
Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program


Aquatic Plant Management Plan – Annabelle 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



Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program Aquatic Plant Management Plan – Annabelle Lake

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

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

Submitted to:

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

Prepared by:

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

Cite as: Premo, Dean, Angie Stine, and Kent Premo. 2021. Presque Isle Wilderness Waters Program: Annabelle Lake Aquatic Plant Management Plan. White Water Associates, Inc.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. Study Area	5
Chapter 3. Purpose and Goal Statements	9
Chapter 4. Information and Analysis	10
Part 1. Watershed	10
Part 2. Aquatic Plant Management History	13
Part 3. Aquatic Plant Community Description	14
Part 4. Fish Community	18
Part 5. Water Quality and Trophic Status	18
Part 6. Water Use	18
Part 7. Riparian Area	18
Part 8. Wildlife	20
Part 9. Stakeholders	21
Chapter 5. Recommendations, Actions, and Objectives	22
Chapter 6. Contingency Plan for AIS	27
Appendix A – Literature Cited	
Appendix B – Tables and Figures	
Appendix C – Review of Lake Water Quality	
Appendix D – Annabelle Lake Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Monitoring Report	
Appendix E – Annabelle Lake Aquatic Invasive Species Report	

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

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

This aquatic plant management plan addresses Annabelle 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 2019 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 proliferate in a water body negatively influence the community of native species. Eurasian water-milfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*) is one of the invasive plant species capable of this kind of population boom. Fortunately, this kind of rampant growth of aquatic invasive plants does not always occur. On occasion, even a native plant species can exhibit rampant growth and results in a population that is viewed by some as a recreational nuisance. The Southern Naiad (*Najas guadalupensis*) has exhibited this kind of behavior in some northern Wisconsin lakes.

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. In some lakes even the presence of an aquatic invasive plant species is not a significantly negative phenomenon.

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. Actions taken to curtail specific plant population (for example, herbicide use to treat Eurasian watermilfoil) will invariably impact other desirable native species. Rare plants, important habitats, or culturally significant plants (such as wild rice) should always be given careful consideration and protection.

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

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

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
- **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, the 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 Annabelle Lake Water Quality*. Appendix D contains the *Lake Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Monitoring Report*, and Appendix E contains the *Aquatic Invasive Species Report* from 2019.

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 (Annabelle 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 Annabelle 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 Annabelle Lake.

Descriptive parameters for Annabelle Lake are in Exhibit 3. It is a drainage lake of about 194 acres and maximum depth of 30 feet. The shoreline development index values for thirteen of the Wilderness Waters Program lakes surveyed in 2019 and 2020 ranged from 1.3 to 3.7 (average = 2.1). Annabelle Lake’s shoreline development index (2.2) is slightly above this average. 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	Annabelle
County	Vilas
Township/Range/Section	T43N-R06E-S12,13, T43N-R07E-S7,18
Water Body Identification Code	2953800
Lake Type	Drainage
Surface Area (acres)	194
Maximum Depth (feet)	30
Maximum Length (miles)	1.0
Maximum Width (miles)	0.7
Shoreline Length (miles)	4.24
Shoreline Development Index	2.2
Total Number of Piers (2019 Shoreline)	41
Number of Piers / Mile of Shoreline	9.7
Total Number of Homes (2021 aerial)	31
Number of Homes / Mile of Shoreline	7.3

Annabelle Lake has one public access site. We observe a total of 41 piers on the shoreline of Annabelle Lake from a 2019 shoreland survey or about 9.7 piers per mile of shoreline. The riparian area consists of both upland and wetland areas (Exhibit 4).



CHAPTER 3

Purpose and Goal Statements

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

Annabelle 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 Annabelle Lake stewards.


CHAPTER 4

Information and Analysis

Our efforts in the Wilderness Waters Program have compiled information about historical and current conditions of the Annabelle 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. Annabelle Lake is contained within the South Branch Presque Isle River sub-watershed (Exhibit 5).



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

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



The watershed (drainage basin) is all of the land and water areas that drain toward a particular river or lake. A water body is greatly influenced by its watershed. Watershed size, topography, geology, land use, soil fertility and erodibility, and vegetation are all factors that influence water quality. The Annabelle Lake watershed is about 3,175 acres. The cover types in the watershed are presented in Exhibit 7. Forest and surface water comprise the largest components. Soil group B is most prevalent, followed by group D, while groups A and C make up a small percentage of the watershed. Soil group A has the highest infiltration capacity, and the lowest runoff potential. Conversely, soil group D has the lowest infiltration capacity, and the highest runoff potential. The watershed to lake area ratio is 16:1. 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 Annabelle Lake Watershed.			
Cover Type		Acres	Percent
Agriculture		0	0
Commercial		0	0
Forest		1768.0	55.7
Grass/Pasture		4.7	0.1
High-density Residential		0	0
Low-density Residential		282.7	8.9
Water		1120.9	35.3
Total		3176.3	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	22.5	0.7	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	1987.2	62.6	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	36.8	1.2	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	1129.8	35.6	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 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 Annabelle Lake. Over the years, no particular nuisance issues have demanded control action. In 1997 there was an aquatic plant survey using transects. In 2008, an aquatic

plant survey was conducted on Annabelle Lake, and again in the summer of 2014 and 2019. Findings from the 2008, 2014, and 2019 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 Annabelle Lake by aquatic plant specialists in 2008, 2014, and 2019. 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 Annabelle Lake has been surveyed three times, we are able to identify differences in the plant community that have resulted over the course of the eleven-year interval. 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 2019 point-intercept aquatic plant survey and summarize and compare findings of the 2008, 2014, and 2019 surveys. Supporting tables and figures for the aquatic plant surveys are provided in Appendix B. Table 3 provides a comparison of statistics from all three survey years.

Species richness refers to the total number of species recorded. We recorded 31 species of aquatic plants (including visuals) in 2019. Of these, 18 were collected at sampling sites and the others were observed from the boat. Table 1 displays summary statistics for the 2019 survey. Table 2 provides a list of the species encountered in 2019, including common and scientific name along with summarizing statistics.² The number of species encountered at any given sample point ranged from 0 to 4 and 50 sample points were found to have aquatic vegetation present. The average number of species encountered at these vegetated sites was 1.42. 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.

The maximum depth of plant colonization was 7.5 feet (Table 1 and Figure 3). Rooted vegetation was found at 50 of the 130 sample sites with depth \leq the maximum depth of plant colonization (38.46 % 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. Several metrics are provided, including total number of sites in which each species was found and frequency of occurrence at sites \leq the maximum depth of rooted vegetation. This frequency metric is standardized as a “relative frequency” (also shown in Table 2) by dividing the frequency of occurrence for a given species by the sum of frequency of occurrence for all plants and multiplying by 100 to form a percentage. The resulting relative frequencies for all species total 100%. The relative frequencies for the plant species collected with a rake are graphically displayed in descending order on Figure 6. This display shows that quillwort (*Isoetes* sp.) along with large purple bladderwort (*Utricularia purpurea*) had the highest relative frequencies. The lowest relative frequencies are at the far right of the graph. As examples of individual species distributions, we show the occurrences of a few of the most frequently and least frequently encountered plants in Figures 8-13.

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 Annabelle Lake aquatic plants is 0.88 (Table 1) which indicates a 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 Annabelle Lake FQI (34.9) compares to other lakes and regions. The statewide medians for number of species and FQI are 13 and 22.2, respectively. Annabelle Lake values are higher than 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. Annabelle 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. Annabelle Lake data is higher than that find. Finally, the Annabelle Lake FQI (34.9) is higher than the median value for the Northern Lakes and Forests lakes group (24.3). This analysis supports the contention that the Annabelle Lake plant community is healthy and diverse. The high FQI value is indicative of a relatively undisturbed environment. We observed no aquatic plants in Annabelle Lake that would be considered a nuisance-level population density/distribution. We found no state or federally listed species.

Table 3 contains statistics that compare the aquatic plant communities documented in each of the three point-intercept surveys (2008, 2014, and 2019, note that some statistics were not available for 2008). The total number of sites with vegetation was very similar between years. The same is true for the total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants. The frequency of occurrence at sites shallower than maximum depth of plants increased over the three surveys (more sites had rooted plants in the recent survey). The maximum depth of plants has decreased somewhat between 2008 and 2014 surveys, but only slightly between the 2014 and 2019 surveys. The average number of species found at any site was remarkably similar over the three surveys. With regard to biological diversity, both Simpson's Diversity Index and species richness were high and very stable across the years of surveys. Similarly, the Floristic Quality Index is high and stable reflecting a very high quality flora in the lake. Figure 6 compares the relative frequency of aquatic plants between the 2014 and 2019 surveys. Quillwort (*Isoetes sp.*) and purple bladderwort (*Utricularia purpurea*) were important in terms of relative frequency in both years. As in most plant communities, a few species are quite common and most species are relatively uncommon.

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 70% sand, 20% gravel, 5% rock, and 5% muck and that fish species present include musky, panfish, smallmouth bass, northern pike, and walleye. In 1998 Annabelle Lake was listed on the 303(d)-list due to mercury concentrations in fish tissue. There is unrestricted fish consumption.

Part 5. Water Quality and Trophic Status

Annabelle Lake is a 194 acre drainage lake with a maximum depth of 30 feet. Existing water quality information includes data was retrieved from the Wisconsin DNR SWIMS database from 1996 to 2020, and Secchi disk measurements taken by Citizen Lake Monitoring volunteers from 1997 to 2020. The water quality information is briefly summarized in this section, but more fully interpreted in Appendix C.

Temperature and dissolved oxygen showed stratification in Annabelle Lake at times in the ice-free season. Average water clarity is considered “poor to fair” based on average Secchi depths. User perception of Annabelle Lake aesthetic quality is generally regarded as “beautiful, could not be nicer” the majority of the years analyzed. The trophic state is mesotrophic. Water quality would be classified as “good” with respect to phosphorus concentrations. Chlorophyll *a*, chloride, hardness, conductivity, calcium, magnesium, sodium, and potassium are considered low. The pH of Annabelle Lake is neutral.

Part 6. Water Use

Annabelle Lake has one public access site, and is used by riparian owners and recreationists for a variety of activities. There is an island nearest the boat landing (parcel 22-399) with State of Wisconsin ownership on the lake.

Part 7. Riparian Area

Part 1 (Watershed) describes the larger riparian area context of Annabelle 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 2021 aerial photography reveals 31 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 for the presence of aquatic invasive wildlife species (for example, rusty crayfish, spiny water flea, or zebra mussel) and fish species (for example, rainbow smelt or common carp).

Annabelle Lake is currently designated as an *area of special natural resource interest* (ASNRI) and a *priority navigable water* (PNW) (WI Admin. Code, 2014). A water body designated as an Area of Special Natural Resource Interest can be any of the following: WDNR trout streams; Outstanding or Exceptional Resource Waters (ORW/ERW); waters or portions of waters inhabited by endangered, threatened, special concern species or unique ecological communities; wild rice waters; waters in ecologically significant coastal wetlands along Lake Michigan and Superior; or federal or state waters designated as wild or scenic rivers (WI Admin. Code, 2014). Annabelle Lake is considered an ASNRI because it harbors state or federally designated threatened or endangered species. The Wisconsin Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) lists plants and animals as rare or sensitive species and/or communities that are considered high-quality and significant natural features. Exhibit 8 provides rare or sensitive species or communities that are found in the same town/range as Annabelle Lake (NHI, 2021).

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). Annabelle Lake is considered a PNW with self-sustaining musky and walleye populations.

Exhibit 8. Rare Species and Communities located near Annabelle Lake.			
<i>Common Name</i>	<i>Scientific Name</i>	<i>State Status</i> ³	<i>Group Name</i>
Bird Rookery	Bird Rookery	SC	
Black Spruce Swamp	Black Spruce Swamp	NA	
Calypso Orchid	<i>Calypso bulbosa</i>	THR	Plant
Downy Willow-herb	<i>Epilobium strictum</i>	SC	Plant
Boreal rich fen		NA	Community
Wild rice marsh		NA	Community
Ephemeral pond		NA	Community
Lake-deep, soft, seepage		NA	Community
Lake-spring		NA	Community
Four-toed salamander	<i>Hemidactylum scutatum</i>	SC/H	Salamander
Northern mesic forest		NA	Community
Northern wet forest		NA	Community
Northern wet-mesic forest		NA	Community
Poor fen		NA	Community
Mink Frog	<i>Lithobates septentrionalis</i>	SC/H	Frog
Smith's Melic Grass	<i>Mellica smithii</i>	END	Plant
Canada Jay	<i>Perisoreus canadensis</i>	SC/M	Bird
Water Shrew	<i>Sorex palustris</i>	SC/N	Mammal
Northern dry-mesic forest		NA	
Boreal Chickadee	<i>Poecile hudsonicus</i>	SC/M	Bird
Lake Emerald	<i>Somatochlora cingulate</i>	SC/N	Dragonfly
Spring Pond		NA	
Stream—slow, soft, warm		NA	

³ **END**=Endangered; **THR**=Threatened; **SC**=Special Concern; **SC/P**=fully protected; **SC/N**=no laws regulating use, possession or harvesting; **SC/H**=take regulated by establishment of open/closed seasons; **SC/FL**=federally protected as endangered or threatened, but not so designated by DNR; **SC/M**=fully protected by federal and state laws under Migratory Bird Act.

Part 9. Stakeholders

At this juncture in the ongoing aquatic plant management planning process, the Town Lakes Committee has represented the Annabelle 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) 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.*

Since Annabelle Lake is a healthy ecosystem, we could simply recommend an alternative of “no action.” In other words, Annabelle Lake continues without any effort or intervention on part of lake stewards. Nevertheless, we consider the “no action” alternative imprudent. Many forces threaten the quality of the lake and Wilderness Waters Program and Town Lakes Committee feels a great responsibility to minimize the threats. 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).

At this time, we recommend no direct manipulation of plant populations in Annabelle Lake. Three aquatic invasive plant species are known to be present and no native plants exhibit nuisance population size or distribution. Action should be taken to remove the purple loosestrife and aquatic forget-me-not at the boat landing. Reed canary grass is also located at various locations around the lake and should be monitored.

Recommended Actions for the Annabelle Lake APM Plan

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

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

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

Status: Planned for 2022.

Action #2: Monitor water quality.

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

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

Status: Ongoing.

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

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

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

Status: Ongoing.

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

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

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

Status: Ongoing.

Recommended Actions for the Annabelle Lake APM Plan

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

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

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

Status: Planned for 2022.

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

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

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

Status: Anticipated in 2024.

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

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

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

Status: Ongoing.

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

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

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

Status: Anticipated to begin in 2022.

Recommended Actions for the Annabelle Lake APM Plan

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

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

Monitoring: Lake residents and other stakeholders.

Status: Ongoing.

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

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

Monitoring: Town Lakes Committee oversees activity and assesses effectiveness.

Status: Ongoing.

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

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

Monitoring: Town Lakes Committee oversees activity and assesses effectiveness.

Status: Anticipated to begin in 2022.

Action #12: Monitor the lake watershed for purple loosestrife, aquatic forget-me-not, and reed canary grass and control the purple loosestrife and aquatic forget-me-not at the boat landing.

Objective: Identify these AIS populations and control before they reach a large size.

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

Status: Anticipated in 2022.

Recommended Actions for the Annabelle Lake APM Plan

Action #13: Identify and highlight high quality areas of littoral zone and riparian areas through review of aquatic plant and shoreland assessment data through various reports and online tools.

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

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

Status: Anticipated to begin in 2022.

Action #14: Lake leaders should encourage and assist landowners to take on shoreland and shallow water improvement projects to rehabilitate areas identified through formal shoreland/shallow water assessments and/or lake user observations (sites might include areas of active erosion, channelized flow, point source pollution, impervious surfaces, and lawns) Vilas County Land and Water Conservation Department looks for partners in this endeavor and can provide planning and sponsorship of projects. Funding for eligible projects is available from WDNR. Example projects on active lake stewards' properties would serve as valuable demonstration projects and encourage others to participate.

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

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

Status: Anticipated to begin in 2022.

Action #15: Investigate WDNR programs such as “Fish Stix” to educate and provide direction and funding for habitat improvements.

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

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

Status: Anticipated to begin in 2022.

CHAPTER 6

Contingency Plan for AIS

Unfortunately, sources of aquatic invasive plants and other AIS are numerous in Wisconsin. Some infested lakes are quite close to Presque Isle Township. There is an increasing likelihood of accidental introduction of AIS to Presque Isle Township Lakes through conveyance of life stages by boats, trailers, and other vectors. It is important for the Town Lakes Committee and other lake stewards to be prepared for the contingency of aquatic invasive plant species colonization in a Presque Isle Township water body. As part of this grant an Aquatic Invasive Survey was conducted using the *Aquatic Invasive Species Early Detection Monitoring Standard Operating Procedure* (2014) and also an educational seminar was conducted. Further discussion is found in Appendix E.

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 9 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 9. Aquatic Invasive Plant Species Rapid Response





Appendix A
Literature Cited

LITERATURE CITED

Hauxwell, J., S. Knight, K. Wagner, A. Mikulyuk, M. Nault, M. Porzky and S. Chase. 2010. *Recommended baseline monitoring of aquatic plants in Wisconsin: sampling design, field and laboratory procedures, data entry and analysis, and applications*. Wisconsin Dept of Nat. Res. Bureau of Science Services, PUB-SS-1068 2010. Madison, WI.

Natural Heritage Inventory. 2021. *Elements by TownRange for Vilas County*. Retrieved 2021. http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/NHI/documents/Vilas_County.pdf

Nichols, Stanley A. 1999. *Floristic Quality Assessment of Wisconsin Lake Plant Communities with Example Applications*. Journal of Lake and Reservoir Management 15(2): 133-141.

Stine, Angie, Dean Premo, and Kent Premo. 2022. *The Wilderness Waters Adaptive Management Plan (Presque Isle Township, Vilas County, Wisconsin) - The Wilderness Waters Program*. White Water Associates, Inc.

US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. June 1986. *Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds*. Technical Release-55.

Walters, C. 1986. *Objectives, constraints, and problem bounding*. In W.M. Getz, ed., *Adaptive Management of Renewable Resources*. Macmillan Publishing Company. New York, NY. 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. 2014. *Aquatic Invasive Species Early Detection Monitoring Standard Operating Procedure*. Retrieved 2017. <http://dnr.wi.gov/water/wsSWIMSDocument.ashx?documentSeqNo=99459630>

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

Appendix B

Aquatic Plant Survey Tables and Figures

Table of Contents

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

Table 2. Plant species and distribution statistic

Table 3. Comparison of summary statistics, 2008, 2014, 2019

Figure 1. Number of plant species recorded at sample sites

Figure 2. Rake fullness ratings for sample sites

Figure 3. Maximum depth of plant colonization

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

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

Figure 6. Aquatic plant occurrences for 2014 and 2019 point-intercept survey data

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

Figure 8-13. Distribution of plant species

Table 1. Summary statistics for the 2019 point-intercept aquatic plant surveys for Annabelle Lake.

Summary Statistic	Value	Notes
Total number of sites on grid	448	Total number of sites on the original grid (not necessarily visited)
Total number of sites visited	278	Total number of sites where the boat stopped, even if much too deep to have plants.
Total number of sites with vegetation	50	Total number of sites where at least one plant was found
Total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants	130	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	38.46	Number of times a species was seen divided by the total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants.
Simpson Diversity Index	0.88	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.)	7.50	The depth of the deepest site sampled at which vegetation was present.
Number of sites sampled with rake on rope	4	
Number of sites sampled with rake on pole	176	
Average number of all species per site (shallower than max depth)	0.55	
Average number of all species per site (vegetated sites only)	1.42	
Average number of native species per site (shallower than max depth)	0.55	Total number of species collected. Does not include visual sightings.
Average number of native species per site (vegetated sites only)	1.42	Total number of species collected including visual sightings.
Species Richness	18	
Species Richness (including visuals)	31	
Floristic Quality Index (FQI)	34.9	

Table 2. Plant species recorded and distribution statistics for the 2019 Annabelle 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
Large purple bladderwort	<i>Utricularia purpurea</i>	11.54	30.0	21.13	15	27	1.07
Spiny spored-quillwort	<i>Isoetes echinospora</i>	11.54	30.0	21.13	15	19	1.00
Muckgrasses	<i>Chara sp.</i>	6.15	16.0	11.27	8	8	1.00
Floating-leaf bur-reed	<i>Sparganium fluctuans</i>	4.62	12.0	8.45	6	15	1.00
Small purple bladderwort	<i>Utricularia resupinata</i>	3.85	10.0	7.04	5	8	1.00
Dwarf water-milfoil	<i>Myriophyllum tenellum</i>	3.85	10.0	7.04	5	7	1.00
Pickerelweed	<i>Pontederia cordata</i>	1.54	4.0	2.82	2	30	1.00
Sessile-fruited arrowhead	<i>Sagittaria rigida</i>	1.54	4.0	2.82	2	14	1.00
Hardstem bulrush	<i>Schoenoplectus acutus</i>	1.54	4.0	2.82	2	14	1.00
Water horsetail	<i>Equisetum fluviatile</i>	1.54	4.0	2.82	2	11	1.00
Berchtold's pondweed	<i>Potamogeton berchtoldii</i>	1.54	4.0	2.82	2	3	1.00
Pipewort	<i>Eriocaulon aquaticum</i>	0.77	2.0	1.41	1	7	1.00
Small bladderwort	<i>Utricularia minor</i>	0.77	2.0	1.41	1	3	1.00
Waterwort	<i>Elatine minima</i>	0.77	2.0	1.41	1	1	1.00
Lake quillwort	<i>Isoetes lacustris</i>	0.77	2.0	1.41	1	1	1.00
Brown-fruited rush	<i>Juncus pelocarpus f. submerses</i>	0.77	2.0	1.41	1	1	1.00
Spiral-fruited rush	<i>Potamogeton spirillus</i>	0.77	2.0	1.41	1	1	1.00
Arum-leaved arrowhead	<i>Sagittaria cuneata</i>	0.77	2.0	1.41	1	1	1.00
Aquatic moss	<i>Aquatic moss</i>	6.15	16.0		8	8	1.00
Freshwater sponge	<i>Freshwater sponge</i>	0.77	2.0		1	1	1.00
Three-way sedge	<i>Dulichium arundinaceum</i>				Visual	11	
Spatdock	<i>Nuphar variegata</i>				Visual	9	
Creeping spikerush	<i>Eleocharis palustris</i>				Visual	5	
Northwest territory sedge	<i>Carex utriculata</i>				Visual	4	
Water lobelia	<i>Lobelia dortmanna</i>				Visual	4	
Ribbon-leaf pondweed	<i>Potamogeton epihydrus</i>				Visual	3	

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
Common bur-reed	<i>Sparganium eurycarpum</i>				Visual	2	
Common bladderwort	<i>Utricularia vulgaris</i>				Visual	2	
Bluejoint grass	<i>Calamagrostea Canadensis</i>				Visual	1	
Fringed sedge	<i>Carex crinita</i>				Visual	1	
Water bulrush	<i>Schoenoplectus subterminalis</i>				Visual	1	
Woolgrass	<i>Scirpus cyperinus</i>				Visual	1	
Broad-leaved cattail	<i>Typha latifolia</i>				Visual	1	
Watersheid	<i>Brasenia schreberi</i>				Boat Survey		
Bulb-bearing water-hemlock	<i>Cicuta bulbifera</i>				Boat Survey		
Smooth sawgrass	<i>Cladium mariscoides</i>				Boat Survey		
	<i>Iris sp.</i>				Boat Survey		
Tufted loosestrife	<i>Lysimachia thyrsiflora</i>				Boat Survey		
Purple loosestrife	<i>Lysimachia salicaria (Boat Landing)</i>				Boat Survey		
Water forget-me-not	<i>Myosotis scorpiodes</i>				Boat Survey		
Reed canary grass	<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>				Boat Survey		
Sessile-fruited arrowhead	<i>Sagittaria rigida</i>				Boat Survey		
Softstem bulrush	<i>Schoenoplectus tabernaemontani</i>				Boat Survey		
Woolgrass	<i>Scirpus cyprinus</i>				Boat Survey		

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

Dr. Freckmann (U.W. Steven's Point: Herbarium) confirmed the voucher specimens January, 2020.

***Phalaris arundinacea*, *Myosotis scorpiodes*, and *Phalaris arundinacea* are "Restricted" species in Wisconsin.**

***Utricularia resipinata* is a Special Concern species in Wisconsin.**

Table 3. Comparison of summary statistics for 2008, 2014, and 2019 point-intercept aquatic plant surveys in Annabelle Lake.

Summary Statistic	2008	2014	2019
Total number of sites on grid	448	448	448
Total number of sites visited		260	278
Total number of sites with vegetation		48	50
Total number of sites shallower than maximum depth of plants		149	130
Frequency of occurrence at sites shallower than maximum depth of plants	20.85	32.21	38.46
Simpson Diversity Index	0.90	0.84	0.88
Maximum depth of plants (ft.)	14.00	8.00	7.50
Number of sites sampled with rake on rope		10	4
Number of sites sampled with rake on pole		203	176
Average number of all species per site (shallower than max depth)	0.33	0.56	0.55
Average number of all species per site (vegetated sites only)	1.59	1.75	1.42
Average number of native species per site (shallower than max depth)	0.33	0.56	0.55
Average number of native species per site (vegetated sites only)	1.59	1.75	1.42
Species Richness	18	16	18
Species Richness (including visuals)		19	31
Floristic Quality Index (FQI)	34.4	30.7	34.9

Figure 2. Rake fullness ratings for Annabelle Lake sample sites (2019).



**Rake fullness
(all species)**

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




Figure 3. Maximum Depth of Plant Colonization, Annabelle Lake, 2019




Figure 4. Annabelle Lake sampling sites less than or equal to maximum depth of rooted vegetation (2019).



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




Figure 5. Annabelle Lake substrate encountered at point-intercept plant sampling sites (2019).



Figure 6. Annabelle Lake, Plant Finds in 2014 and 2019.




Figure 7. Annabelle Lake point-intercept plant sampling sites with emergent and floating aquatic plants (2019). No floating plants were observed.





Figure 8. Distribution of plant species, Annabelle Lake (2019).

Utricularia purpurea,
Large purple bladderwort

● 1 (Rake fullness)

● 2

● 3

▼ Visual

✗ Not found

✗ Unsamplable (depth)

✗ Non-navigable




Figure 9. Distribution of plant species, Annabelle Lake (2019).

Isoetes echinospora,
Spiny spored-quillwort

- 1 (Rake fullness)
- 2
- 3
- ▼ Visual
- ✗ Not found
- ✗ Unsampld (depth)
- ✗ Non-navigable




Figure 10. Distribution of plant species, Annabelle Lake (2019).



Chara sp., Muskgrasses

● 1 (Rake fullness)

● 2

● 3

▼ Visual

× Not found

× Unsampled (depth)

× Non-navigable




Figure 11. Distribution of plant species, Annabelle Lake (2019).

Sparganium fluctuans,
Floating-leaf bur-reed

- 1 (Rake fullness)
- 2
- 3
- ▼ Visual
- ✗ Not found
- ✗ Unsampld (depth)
- ✗ Non-navigable




Figure 12. Distribution of plant species, Annabelle Lake (2019).



Utricularia resupinata,
Small purple bladderwort

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




Figure 13. Distribution of plant species, Annabelle Lake (2019).

Myriophyllum tenellum,
Dwarf water-milfoil

● 1 (Rake fullness)

● 2


● 3

▼ Visual

× Not found

× Unsampled (depth)

× Non-navigable





Appendix C
Annabelle Lake Water Quality Report

Appendix C

Review of Lake Water Quality

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Comparison of Annabelle Lake with other datasets	1
Temperature	1
Dissolved Oxygen.....	4
Water Clarity.....	7
Turbidity	9
Water Color.....	9
Water Level.....	9
User Perceptions	10
Chlorophyll <i>a</i>	11
Phosphorus.....	11
Trophic State.....	13
Nitrogen	14
Chloride	15
Sulfate	16
Conductivity.....	16
pH.....	16
Alkalinity	18
Hardness.....	18
Calcium and Magnesium Hardness	19
Sodium and Potassium.....	20
Dissolved Organic Carbon.....	21
Silica	21
Aluminum	21
Iron.....	22
Manganese	22
Sediment	22
Total Suspended Solids.....	22
Aquatic Invasive Species	22
Resources.....	24

Review of Annabelle Lake Water Quality

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


Introduction

Annabelle Lake is located in Vilas County, Wisconsin. It is a 194 acre drainage lake with a maximum depth of 30 feet. The Waterbody Identification Code (WBIC) is 2953800. 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 Annabelle Lake for a comparison of environmental and human changes. Water quality data was retrieved from the Wisconsin DNR SWIMS database from 1996 to 2020. Secchi disk measurements were collected by Citizen Lake Monitoring Network (CLMN) volunteers from 1997 to 2020. Chlorophyll *a* and total phosphorus were collected from 1997-2020 by CLMN volunteers.

Comparison of Annabelle Lake with other datasets

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

Figure 1. Wisconsin regions in terms of water quality.



Temperature

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

affect the distribution of fish species throughout a lake. Figure 2 indicates the changes in water temperature from various months and years sampled between 1997 and 2020. In May, October and November (Figures 2 and 7), the temperatures show little variation from surface to bottom. The June (Figure 3) and July (Figure 4) temperature profiles show stratification beginning around 12 feet. August temperature profile (Figure 5) shows stratification at approximately 15 feet. The lake begins to cool in September and October (Figure 6 and 7). For more information about the influence of lake stratification on a lake's water quality and biota, please refer to *Understanding Lake Data* (Shaw et al., 2004).





Figure 4. Annabelle Lake temperature profile, July.




Figure 5. Annabelle Lake temperature profiles, August.




Figure 6. Annabelle Lake temperature profile, September.





Figure 7. Annabelle Lake temperature profile, October and November.



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.

Figures 8-13 display the D.O. concentration for Annabelle Lake during sampled years. In March to May (Figure 8), D.O. levels ranged from 8-10 mg/L at the surface. In May, 1997, the D.O. level was much higher. In June (Figure 9), the surface D.O. was good and low oxygen levels appear around 5 feet. In July (Figure 10), the D.O. level drops below 5 mg/L around 10 feet. In August (Figure 11) and September (Figure 12), there is some variation in D.O. In October and November (Figure 13), the D.O. is between 8 and 11 mg/L at the surface.





Figure 10. Annabelle Lake dissolved oxygen profile, July.




Figure 11. Annabelle Lake dissolved oxygen profile, August.




Figure 12. Annabelle Lake dissolved oxygen profile, September.





Figure 13. Annabelle Lake dissolved oxygen profile, October-November.




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 14 shows the July and August mean Secchi depths in Annabelle Lake from 1997 to 2020. The shallowest mean Secchi depth was 4.13 feet in 2013, and the deepest mean depth was 8.6 feet in 1998

(Figure 15). According to Table 1, in 2020 Annabelle Lake was considered “poor to fair” with respect to water clarity. This suggests that the Secchi depth may have been impacted by tannins, stain from decaying matter, which is natural.

Figure 14. Annabelle Lake Secchi depth averages (July and August only).



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

(WDNR, 2021)

Figure 15. Annabelle Lake’s July and August Secchi Data: Mean, Min, Max, and Secchi Count (1997-2020).

Year	Secchi Mean	Secchi Min	Secchi Max	Secchi Count
1997	7.56	7	7.75	4
1998	8.6	7.75	10	5
1999	7.13	6.75	7.5	2
2000	5.94	5.5	6.25	4
2001	7.33	7	8	3
2002	6.56	6.25	7	4
2003	6.75	6.25	7.25	2
2004	7.9	7.25	9	5
2005	7.45	6.75	8.25	5
2006	7.25	7.25	7.25	2
2007	7.67	7.25	8	3
2008	7.19	6.75	7.5	4
2009	7.38	7	8	4
2010	7.08	5.25	9.5	3
2011	5.25	4.5	6	2
2012	7.17	5.75	8	3
2013	4.13	4	4.25	2
2014	5	5	5	3
2015	5.5	5	5.75	3
2016	6	5.25	6.75	3
2017	5.25	5	5.5	2
2018	5.92	5.25	6.5	3
2019	5.95	5.75	6.25	4
2020	6	6	6	1

(WDNR, 2021)

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

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. Annabelle Lake turbidity has not been tested, and should be included in future water quality sampling.

While checking Secchi depth, the CLMN volunteers also rated the water clarity and describe the water as “clear” or “murky.” There were 92% of the volunteers that said the water appeared “clear” and 8% said the water appeared “murky” from 1996 to 2020.


Water Color

Color of lake water is related to the type and amount of dissolved organic chemicals. Its main significance is aesthetics, although it may also influence light penetration and in turn affect aquatic plant and algal growth. Many lakes have naturally occurring color compounds from decomposition of plant material in the watershed (Shaw et al., 2004). Units of color are determined from the platinum-cobalt scale and are therefore recorded as Pt-Co units. Shaw states that a water color between 0 and 40 Pt-Co units is low. Color data was analyzed 8/6/2019 with a value of 40 SU for Annabelle Lake. Additionally, the CLMN recorded their perceptions of water color in Annabelle Lake. Since 1996 to 2020, 99% of volunteers indicated the water color to be “brown” in color and 1% said it looked “green.”

Water Level

CLMN volunteers also recorded their opinions of the lake level as “high,” “normal,” or “low.” Figure 16 indicates that in 1996, 100% of volunteers viewed the water level in Annabelle Lake as “normal.” In 1998 and 2007, 99% of volunteers said the lake levels were “low.” Most recently in 2020, half of volunteers viewed the lake level as “high” and half as “normal” levels.


Figure 16. Annabelle Lake water level percentage viewed by CLMN, 1996-2020.



User Perceptions


CLMN volunteers recorded their perceptions of the water, based on the physical appearance and recreational suitability. These perceptions can be compared to water quality parameters to see how the lake user would experience the lake at that time. These perceptions of recreational suitability are displayed by year in Figure 17. In every year except 2010, 2017, and 2020, 100% of volunteers recorded the lake to be “beautiful, could not be nicer.”

Figure 17. Annabelle Lake aesthetic value, 1996-2020.



Chlorophyll *a*

Chlorophyll *a* is the photosynthetic pigment that makes plants and algae green. Chlorophyll *a* in lake water is therefore an indicator of the amount of algae. Chlorophyll *a* concentrations greater than 10 µg/L are perceived as a mild algae bloom, while concentrations greater than 20 µg/L are perceived as a nuisance. Chlorophyll *a* was analyzed in Annabelle Lake during the growing season (April-May) and summer months (June-August), from 1996-2020 (Figure 18) with average values for all years being 5.07 µg/L (growing season) and 4.90 µg/L (summer season). Chlorophyll *a* values were below nuisance levels and well below the average levels for Wisconsin natural lakes.



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).

Annabelle Lake total phosphorus levels were sample during the growing season and summer months. In most years, the total phosphorus level remained below the nuisance threshold, except in summer, 2005 and 2014-2017 (Figure 19). According to Figure 20, Annabelle Lake is considered “good,” with respect to phosphorus, and is comparable to the region and state values.





Figure 20. 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, chlorophyll *a* and total phosphorus measurements. The July and August average (2020) Secchi TSI (51.0), chlorophyll *a* TSI (50.0), and total phosphorus TSI (50.0) classify Annabelle Lake as “mesotrophic” (Figure 21 and Table 2).

Figure 21. Annabelle Lake Trophic State Index (1997-2020).

Trophic State Index Graph: Annabelle Lake - Deep Hole - Vilas County



(WDNR, 2021)

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

(WDNR, 2014)

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


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

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

Nitrogen


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

Nitrogen exists in lakes in several forms. Annabelle Lake was analyzed for total Kjeldahl nitrogen (0.56 mg/L in October, 1998; 0.51 mg/L in May, 1999 and 0.52 mg/L in November, 1999) and nitrate-nitrite (not detected in May, 1999). Nitrogen is a major component of all organic (plant and animal) matter. Decomposing organic matter releases ammonia, which is converted to nitrate if oxygen is present (Shaw et al., 2004). All inorganic forms of nitrogen can be used by aquatic plants and algae (Shaw et al., 2004). If these inorganic forms of nitrogen exceed 0.3 mg/L (as N) in spring, there is sufficient nitrogen to support summer algae blooms (Shaw et al., 2004). Elevated concentrations of ammonium, nitrate, and nitrite, derived from human activities, can stimulate or enhance the development, maintenance and proliferation of primary producers (phytoplankton, benthic algae, macrophytes), contributing to the widespread phenomenon of the cultural (human-made) eutrophication of aquatic ecosystems (Camargo et al., 2007). The nutrient enrichment can cause important ecological effects on aquatic communities, since the overproduction of organic matter, and its subsequent decomposition, usually lead to low dissolved oxygen concentrations in bottom waters, and sediments of eutrophic and hypereutrophic aquatic ecosystems with low turnover rates (Camargo et al., 2007). Further analysis should be done to better understand the current levels of nitrogen in Annabelle Lake. Figure 22 displays total Kjeldahl nitrogen. Nitrate/Nitrite was non detectable 5/31/1999, 11/7/1999, 6/12/2000, and 8/6/2019. Ammonia was non detectable for the sample taken 8/6/2019.



Chloride

The presence of chloride (Cl^-) where it does not occur naturally indicates possible water pollution (Shaw et al., 2004). Chloride does not affect plant and algae growth and is not toxic to aquatic organisms at most of the levels found in Wisconsin (Shaw et al., 2004). Chloride concentrations in Annabelle Lake in November, 1999 and June, 2000 were well below the generalized distribution gradient of chloride found in Wisconsin surface waters. Figure 23 indicates Annabelle Lake's chloride levels.




Sulfate

Sulfate in lake water is primarily related to the types of minerals found in the watershed, and to acid rain (Shaw et al., 2004). Sulfate concentrations are noted to be less than 10 mg/L in Vilas County (Lillie and Mason, 1983). Sulfate was 2.87 mg/L on 8/6/2019 for Annabelle Lake.

Conductivity

Conductivity is a measure of the ability of water to conduct an electric current. Conductivity is reported in micromhos per centimeter ($\mu\text{mhos/cm}$) and is directly related to the total dissolved inorganic chemicals in the water. Usually, values are approximately two times the water hardness, unless the water is receiving high concentrations of human-induced contaminants (Shaw et al., 2004). Figure 24 displays conductivity levels for Annabelle Lake.



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. In 1999, 2000, and 2019, Annabelle Lake's pH ranged from 6.73 to 7.54 (Figure 25). Further analysis should be done to better understand the current pH of Annabelle Lake.





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

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

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

Alkalinity

Alkalinity levels in a lake are affected by the soil minerals, bedrock type in the watershed, and frequency of contact between lake water and these materials (Shaw et al., 2004). Alkalinity is important in a lake to buffer the effects of acidification from the atmosphere. Acid rain has long been a problem with lakes that have low alkalinity levels and high potential sources of acid deposition. Alkalinity in Annabelle Lake had no detection 10/10/1998 and 8/6/2019. Figure 26 displays the samples taken in 1999 and 2000.



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). Annabelle Lake's hardness is low indicating the lake to be "soft water" (Figure 27 and Table 5).






Table 5. Categorization of hardness (mg/L of calcium carbonate (CaCO₃)) (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. Calcium levels (Figure 28) in Annabelle Lake average 2.51 mg/L, so zebra mussels could not survive. Annabelle Lake magnesium levels were also low (Figure 29).




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).

Annabelle Lake sodium was 0.985 mg/L 8/6/2019 and potassium was 0.682 mg/L on 8/6/2019 which is within range for the area.

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. Annabelle Lake DOC values are shown in Figure 30.



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. Annabelle Lake silica has not been tested for silica, and should be included in future water quality sampling.

Aluminum

Aluminum occurs naturally in soils and sediments. In low pH (acidic) environments aluminum solubility increases greatly. With a low pH and increased aluminum values, fish health can become impaired. This can have impacts on the entire food web. Aluminum also plays an important role in phosphorus cycling

in lakes. When aluminum precipitates with phosphorus in lake sediments, the phosphorus will not dissolve back into the water column as readily. Annabelle Lake aluminum has not been tested, and should be included in future water quality sampling.

Iron

Iron also forms sediment particles that 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. Annabelle 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 Annabelle 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 Annabelle 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 Annabelle Lake, so future water quality sampling should include this parameter.

Aquatic Invasive Species

There are no known aquatic invasive species found in Annabelle Lake. The University of Wisconsin-Madison’s Aquatic Invasive Species Smart Prevention program classifies Annabelle Lake as “Not Suitable” for zebra mussels, based on calcium and conductivity levels found in the lake (UW-Madison).

Citizen Lake monitors looked for aquatic invasives such as curly-leaf pondweed, Eurasian water-milfoil, purple loosestrife, rusty crayfish, and adult zebra mussels in May, June, and July of 2008; May 2009, 2010 and 2011; and October, 2012. An August, 2004 zebra mussel veliger sample was taken with no positive finds.


In June 2011, U.W. Madison conducted an AIS Early Detection Survey and looked for the following AIS: faucet snail, banded mystery snail, Chinese mystery snail, New Zealand mudsnail, zebra and quagga mussels, yellow floating heart, Brazilian waterweed, curly-leaf pondweed, Eurasian water-milfoil, hydrilla, flowering rush, purple loosestrife, *Phragmites* spp., and red swamp crayfish. None of these species were observed. A zooplankton tow was also collected for identifying spiny water flea and fishhook water flea, also resulting in no finds.

In March, 2015 and September, 2017 there was a Citizen Monitoring Aquatic Invasive Survey and no invasives were found.

In June, 2019 a biologist from White Water Associates, Inc. conducted a aquatic invasive survey and found purple loosestrife at the boat landing away from the water, aquatic forget-me-not, and reed canary grass. A detailed report can be found in the Appendix E AIS Survey.

Ice Off

Citizen lake monitors measured Annabelle Lake’s ice off dates in 2009, 2011, and 2014 to 2020 (Figure 31). We can see that it can be estimated that the ice of date will likely occur sometime in mid-April.



Resources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

Appendix D
Annabelle Lake Shoreland and Shallows
Habitat Monitoring Report

Annabelle Lake (Vilas County, Wisconsin)

Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Monitoring Report



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



Date: March 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 Annabelle Lake (Vilas County, Wisconsin). The assessment was conducted using the *Lake Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Monitoring Field Protocol* (WDNR 2016)¹. This protocol provides a standard methodology for surveying, assessing, and mapping habitat in lakeshore areas, including the riparian buffer, bank, and littoral zone (WDNR 2016). This information will be useful to local and regional resource managers, community stakeholders, and others interested in protecting and enhancing Wisconsin's lakes and rivers (WDNR 2016).

METHODS

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

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

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



The shoreline habitat assessment was conducted for every ownership parcel on the lake. To facilitate this effort, parcel data was obtained March 2018 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 Annabelle 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 10, 2019. At the time of the survey there were 63 ownership parcels on Annabelle Lake. The shoreline perimeter including islands of Annabelle Lake is 4.2 miles. Exhibit 4 summarizes some of the Annabelle Lake data. Exhibits 5 through 13 provide maps of findings on Annabelle 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 Annabelle 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 high.

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

Annabelle 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 Annabelle Lake is in a mostly natural state, there are a few parcels that could undertake some restoration to ameliorate possible runoff and erosion issues. These areas can be identified by investigating the 2019 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). Annabelle Lake large woody habitat is somewhat sparse and could be augmented with 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Herbaceous <input type="checkbox"/>		
Shrub/Herbaceous	_____	
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	Present in	Present out
in Riparian or Entire Parcel	Riparian	of Riparian
Point source	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Channelized water flow/gully	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Stair/trail/road to lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lawn/soil sloping to lake	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bare soil	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sand/silt deposits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
description: _____		

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

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

Notes:

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 Annabelle Lake.			
Date of Survey: June 10, 2019		Miles of shoreline: 4.2	
Number of ownership parcels: 63		Mean parcel frontage feet: 352	
Riparian Buffer Zone		# of parcels	% of parcels
Impervious surfaces		41	65
Manicured lawn		32	51
Agriculture		0	0
Other (duff, soil, mulch)		21	33
Human structures (buildings, boats on shore, fire pit, other)		39	62
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	65
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)		12	19
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)		35	56
Emergent and/or floating aquatic plants		63	100
Evidence of aquatic plant removal		7	11
Large Wood Habitat			
Total Number of large wood pieces		341	
Number of large wood pieces per mile of shoreline		81.2	




Exhibit 5. Annabelle Lake Riparian Coverage - % Canopy - 2019



Legend

- Percent Canopy**
 - 0 - 20
 - 21 - 40
 - 41 - 60
 - 61 - 80
 - 81 - 100
- Shoreland Parcels
- County Boundary
- Municipality
- State Boundaries
- County Boundaries
- Major Roads**
 - Interstate Highway
 - State Highway
 - US Highway
- County and Local Roads**
 - County HWY
 - Local Road
- Railroads
- Tribal Lands
- Rivers and Streams
- Intermittent Streams
- Open Water
- Great Lakes

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

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

Notes



Exhibit 6. Annabelle Riparian Coverage - % Shrub Herbaceous- 2019



Legend

Percent Shrub Herbaceous

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

Shoreland Parcels

County Boundary

Municipality

State Boundaries

County Boundaries

Major Roads

- Interstate Highway
- State Highway
- US Highway

County and Local Roads

- County HWY
- Local Road

Railroads

Tribal Lands


Rivers and Streams

Intermittent Streams

Open Water

Great Lakes

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

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

Notes



Exhibit 7. Annabelle Riparian Coverage - % Impervious Surface - 2019



Legend

Percent Impervious

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

Shoreland Parcels

County Boundary

Municipality

State Boundaries

County Boundaries

Major Roads

- Interstate Highway
- State Highway
- US Highway

County and Local Roads

- County HWY
- Local Road

Railroads

Tribal Lands


Rivers and Streams

Intermittent Streams

Open Water

Great Lakes

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

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

Notes



Exhibit 8. Annabelle Riparian Coverage - % Manicured Lawn - 2019



Legend

Percent Manicured Lawn

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

Shoreland Parcels

County Boundary

Municipality

State Boundaries

County Boundaries

Major Roads

- Interstate Highway
- State Highway
- US Highway

County and Local Roads

- County HWY
- Local Road

Railroads

Tribal Lands


Rivers and Streams

Intermittent Streams

Open Water

Great Lakes

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

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

Notes



Exhibit 9. Annabelle Lake Bank Erosion and Modifications - 2019



Legend

- Bank Erosion >1ft
- Bank Erosion <1ft

Vertical Sea Wall

- 1 - 50 ft
- 51 - 100 ft
- 101 - 200 ft
- 200 + ft

Rip Rap

- 1 - 50 ft
- 51 - 100 ft
- 101 - 200 ft
- 200+ ft

Other Bank Modifications


- 10 - 50 ft
- 51 - 100 ft
- 101 - 200 ft
- 200+ ft

Artificial Beach

- 0 - 50 ft
- 51 - 100 ft
- 101 - 200 ft
- 200+ ft

- Shoreland Parcels
- County Boundary
- Municipality
- State Boundaries

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

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

Notes



Exhibit 10. Annabelle Lake Runoff Concerns - 2019



Legend

- Channelized Flow
- Point Source
- Shoreland Parcels
- County Boundary
- Municipality
- State Boundaries
- County Boundaries

Major Roads


- Interstate Highway
- State Highway
- US Highway

County and Local Roads

- County HWY
- Local Road

- + Railroads
- Tribal Lands
- Rivers and Streams
- Intermittent Streams
- Open Water
- Great Lakes

1: 15,840




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

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

Notes



Exhibit 11. Annabelle Lake Littoral Zone - Aquatic Plants - 2019




Legend

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

1: 15,840



Notes




NAD_1983_HARN_Wisconsin_TM
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

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



Exhibit 12. Annabelle Lake Littoral Zone - Human Structures - 2019



Legend

Swim Rafts

- 1 (light blue circle)
- 2 (medium blue circle)
- 3-5 (dark blue circle)
- 6+ (darkest blue circle)

Boat Lifts

- 1 (light purple circle)
- 2 (medium purple circle)
- 3-5 (dark purple circle)
- 6+ (darkest purple circle)

Piers

- 1 (light pink circle)
- 2 (medium pink circle)
- 3-5 (dark pink circle)
- 6+ (darkest pink circle)

Boat Houses


- 1 (light orange circle)
- 2 (medium orange circle)
- 3-5 (dark orange circle)
- 6+ (darkest orange circle)

Marinas

- 1 (light green circle)
- 2 (medium green circle)
- 3-5 (dark green circle)
- 6+ (darkest green circle)

☐ Shoreland Parcels

1: 15,840



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

Notes




Exhibit 13. Annabelle Lake Woody Habitat - 2019



Legend

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

1: 7,920



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

Notes

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

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

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




Appendix E
Annabelle Lake Aquatic Invasive Species Report

Annabelle Lake (Vilas County, Wisconsin)

Aquatic Invasive Species

Report



INTRODUCTION

White Water Associates, Inc. has been retained by Wilderness Waters: through an Education, Prevention, and Planning Grant on Annabelle 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 Annabelle Lake. This work prepares Annabelle Lake stakeholders to conduct actions that serve lake health. A portion of this project monitored Annabelle 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 conducted for interested Annabelle Lake stewards.

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 Annabelle Lake Survey took place June 10, 2019.

Five sites around the lake shoreline were thoroughly searched and a meander search was conducted while traveling from one site to another. The public boat landing was surveyed for 30 minutes by checking the dock and walking 200 feet of shoreline. The other four shoreline sites were randomly selected and are identified in Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2. Snorkeling was not used to search for AIS due to the tannic water. A long rake was used to collect any suspicious aquatic plants for closer inspection and identification. A D-net was used to collect invertebrate animals to look for AIS. Any invasive species observed were recorded. In the event of a new AIS record, specimens are collected for verification.

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

There were no known AIS that were established in Annabelle Lake prior to this survey. During the survey there were two new invasive plants that were noted. One was aquatic forget-me-not (Exhibit 4) and the other was purple loosestrife (Exhibit 5). Aquatic forget-me-not was noted at the boat landing along with the purple loosestrife. The purple loosestrife was not near the water but by the tarred area near the trees. These specimens were vouchered and sent to Dr. Freckmann and were confirmed January, 2019. Sites 1-4 had no AIS present.




Exhibit 1. Annabelle Lake AIS survey sites 1-4, boat landing (BL) and location of dredge site.

Exhibit 2. AIS Survey on Annabelle Lake 6/10/2019.

Density (1-5), and live (L) or dead (D). Boat Landing (BL).

Site	Latitude	Longitude	Species found
1	46.21393	-89.67816	None
2	46.20968	-89.68182	None
3	46.21440	-89.68954	None
4	46.22098	-89.68683	None
BL	46.220478	-89.679717	Aquatic forget-me-not 1 (L), Purple Loosestrife 3 (L)

Exhibit 3. Spiny Water Flea Sediment Sample from Annabelle Lake

Date: 6/10/2019	GPS Coordinates		Depth of sample (feet)
Dredge Site	46.21209	-89.68268	25

Aquatic Forget-me-not (*Myosotis scorpioides*) can quickly crowd out native plant species and is able to form large monocultures, especially in situations where it is in or near a stream (WDNR, 2019a). This plant is restricted in Wisconsin.




Exhibit 4. Photo of the aquatic forget-me-not voucher specimen sent to Dr. Freckmann (U.W. Steven's Point: Herbarium) for confirmation, January 2019.



Exhibit 5. Photo of purple loosestrife found at the boat landing but not near the water.

Purple loosestrife was introduced in North America in the early 1800s. Now, it is spread primarily via highways and waterways. Purple loosestrife is a perennial plant (2+ growing seasons) that prefers wetland areas (Czarapata 2005). It has opposite/whorled leaves with attractive purple flowers. Purple loosestrife was introduced as an ornamental plant, and has since infested every county in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan (Czarapata 2005). It impacts native plants by competing for food sources and by replacing native plants. Its survival rate is excellent because it can produce up to 2 million seeds annually, which can lie dormant in the substrate for years. Dispersal can occur by floating on open water, however, long distance dispersal may occur from seeds being imbedded in animal fur, truck or ATV tires, and outboard engines or live wells (Gilbert et al., 1998). Germination sites are most often associated with recent disturbances that expose the soil such as road construction, reduction of water levels, and roadside moving (Gilbert et al., 1998). Purple loosestrife can also regenerate from plant fragments, necessitating careful selection of control methods.

The Wisconsin DNR has a very informative website that educates on invasive species. The Annabelle 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 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/>.

FLOATING WORKSHOP

A floating workshop planned for summer 2020 was not offered due to Covid-19 restrictions.

Literature Cited

Czarapata, Elizabeth. 2005. *Invasive Plants of the Upper Midwest: An Illustrated Guide to Their Identification and Control*. University of Wisconsin Press. Retrieved 2014.

<<http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/fact/.html>>

Gilbert, Jon, Kari Linder, and Miles Falck. April 1998. *1996 Purple Loosestrife Survey and Control Activities*. : Great Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Commission Biological Services Division. Administrative Report 98-6.

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.html>>