($CaCO_3$)) (Shaw et al., 2004). | |
|---|---|
| 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. Big Lake had a calcium level of 17 and 18 mg/L in October, 1985, and 16.5 mg/L in August, 2003, which is an indication that zebra mussels could flourish (Figure 21). Magnesium is shown in Figure 22.







**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). Big Lake sodium (1 mg/L surface and 2 mg/L bottom) and potassium (1 mg/L) were sampled in October, 1985.

**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 extremely 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. Big Lake DOC has not been tested, 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. Big Lake was analyzed for silica in October, 1985 and had values of 8.9 surface and 14 mg/L bottom.

**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. Big Lake aluminum was sampled in August, 2003 and had a value of 25 µg/L.

**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. Big Lake iron levels have not been tested, and should be included in future water quality sampling.

**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 data is unknown for Big Lake, so future water quality sampling should include this parameter.

**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 Big 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 Big Lake, so future water quality sampling should include this parameter.

**Aquatic Invasive Species**

There are three invasive species found in Big Lake: banded mystery snail (found in 2010), Chinese mystery snail (2005) and rusty crayfish (1961). White Water Associates biologist conducted a Aquatic Invasive Survey June 16, 2020. Narrow-leaved cattail, aquatic forget-me-not and the yellow iris were found in addition to the Chinese and banded mystery snail. A detailed report can be found in Appendix E.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison's Aquatic Invasive Species Smart Prevention program classifies Big Lake as "Borderline Suitable" for zebra mussels, based on calcium and conductivity levels found in the lake (UW-Madison).

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 inspected 335 boats in 2019 at Big Lake with 446 people being contacted (Figure 23). It would be beneficial for Big Lake to continue the CBCW program.

**Figure 23. Big Lake (Hwy K Access) Clean Boats Clean Waters data (WDNR, 2021).**

**Literature Cited**


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 2014. <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 2014. <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 2014. <http://www.aissmartprevention.wisc.edu/>

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2021. *Clean Boats, Clean Waters*. Retrieved 2014. <http://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/cbcw/>

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

# Appendix D

# Big Lake Shoreland and Shallows

# Habitat Monitoring Report

# Big 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)

WHITE WATER ASSOCIATES, INC.

**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 Big 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.

Photo of the water's edge and understory vegetation on Big Lake (White Water Associates, Inc., 2020)

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 Big 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 June 15, 2020. At the time of the survey there were 56 ownership parcels on Big Lake. The shoreline perimeter of Big Lake is 8.976 miles. Exhibit 4 summarizes some of the Big Lake data. Exhibits 5 through 13 provide maps of findings on Big 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 Big 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 somewhat low.

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

Big 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 Big Lake is in a mostly natural state, there are many 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). Big Lake large woody habitat is somewhat low. A program that could be augmented in areas that are sparse would be the “fish sticks” best practice.

Exhibit 1. Shoreland Parcels.



## Habitat Assessment Data Sheet (one per parcel)

Date ______________ Lake name ____________________________ WBIC__________

Parcel ID__________________ Observers____________________________________________________

**RIPARIAN BUFFER ZONE**

| **Percent Cover** | Percent | |
|---|---|---|
| Canopy | | (0-100) |
| Shrub ☐ Herbaceous ☐ | | |
| Shrub/Herbaceous | | sum=100 |
| Impervious surface | | |
| Manicured lawn | | |
| Agriculture | | |
| Other (e.g. duff, soil, mulch) | | |

description:_________________________

| **Human Structures** | Number |
|---|---|
| Buildings | |
| Boats on shore | |
| Fire pits | |
| Other | |

description:_________________________

| **Runoff Concerns in Riparian or Entire Parcel** | Present in Riparian | Present out of Riparian |
|---|---|---|
| Point source | ☐ | ☐ |
| Channelized water flow/gully | ☐ | ☐ |
| Stair/trail/road to lake | ☐ | ☐ |
| Lawn/soil sloping to lake | ☐ | ☐ |
| Bare soil | ☐ | ☐ |
| Sand/silt deposits | ☐ | ☐ |
| Other | ☐ | ☐ |

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 | ☐ |
| Floating | ☐ |
| Plant Removal | ☐ |

**If Applicable (low water level):**

**EXPOSED LAKE BED ZONE**

| **Plants** | Present |
|---|---|
| Canopy | ☐ |
| Shrubs | ☐ |
| Herbaceous | ☐ |
| **Disturbed** | |
| Plants (mowed or removed) | ☐ |
| Sediment (tilled or dug) | ☐ |

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 Big Lake. | | |
|---|---|---|
| Date of Survey: June 15, 2020 | Miles of shoreline: 8.976 | |
| Number of ownership parcels: 56 | Mean parcel frontage feet: 903 | |
| Riparian Buffer Zone | # of parcels | % of parcels |
| Impervious surfaces | 42 | 75 |
| Manicured lawn | 34 | 61 |
| Agriculture | 0 | 0 |
| Other (duff, soil, mulch) | 6 | 11 |
| Human structures (buildings, boats on shore, fire pit, other) | 41 | 73 |
| 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. | 41 | 73 |
| 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) | 15 | 27 |
| 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) | 39 | 70 |
| Emergent and/or floating aquatic plants | 36 | 64 |
| Evidence of aquatic plant removal | 0 | 0 |
| Large Wood Habitat | | |
| Total Number of large wood pieces | 305 | |
| Number of large wood pieces per mile of shoreline | 31.8 | |

# Exhibit 5. Big 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: 23,760

## Notes

0.8 0 0.38 0.8 Miles

NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM

# Exhibit 6. Big 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: 23,760

Notes

0.8 0 0.38 0.8 Miles

NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM

# Exhibit 7. Big Lake Riparian Coverage - % Impervious - 2020




1: 23,760

## 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

## Notes

0.8 0 0.38 0.8 Miles

NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM

# Exhibit 8. Big 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

Notes

0.8 0 0.38 0.8 Miles

NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM

# Exhibit 9. Big 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: 23,760

Notes

0.8 0 0.38 0.8 Miles

NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM

# Exhibit 10. Big 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: 23,760

0.8 0 0.38 0.8 Miles

NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM





Notes

# Exhibit 11. Big 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

Notes

1: 23,760

0.8 | 0 | 0.38 | 0.8 Miles

NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM

# Exhibit 12. Big Lake Littoral Zone - Human Structures - 2020




Legend

Swim Rafts
- 1
- 2
- 3 - 5
- 6+

Boat Lifts
- 1
- 2
- 3 - 5
- 6+

Piers
- 1
- 2
- 3 - 5
- 6+

Boat Houses
- 1
- 2
- 3 - 5
- 6+

Marinas
- 1
- 2
- 3 - 5
- 6+

Shoreland Parcels

1: 23,760

Notes

0.8 0 0.38 0.8 Miles

NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM

# Exhibit 13. Big Lake Woody Habitat - 2020


## Legend

WH Branchiness
- No branches
- Few branches
- Full tree crown

WH Touching Shore
WH In Water
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: 23,760

## Notes

0.8 0 0.38 0.8 Miles

NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM

## 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

# Big Lake Aquatic Invasive Species Report

# Big Lake (Vilas County, Wisconsin)

# Aquatic Invasive Species Report



White Water Associates, Inc.

Date: 2020

# INTRODUCTION

White Water Associates, Inc. has been retained by Wilderness Waters: through a Lake Planning Grant on Big 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 Big Lake. This work prepares Big Lake stakeholders to conduct actions that serve lake health. A portion of this project monitored Big 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 Big Lake Survey took place June 16, 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 and the park boat landing were surveyed for 15 minutes by checking the dock and walking 200 feet of shoreline and a biologist snorkeled. 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 high-water clarity (it is very easy to see into the water from the boat) except at the boat landings. 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 water flea exoskeleton fragments. In Big 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 are five known AIS that are established in Big Lake prior to this survey. The banded and Chinese mystery snail, rusty crayfish, narrow-leaf cattail, and purple loosestrife. During the survey two new invasive plants were noted including the Aquatic Forget-Me-Not (*Myosotis scorpioides*) and the Yellow Iris (*Iris pseudacoris*) (Exhibit 4). Both species were documented during the meander search (Exhibit 1, 4, and 5). A voucher specimen of both the aquatic forget-me-not and the yellow iris were collected during the aquatic plant survey and sent to Dr. Freckmann (U.W. Steven's Point) and they were both confirmed in November, 2020. Site 2 had no AIS present.




Exhibit 1. Big Lake AIS survey sites 1-5, meander sites, and zooplankton sites.

| **Exhibit 2. AIS Survey on Big Lake 6/20/2020.**<br>**Density (1-5), and live (L) or dead (D).** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Site** | **Latitude** | **Longitude** | **Species found** |
| 1 | 46.14928 | -89.77995 | Chinese mystery snail 3 (L), Banded mystery snail 2 (L), Rusty crayfish 1 (D) |
| 2 | 46.16353 | -89.77319 | Banded mystery snail 1 (L) |
| 3 | 46.15471 | -89.74761 | No AIS |
| 4 | 46.14782 | -89.75783 | Banded mystery snail 1 (L), Rusty crayfish 1 (D) |
| BL | 46.16233 | -89.78630 | Aquatic forget-me-not 1 (L) |
| BL1 | 46.14467 | -89.77427 | Banded mystery snail 1 (D) |
| MS1 | 46.14937 | -89.77884 | Yellow iris 1 (L) |
| MS2 | 46.14946 | -89.77827 | Yellow iris 1 (L) |
| MS3 | 46.16233 | -89.78467 | Aquatic forget-me-not 1 (L) |
| MS4 | 46.15694 | -89.76662 | Yellow iris 1 (L) |
| MS5 | 46.162844 | -89.78605 | Narrow-leaved cattail 1 (L) |
| MS6 | 46.162844 | -89.162844 | Aquatic forget-me-not 1 (L) |
| MS7 | 46.15574 | -89.75552 | Aquatic forget-me-not 1 (L) |
| MS8 | 46.15520 | -89.75632 | Yellow iris 1 (L) |
| MS9 | 46.15036 | -89.75848 | Yellow iris 1 (L) |
| MS10 | 46.14915 | -89.76802 | Yellow iris 2 (L) |

| Exhibit 3. Spiny Water Flea Zooplankton Tows from Big Lake | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Date: 6/16/2020** | **GPS Coordinates** | | **Depth of sample (feet)** |
| Site 1 | 46.15438 | -89.76145 | 25 |
| Site 2 | 46.14861 | -89.75000 | 25 |
| Site 3 | 46.14516 | -89.77435 | 24 |

Exhibit 4. Yellow Flag Iris 2020 (White Water Associates, photo).



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

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.

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).

Chinese mystery snails are from Southeast Asia and Eastern Russia and were likely released to the Great Lakes from an aquarium (Kipp et al., 2015). The snail does not seem to have a significant impact on native species, but its ecological and anthropological threat comes from its potential to transmit parasites and diseases (Kipp et al., 2015). It is illegal to introduce the Chinese mystery snail into Wisconsin waters.

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).

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 Wisconsin DNR has a very informative website that educates on invasive species. The Big 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. 2019. *Aquatic Forget-me-not*. Retrieved 2019. < https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/fact/AquaticForgetMeNot.htm>