2001 SUMMARY REPORT
of
LUCKY LAKE

Lake County, Illinois

Prepared by the

LAKE COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
LAKES MANAGEMENT UNIT
3010 Grand Avenue
Waukegan, Illinois 60085

Michael Adam
Mary Colwell
Christina L. Brant
Joseph Marencik
Mark Pfister

June 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lucky Lake is a manmade lake located east of Interstate 94 in Libertyville Township and is within the village limits of Green Oaks. It encompasses approximately 9.5 acres and has a shoreline length of 0.7 miles. The maximum depth recorded in April of 2001 was 12.7 feet. Lucky Lake is managed by the Lucky Lake Property Owners Association and is used primarily for the aesthetic enjoyment of the residents around the lake.

Stormwater runoff from Interstate 94 and adjacent land areas likely contributed sediment, nutrients, salts, and other materials into the lake. Lucky Lake had poor water clarity, high levels of total phosphorus, total suspended solids, total dissolved solids, and high conductivity readings.

Water clarity (as measured by Secchi disk transparency readings) averaged only 3.22 feet. Highest readings occurred early in the season. Algae blooms, which significantly contributed to the poor clarity, were seen frequently during the season.

Good dissolved oxygen conditions existed throughout most of the water column (surface to bottom of the lake) during the season.

Only two small pieces of aquatic vegetation were found in Lucky Lake in 2001. Lack of aquatic vegetation may have negative impacts on many of the organisms in the lake, including fish.

At least three exotic plant species (purple loosestrife, buckthorn, and reed canary grass) were found on the shores of Lucky Lake. Plants should be removed and replaced with native shoreline plants.

Good numbers of wildlife, particularly birds, were noted on and around Lucky Lake. Many of the migrating songbirds were seen in the oak grove and also the pine trees along the southern shoreline.

LAKE IDENTIFICATION AND LOCATION

Lucky Lake (T44N, R11E, Section 25, NW ¼) is located east of Interstate 94 in Libertyville Township and is within the village of Green Oaks. It is part of the Middle Fork drainage of the Chicago River watershed. Water enters Lucky Lake from a ditch at the northwestern end of the lake. This ditch drains a small man-made pond, which receives stormwater from Interstate 94. The sole outlet is located along the southern shoreline. Water that leaves Lucky Lake eventually drains into the Middle Fork of the North Branch of the Chicago River.

Lucky Lake encompasses approximately 9.5 acres and has a shoreline length of 0.7 miles. The maximum depth recorded by LCHD staff in April of 2001 was 12.7 feet. Lake elevation is approximately 675 feet above mean sea level. Although no bathymetric (depth contour) map for Lucky Lake exists, a mean depth and volume was estimated based on data from lakes with known depths and volumes. Mean depth was obtained by multiplying the maximum depth by 0.5. Volume was obtained by multiplying the mean depth by the lake surface area. Based on these calculations, Lucky Lake has an estimated mean depth of 6.35 feet and an estimated volume of 60.3 acre-feet.

BRIEF HISTORY OF LUCKY LAKE

Lucky Lake was created in 1957 when Interstate 94 construction was occurring. Approximately 247,000 yd^3 of soil were removed. The area was previously a farm field. The lake is reported to have had very clear water for several years after construction.

Carp became established in the lake reducing its water clarity. The lake was rehabilitated with fish poison (Rotenone) and restocked approximately 10 years ago, including grass carp. Approximately 25 grass carp were stocked and have been reportedly seen in the lake as recently as 2000. This will be discussed in more detail later in the report.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT AND HISTORICAL LAKE USES

Lucky Lake is a private lake managed by the Lucky Lake Property Owners Association. Nearly the entire lake bottom is owned by the association, with the exception of the small bay along the north shoreline and the area at the western shoreline. The association meets annually or as needed.

The lake is used primarily for the aesthetic enjoyment of the residents around the lake. Fishing, swimming, and ice skating are also reported as popular activities. Only non-motorized watercraft or electric motors are allowed on Lucky Lake. The lake has no public access.

LIMNOLOGICAL DATA – WATER QUALITY

Water samples were taken monthly from May - September at the deep-hole location near the lake's center (Figure 1). See Appendix B for water sampling methods.

Lucky Lake's water quality is similar to many lakes in Lake County (Table 1 in Appendix A). Most of the water quality parameters measured were near the averages of other Lake County lakes that the Health Department has monitored. Several important findings were noted.

Secchi disk readings fluctuated during the season (average = 3.22 feet). Highest readings occurred early in the season (May, 4.76 feet; June, 3.02 feet, and July, 4.43 feet). August and September had significantly lower readings (2.42 feet and 1.47 feet, respectively). These lower readings are likely the result of increased stormwater entering the lake, since significant rainfall occurred within 48 hours of these sampling dates (0.16 inches in August and 0.31 inches in September as recorded at the Lake County Stormwater Management Commission rain gauge in Highland Park). In addition, algae blooms which occurred throughout the season also reduced water clarity. The county median (the point where 50% of the reading are below and above this value; based on data from 1995-2001) for Secchi disk readings is 4.18 feet.

Water clarity can also be inferred from the 1% light levels recorded each month. The 1% light levels (i.e., the point where plant photosynthesis ceases) reached the lake bottom in all months measured except September when it only reached 3.5 feet. In other words, sufficient light was available for plant growth throughout most of the season in Lucky Lake.

Lucky Lake began to weakly thermally stratify in August, but by September water and ambient (air) temperatures dropped, eliminating any temperature gradient that began to form. Good dissolved oxygen (DO) conditions existed throughout most of the water column (surface to bottom of lake) during the season. September readings were the lowest, likely the result of increased stormwater entering the lake from recent rain events. Stormwater contains organic matter that aquatic organisms breakdown and consume oxygen in the water during this process. However, DO conditions in Lucky Lake appear to be stable.

Total suspended solids (TSS) in Lucky Lake correlated with the reduced water clarity (Secchi disk) readings described above (Figure 2). For example, the highest TSS value of 15.5 mg/L in the September (epilimnion) sample corresponds to the lowest Secchi disk reading (1.47 feet) of the season. Again, algae blooms and stormwater runoff are the most likely causes. Additional support for this is found in the seasonal average of 6.5 mg/L for non-volatile suspended solids (NVSS), that is, the inorganic solids found in the water sample. This value is low, compared to many other lakes in the county, indicating that much of the TSS is made up of compounds like algae or organic sediment.

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

The 2001 average total phosphorus (TP) concentration in Lucky Lake (0.048 mg/L in the epilimnion) was near the county median (0.047 mg/L). TP levels were, however, still high enough to be considered nutrient-rich. Generally, values greater than 0.03 mg/L are considered sufficient for nuisance plant and algae growth. These high values are indicative of man-made lakes in the lower Midwest. High levels of phosphorus in Lucky Lake can be the result of both internal and external sources. Due to the lake's origin (the excavating of a farm field), high levels of phosphorus may have already been present when the lake was filled (thus, an internal source). External events, like runoff from rain events are another source. Once in the lake, the phosphorus generally recycles over and over again through plant and algae growth and senescence. A significant source may come from lawn fertilizer, which is usually high in phosphorus. Some manufactures are making low (<5%) to no phosphorus formulations which should be used by lake homeowners.

Conductivity readings in Lucky Lake in 2001 were high. The seasonal average (1.055 milliSiemens/cm) is significantly higher than the county average (0.7557 milliSiemens/cm). Stormwater runoff containing road salt applied to Interstate 94 in the winter is the likely source of these readings. Since most road salt is sodium chloride, calcium chloride, potassium chloride, magnesium chloride or ferrocyanide salts, we calculate the concentration of chlorides in each water sample based on conductivity readings. The seasonal average for chlorides in Lucky Lake was 208 mg/L. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) standard for chloride is 500 mg/L. Once values exceed this standard the water body is deemed to be impaired, thus impacting aquatic life. High total dissolved solids (TDS) also correlate with the conductivity readings. Generally, the higher the TDS levels the higher the conductivity readings.

Water levels on Lucky Lake fluctuated throughout the season. The lowest levels were found in July, highest levels in May. The total water level change (10-inch drop) occurred from June to July. Significant water fluctuations were not an issue on Lucky Lake in 2001. Lakes with stable water levels potentially have less shoreline erosion problems.

The average ratio between total nitrogen and total phosphorus for Lucky Lake was 21:1, indicating a phosphorus-limited system. Nitrogen, as well as carbon, naturally occur in high concentrations and come from a variety of sources (soil, air, etc.) which are more difficult to control than sources of phosphorus. Lakes that are phosphorus-limited may be easier to manage, since controlling phosphorus is more feasible than controlling nitrogen or carbon.

Based on data collected in 2001, standard classification indices compiled by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) were used to determine the current condition of Lucky Lake. A general overall index that is commonly used is called a trophic state index or TSI. The TSI index classifies the lake into one of four categories: oligotrophic (nutrient-poor, biologically unproductive), mesotrophic (intermediate nutrient availability and biological productivity), eutrophic (nutrient-rich, highly productive), or hypereutrophic (extremely nutrient-rich productive). This index is calculated using total phosphorus values obtained at or near the surface. The phosphorus TSI for Lucky Lake classified it as a eutrophic lake. Eutrophic lakes are the most common types of lakes throughout the Midwest, and they are particularly common among man-made lakes. See Table 2 in Appendix A for a ranking of average total phosphorus TSI values for Lake County lakes (Lucky Lake is currently #41). This ranking is only a relative assessment of the lakes in the county. The current rank of a lake is dependent upon many factors including lake origin, water source, nutrient loads, and morphometric features (volume, depth, substrate, etc.). Thus a small, shallow, manmade lake with high nutrient loads could not expect to achieve a high ranking even with intensive management.

In Lucky Lake, the IEPA aquatic life impairment index was low, indicating a full degree of support for all aquatic organisms in the lake. However, due to high nutrient levels (particularly phosphorus) and poor water clarity, the swimming and recreation use indices showed a partial impairment of these activities. The Health Department did not test for bacteria or other harmful pathogens on Lucky Lake in 2001.

LIMNOLOGICAL DATA – AQUATIC PLANT ASSESSMENT

Aquatic plant species presence and distribution in Lucky Lake were assessed monthly from May through September 2001 (see Appendix B for methods). Only one submersed aquatic plant, one macro-algae, and several emergent shoreline plants were found (see Table 3, below). The lack of aquatic plants is likely the result of the presence of grass carp and the use of aquatic herbicides, which were applied last in 1999. At that time, 50 pounds of copper sulfate was used to control algae, and 10 gallons of diquat was used to control aquatic plants, which had reached nuisance levels. No herbicides or algicides were used in 2001.

Lack of aquatic plants in the lake may have detrimental effects in the future. Water quality may continue to deteriorate without aquatic plants since plants help stabilize lake sediment and utilize nutrients that enter the lake. The lack of plants may also have long-term negative impacts on the lake's fishery. Gamefish as well as smaller fish and their prey need cover to hide and hunt. Lack of vegetation in the lake negatively influences even the smallest organisms, like zooplankton, which are preyed on by small fish. If these small organisms are decimated it has repercussions throughout the food chain. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources recommends 25-40% aquatic plant coverage to maintain ideal fish habitat conditions.

Re-establishment of aquatic plants may be difficult due to the steep nature of the lake bottom near the shoreline. If water clarity continues to deteriorate, light levels required for plants to photosynthesize (1% light level) will not reach the lake bottom. This in-turn may cause the lake to remain algae dominated.

While not found in 2001, the lake reportedly has had a problem with the exotic Eurasian water milfoil (EWM). The 1999 herbicide treatment and the previously stocked grass carp have apparently controlled aquatic plant life for at least two years. Continued monitoring will be needed to determine if and when a herbicide treatment is needed.

EWM was first detected in Lucky Lake approximately 15 years ago, according to the primary landowner. If EWM does reappear, it can be hand-pulled or controlled with spot treatments of herbicides (e.g., granular 2,4-D). Native plants should be allowed to grow in the lake until they reach nuisance levels, and then only spot treated.

Due to the lack of aquatic vegetation, the grass carp in the lake may or may not be still present. As mentioned previously, they were last seen in 2000. Since the lake has had few or no plants for two years, these carp may or may not be still alive. A few may be surviving on the few plants that may be growing in the lake. No evidence of carp foraging on overhanging terrestrial plants, such as willow, was seen. Grass carp should not be restocked into Lucky Lake due to their destructive and non-selective foraging behaviors.

Floristic quality index (FQI; Swink and Wilhelm 1994) is an assessment tool designed to evaluate the closeness that the flora of an area is to that of undisturbed conditions. It can be used to: 1) identify natural areas, 2) compare the quality of different sites or different locations within a single site, 3) monitor long-term floristic trends, and 4) monitor habitat restoration efforts. Each aquatic plant in a lake is assigned a number between 1 and 10 (10 indicating the plant species most sensitive to disturbance). This is done for floating and submersed plants found in the lake. These numbers are averaged and multiplied by the square root of the number of species present to calculate an FQI. A high FQI number indicates that there are a large number of sensitive, high quality plant species present in the lake. Non-native species were counted in the FQI calculations for Lake County lakes. In 2001, Lucky Lake had a FQI of 7.0. The average FQI of lakes studied by the Lake County Health Department in 2000-2001 was 14.0.

Table 3. Aquatic and shoreline plants on Lucky Lake, May - September 2001.

Aquatic Plants	
Chara/Nitella	*Chara* sp./*Nitella* sp.
Small Pondweed	*Potamogeton pusillus*
Shoreline Plants	
Purple Loosestrife	*Lythrum salicaria*
Reed Canary Grass	*Phalaris arundinacea*
Buckthorn	*Rhamnus cathartica*
Willow	*Salix* sp.
Cattail	*Typha* sp.

LIMNOLOGICAL DATA – SHORELINE ASSESSMENT

A shoreline assessment was conducted in 2001 to determine the condition of the lake shoreline (see Appendix B for methods). Of particular interest was the condition of the shoreline at the water/land interface. Lucky Lake is approximately 80% developed, 20% undeveloped. All development is in the form of private lots.

The shoreline of Lucky Lake was classified into several types (Figure 3). Buffer habitat, consisting of unmowed turfgrass or natural vegetation, comprised approximately 30% of the shoreline. Rip-rap (i.e., rocks or concrete chunks) and shrub habitat made up approximately 26% and 22%, respectively. The remaining shoreline consisted of lawn (12%), woodland (5%), and beach (5%). While the presence of buffer strips are strongly recommended along the shoreline of Lucky Lake, the existing buffers are minimal in width and consist of either unmowed turfgrass or small buckthorn shrubs, an exotic. Removal of buckthorn and the expansion of buffers is recommended. An exception is the buffer along the eastern end of the lake, which consists of cattails. This buffer provides good protection of this shoreline, particularly from prevailing southwest winds which may cause wave erosion along this shore. Emergent vegetation like cattails or bulrushes help absorb wave energy, although cattails can expand and become problematic.

The rip-rap that is present around the lake is of minimal quality. It consists mainly of concrete chunks and old bricks, which may not be effectively absorbing or deflecting wave energy causing erosion. While minimal erosion is occurring where this rip-rap is present, future problems may occur.

Erosion does not appear to be a major problem at this time. Moderate erosion was noted along the northwestern shoreline (Figure 4). This shoreline consists of unmowed turfgrass and small buckthorn shrubs. A portion of this area was cleared of shrubs during the summer 2001. However, additional rehabilitation of this area is recommended. Buckthorn will dominate this area quickly and will provide minimal shoreline stabilization. A buffer strip (minimum 25 feet wide) of native vegetation is recommended.

At least three exotic plant species (purple loosestrife, buckthorn, and reed canary grass) were found on the shores of Lucky Lake. Loosestrife and buckthorn are particularly problematic as they outcompete native plants and offer little value in terms of shoreline stabilization or wildlife habitat. Plants should be removed and replaced with native shoreline plants.

In addition to shoreline plants, emergent vegetation should be planted or encouraged to grow. These plants (arrowhead, bulrushes, and spikerushes, etc.) help stabilize the shoreline by buffering wind and wave action. They also provide habitat for fish and wildlife that use the lake. More information can be found in the section **Objective IV: Enhance Shoreline Vegetation**.

Figure 3

Figure 4

LIMNOLOGICAL DATA – WILDLIFE ASSESSMENT

Good numbers of wildlife, particularly birds, were noted on and around Lucky Lake. See Appendix B for methods. Several of the species listed in Table 4 (below) were seen during spring or fall migration and were assumed not to be nesting around the lake. While no reptiles were seen, two species of amphibians were noted. Presence of amphibians is generally a good indicator of water quality and surrounding habitat.

Habitats surrounding Lucky Lake are fair. The best habitats are located away from the lake in the park of oaks just east of the lake and the open fields just north of the lake. Many of the migrating songbirds were seen in the oak grove and also the pine trees along the southern shoreline. The open field provided habitat for the bobolink, a grassland bird that is becoming increasingly rare in northeast Illinois. All these habitats are important to maintain and enhance. Additional enhancement could be made by allowing emergent vegetation to expand, by increasing buffer widths, and providing natural and artificial structures (i.e., bat and bird houses, logs/dead wood left in the water along the shoreline) for other species of wildlife. Additional information on enhancing wildlife habitats can be found in the section entitled **Objective VI: Enhance Wildlife Habitat Conditions**.

No fish surveys were completed by the Lake County Health Department during 2001.

Table 4. Wildlife species observed on Lucky Lake, May – September, 2001.

<u>*Birds*</u>	
Double-crested Cormorant	*Phalacrocorax auritus*
Canada Goose	*Branta canadensis*
Mallard	*Anas platyrhnchos*
Great Blue Heron	*Ardea herodias*
Green Heron	*Butorides striatus*
Killdeer	*Charadrius vociferus*
Spotted Sandpiper	*Actitis macularia*
Downy Woodpecker	*Picoides pubescens*
Eastern Kingbird	*Tyrannus tyrannus*
Eastern Pewee	*Contopus virens*
Willow Flycatcher	*Empidonax traillii*
Barn Swallow	*Hirundo rustica*
Tree Swallow	*Iridoprocne bicolor*
Chimney Swift	*Chaetura pelagica*
American Crow	*Corvus brachyrhynchos*
Blue Jay	*Cyanocitta cristata*
Black-capped Chickadee	*Poecile atricapillus*
House Wren	*Troglodytes aedon*
Catbird	*Dumetella carolinensis*

Table 4. Wildlife species observed on Lucky Lake, May – September, 2001 (cont'd).

American Robin	*Turdus migratorius*
Cedar Waxwing	*Bombycilla cedrorum*
Red-eyed Vireo	*Vireo olivaceus*
Warbling Vireo	*Vireo gilvus*
Yellow-rumped Warbler	*Dendroica coronata*
Cape May Warbler	*Dendroica tigrina*
Chestnut-sided Warbler	*Dendroica pensylvanica*
Palm Warbler	*Dendroica palmarum*
Yellow Warbler	*Dendroica petechia*
Common Yellowthroat	*Geothlypis trichas*
Louisiana Waterthrush	*Seiurus motacilla*
Red-winged Blackbird	*Agelaius phoeniceus*
Brown-headed Cowbird	*Molothrus ater*
Common Grackle	*Quiscalus quiscula*
Bobolink	*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*
Starling	*Sturnus vulgaris*
Northern Oriole	*Icterus galbula*
House Sparrow	*Passer domesticus*
Northern Cardinal	*Cardinalis cardinalis*
House Finch	*Carpodacus mexicanus*
Purple Finch	*Carpodacus purpureus*
American Goldfinch	*Carduelis tristis*
White-crowned Sparrow	*Zonotrichia leucophrys*
Chipping Sparrow	*Spizella passerina*
Song Sparrow	*Melospiza melodia*
Mammals	
Gray Squirrel	*Sciurus carolinensis*
White-tailed Deer	*Odocoileus virginianus*
Amphibians	
Bull Frog	*Rana catesbeiana*
Western Chorus Frog	*Pseudacris triseriata triseriata*
Reptiles	
None noted	
Insects	
Cicadas	
Dragonfly	
Damselfly	

EXISTING LAKE QUALITY PROBLEMS

- *Lack of a Quality Bathymetric Map*

  A bathymetric (depth contour) map is an essential tool for effective lake management since it provides critical information on the morphometric features of the lake (i.e., acreage, depth, volume, etc.). This information is particularly important when intensive management techniques (i.e., chemical treatments for plant or algae control, dredging, fish stocking, etc.) are part of the lake's overall management plan. Currently, no such map exists for Lucky Lake.

- *Lack of Aquatic Vegetation*

  Only two small pieces of vegetation were found in Lucky Lake in 2001. Lack of aquatic vegetation may have negative impacts on many of the organisms in the lake, including fish. It is recommended that no herbicide treatments be made until some plants begin to grow. Beneficial native plants could be planted to enhance habitats for fish and other wildlife, with minimal impact to other recreational activities. If Eurasian water milfoil returns the plants should be either removed by hand or spot treated with herbicides that are selective for this species and would have minimal impact to native plant species.

- *Invasive Shoreline Plant Species*

  At least three exotic plant species (purple loosestrife, buckthorn, and reed canary grass) were found on the shores of Lucky Lake. Loosestrife and buckthorn are particularly problematic as they outcompete native plants and offer little value in terms of shoreline stabilization or wildlife habitat. Plants should be removed and replaced with native shoreline plants. Buffer strips should be expanded.

- *High Conductivity Readings and Levels of Total Dissolved Solids*

  Water quality samples showed high conductivity readings and high levels of total dissolved solids. These readings are likely the result of stormwater runoff from adjacent Interstate 94. The impacts of these pollutants to organisms in the lake are unknown.

POTENTIAL OBJECTIVES FOR THE LUCKY LAKE MANAGEMENT PLAN

I. Bathymetric Map
II. Illinois Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program
III. Nuisance Algae Management Options
IV. Enhance Shoreline Vegetation
V. Control Exotic Plant Species
VI. Enhance Wildlife Habitat Conditions

OPTIONS FOR ACHIEVING THE LAKE MANAGEMENT PLAN OBJECTIVES

Objective I: Bathymetric Map

A bathymetric (depth contour) map is an essential tool for effective lake management since it provides critical information on the morphometric features of the lake (i.e., acreage, depth, volume, etc.). This information is particularly important when intensive management techniques (i.e., chemical treatments for plant or algae control, dredging, fish stocking, etc.) are part of the lake's overall management plan. Some bathymetric maps for lakes in Lake County do exist, but they are frequently old, outdated and do not accurately represent the current features of the lake.

Maps can be created by agencies like the Lake County Health Department - Lakes Management Unit or other companies. Costs vary, but can range from $3,000-10,000 depending on lake size.

Objective II: Illinois Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program

In 1981, the Illinois Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program (VLMP) was established by the Illinois Environmental Protection agency (Illinois EPA) to gather fundamental information on Illinois inland lakes, and to provide an educational program for citizens. Annually, 150-200 lakes (out of 3,041 lakes in Illinois) are sampled by approximately 250 citizen volunteers. The volunteers are primarily lake shore residents, lake owners/managers, members of environmental groups, public water supply personnel, and citizens with interest in a particular lake.

The VLMP relies on volunteers to gather a variety of information on their chosen lake. The primary measurement is Secchi disk transparency or Secchi depth. Analysis of the Secchi disk measurement provides an indication of the general water quality condition of the lake, as well as the amount of usable habitat available for fish and other aquatic life.

Microscopic plants and animals, water color, and suspended sediments are factors that interfere with light penetration through the water column and lessen the Secchi disk depth. As a rule, one to three times the Secchi depth is considered the lighted or euphotic zone of the lake. In this region of the lake there is enough light to allow plants to survive and produce oxygen. Water below the lighted zone can be expected to have little or no dissolved oxygen. Other observations such as water color, suspended algae and sediment, aquatic plants, and odor are also recorded. The sampling season is May through October with volunteer measurements taken twice a month. After volunteers have completed one year of the basic monitoring program, they are qualified to participate in the Expanded Monitoring Program. In the expanded program, selected volunteers are trained to collect water samples that are shipped to the Illinois EPA laboratory for analysis of total and volatile suspended solids, total phosphorus, nitrate-nitrite nitrogen and ammonia nitrogen. Other parameters that are part of the expanded program include dissolved oxygen, temperature, and zebra mussel monitoring. Additionally, chlorophyll *a* monitoring has been added to the regiment of selected lakes. These water quality parameters are routinely measured by lake scientists to help determine the general health of the lake ecosystem.

For more information about the VLMP contact the VLMP Regional Coordinator:

Holly Hudson
Northeast Illinois Planning Commission
222 S. Riverside Plaza, Suite 1800
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 454-0400

Objective III: Nuisance Algae Management Options

The growth of nuisance or excessive algae can cause a number of problems. Excessive algal growth can cause decreases in water clarity and light penetration. This can lead to several major problems such as loss of aquatic plants, decline in fishery health, and interference with recreational activities. Health hazards, such as swimmer's itch and other skin irritations have been linked to nuisance algae growth. Normally, excessive/nuisance algae growth is a sign of larger problems such excessive nutrients and/or lack of aquatic plants. Some treatment methods, such as copper sulfate, are only quick remedies to the problem. Solving the problem of nuisance algal growth involves treating the factors that cause the growth not the algae it self. Long-term solutions typically include an integrated approach such as alum treatments, revegetation with aquatic plants, and limiting external sources of nutrients. Interestingly enough, these long-term management strategies are seldom used, typically because of their high initial costs. Instead, the cheap, quick fix of using copper sulfate, though temporary, is much more widely used. However, the costs of continually applying copper sulfate over years, even decades, can eventually far exceed the costs of a slower acting, eventually more effective, integrated approach.

As with aquatic plant management techniques, algae management practices have both positive and negative characteristics. If used properly, they can be beneficial to a lake's well being. If misused or abused, they all share similar outcomes - negative impacts to the lake. Putting together a good management plan should not be rushed. Plans should consist of a realistic set of goals well thought out before implementation. The plan should be based on the management goals of the lake and involve usage issues (beaches, boat ramps, etc.), habitat maintenance/restoration issues, and nutrient levels. For an algal management plan to achieve long term success, follow up is critical. The management of the lake's algae problem does not end once the blooms and/or mats have been reduced/eliminated. It is critical to continually monitor problematic areas for regrowth and treat as necessary. An association or property owner should not always expect immediate results. A quick fix of the algal problem may not always be in the best interest of the lake. Sometimes the best solutions take several seasons to properly address the problem. The management options covered below are commonly used techniques and those that are coming into wider acceptance, and have been used in Lake County. There are other algae management options that are not covered below as they are not very effective, unproven, unfounded, or are too experimental to be widely used.

Option 1: No Action

With a no action management plan nothing would be done to control the nuisance algae in Lucky Lake regardless of type and extent. Nuisance algae, planktonic and/or filamentous, could continue to grow until epidemic proportions are reached. Growth limitations of the algae and the characteristics of the lake itself (light penetration, nutrient levels.) will dictate the extent of growth. Unlike aquatic plants, algae are not normally bound by physical factors such as substrate type. The areas in which filamentous and thick surface planktonic blooms (scum) occur can be affected by wind and wave action if strong enough. However, under normal conditions, with no action, both filamentous and planktonic algal blooms can spread to cover 100% of the surface. This could cause major inhibition of the lakes recreational uses and impact fish and other aquatic organisms adversely.

Pros

There are positive aspects associated with the no action option for nuisance algae management. The first, and most obvious, is that there is no cost. However, if an active management plan for algae control were eventually needed, the cost would be substantially higher than if the no action plan had been followed in the first place. Another benefit of this option would be the lack of environmental manipulation. Under the no action option, chemicals or introduction of any organisms would not take place. Use of the lake would continue as normal unless blooms worsened. In this case, activities such as swimming might have to be suspended due to an increase in health risks. Other problems such as strong odors (blue-green algae) might also increase in frequency.

Cons

Under the no action option, if nuisance algae becomes wide spread and able to reach epidemic proportions, there will be many negative impacts on the lake. The fishery of the lake may become stunted due the to lack of quality forage fish habitat and reduced predation. This will cause an explosion in the small fish population and with food resources not increasing, growth of fish will be reduced. Fish kills can result from toxins released by some species such as some blue-green algae. Blue-green algae can also produced toxins that are harmful to other algae. This allows blue-green algae to quickly dominate a body of water. Decreased dissolved oxygen levels, due to high biological oxygen demand from the excessive algae growth, will also have negative impacts on the aquatic life. Wildlife populations will also be negatively impacted by dense growths of algae. Birds and waterfowl will have difficulty finding quality plants for food or in locating prey within the turbid green waters. Additionally, some species, such as blue-green algae, are poor sources of food for zooplankton and fish.

Water quality could also be negatively impacted with the implementation of a no action option. Decomposition of organic matter and release of nutrients upon algal death is a probable outcome. Large nutrient release with algae die back could lead to lake-wide increases of internal nutrient load. This could in turn, could increase the frequency or severity of other blooms. In addition, decomposition of massive amounts of algae, filamentous and planktonic, will lead to a depletion of dissolved oxygen in the lake. This can cause fish stress, and eventually, if stress is frequent or severe enough, fish kills. All of the impacts above could in turn have negative impacts on numerous aspects of the lake’s ecosystem.

In addition to ecological impacts, many physical lake uses will be negatively impacted. Boating could be nearly impossible without becoming entangled in thick mats of filamentous algae. Swimming could also become increasingly difficult and unsafe due to thick mats and reduction in visibility by planktonic blooms. Fishing could become more and more exasperating due in part to the thick mats and stunted fish populations. In addition, the aesthetics of the lake will also decline due to large areas of the lake covered by large green mats and/or blooms of algae and the odors that may develop, such as with large blue-green blooms. The combination of above events could cause property values on the lake to suffer. Property values on lakes with algae problems have been shown to decrease by as much as 15-20%.

Costs

No cost will be incurred by implementing the no action management option.

Option 2: Algicides

Algicides are a quick and inexpensive way to temporarily treat nuisance algae. Copper sulfate ($CuSO_4$) and chelated copper products are the two main algicides in use. These two compounds are sold by a variety of brand names by a number of different companies. They all work the same and act as contact killers. This means that the product has to come into contact with the algae to be affective. Algicides come in two forms, granular and liquid. Granular herbicides are spread by hand or machine over an effected area. They can also be placed in a porous bag (such as a burlap sack) and dragged though the water in order to dissolve and disperse the product. Granular algicides are mainly used on filamentous algae where they are spread over the mats. As the granules dissolve, they kill the algae. Liquid algicides, which are much more widely used, are mixed with a known amount of water to achieve a known concentration. The mixture is then sprayed onto/into the water. Liquid algicides are used on both filamentous and planktonic algae. Liquid algaecides are often mixed with herbicides and applied together to save on time and money. The effectiveness of some herbicides are enhanced when mixed with an algicide. When applying an algicide it is imperative that the label is completely read and followed. If too much of the lake is treated at any one time an oxygen crash may occur. This may cause fish kills due to decomposition of treated algae. Additionally, treatments should never be made when blooms/mats are at their fullest extent. It is best to divide the lake into at least two sections depending on the size of the lake. Larger lakes will need to be divided into more sections. Then treat the lake one section at a time allowing at least two weeks between treatments. Furthermore, application of algicides should never be done in extremely hot weather (>90^{o}F) or when D.O. concentrations are low. This will help lessen the likelihood of an oxygen crash and resulting fish kills. When possible, treatments should be made as early in the season as possible when temperature and D.O. concentrations are adequate. It is best to treat in spring or when the blooms/mats starts to appear there by killing the algae before they become a problem.

Pros

When used properly, algicides can be a powerful tool in management of nuisance algae growth. A properly implemented plan can often provide season long control with minimal applications. Another benefit of using algicides are their low costs. The fisheries and waterfowl populations of the lake would greatly benefit due to a decrease in nuisance algal blooms. By reducing the algae, clarity would increase. This in turn would allow the native aquatic plants to return to the lake. Newly established stands of plants would improve spawning habitat and food source availability for fish. Waterfowl population would greatly benefit from increases in quality food sources, such as large-leaf pondweed (*Potamogeton amplifolius*) and sago pondweed (*Potamogeton pectinatus*). Additionally, copper products, at proper dosages, are selective in the sense that they do not affect aquatic vascular plants and wildlife.

By implementing a good management plan, usage opportunities for the lake would increase. Activities such as boating and swimming would improve due to the removal of thick blooms and/or mats of algae. Health risks associated with excessive algae growth (toxins, reduced visibility, etc.) The quality of fishing may recover due to improved habitat and feeding opportunities. In addition to increased usage opportunities, overall aesthetics of the lake would improve, potentially increasing property values.

Cons

The most obvious drawback of using algicides is the input of chemicals into the lake. Even though the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) approved these chemicals for use, human error and overuse can make them unsafe and bring about undesired outcomes. By continually killing particular algal species, lake managers may unknowingly be creating a larger problem. As the algae are continuously exposed to copper, some species are becoming more and more tolerant. This results in the use of higher concentrations in order to achieve adequate control, which can be unhealthy for the lake. In other instances, by eliminating one type of algae, lake managers are finding that other species that are even more problematic are filling the empty gap. These species that fill the gap can often be more difficult to control due to an inherent resistance to copper products. Additionally, excessive use of copper products can lead to a build up of copper in lake sediment. This can cause problems for activities such as dredging. Due to a large amount of copper in the sediment, special permits and disposal methods would have to be utilized.

Costs

Chelated copper products costs about $35-45 per gallon. Treatment applications vary but generally are recommended at 1-5 gallons per acre foot, depending on the product.

Option 3: Alum Treatment

A possible remedy to excessive algal growth is to eliminate or greatly reduce the amount of phosphorus. This can be accomplished by using aluminum sulfate (alum). Alum does not directly kill algae as copper sulfate does. Instead, alum binds phosphorus making it unavailable, thus reducing algal growth. Alum binds water-borne phosphorus and forms a flocculent layer that settles on the bottom. This floc layer can then prevent sediment bound phosphorus from entering the water column. Phosphorus inactivation using alum has been in use for 25 years. However, cost and sometimes unreliable results deterred its wide spread use. Currently, alum is commonly being used in ponds and small lakes, and its use in larger lakes is increasing. Alum treatment typically lasts 1 to 20 years depending on various parameters. Lakes with low mean depth to surface area ratio are good candidates. This encompasses many lakes within Lake County. Lakes that are thermally stratified experience longer inactivation than non-stratified lakes due to isolation of the flocculent layer. Lakes with small watersheds are also better candidates because external phosphorus sources can be limited. Alum treatments must be carefully planned and carried out by an experienced professional. If not properly done, there may be many detrimental side effects.

This option would only be recommended for Lucky Lake only if the water clarity were poor enough to limit light penetration (due to algae blooms), which would prohibit aquatic plant growth. The phosphorus levels in Lucky Lake are not excessive at this time, however, this option may be practical in the future.

Pros

Phosphorus inactivation is a possible long-term solution for controlling nuisance algae and increasing water clarity. Alum treatments can last as long as 20 years. This makes alum more cost effective in the long-term compared to continual treatment with algaecides. Studies have shown reductions in phosphorus concentrations by 66% in spring and 68% in summer. Chlorophyll *a*, a measure of algal biomass, was reduced by 61%. Reduction in algal biomass caused an increase in dissolved oxygen and a 79% increase in secchi disk readings. Effects of alum treatments can be seen in as little as a few days. The increase in clarity can have many positive effects on the lake's ecosystem. With increased clarity, plant populations could expand or reestablish. This in turn would improve fish habitat and provide improved food/habitat sources for other organisms. Recreational activities such as swimming and fishing would be improved due to increased water clarity and healthy plant populations. Typically, there is a slight invertebrate decline immediately following treatment but populations recover fully by the following year.

Cons

There are several drawbacks to alum. External nutrient inputs must also be reduced or eliminated for alum to provide long-term effectiveness. With larger watersheds this could prove to be physically and financially impossible. Phosphorus inactivation may be shortened by excessive plant growth or motorboat traffic, which can disturb the flocculent layer and allow phosphorus to be released. Also, lakes that are shallow, non-stratified, and wind blown typically do not achieve long term control due to disruption of the flocculent layer. If alum is not properly applied toxicity problems may occur. Typically aluminum toxicity occurs if pH is below 6 or above 9. Most of Lake County's lakes are in this safe range. However, at these pHs, special precautions must be taken when applying alum. By adding the incorrect amounts of alum, pH of the lake could drastically change. Due to these dangers, it is highly recommended that a lake management professional plans and administers the alum treatment.

Costs

Morphometric data is required to make proper calculations. Currently, no bathymetric map of Lucky Lake exists. However, a rough calculation based on available data estimates the cost of an alum treatment to be between $2,500-4,000.

Option 4: Revegetation With Native Aquatic Plants

This option is strongly recommended for Lucky Lake.

A healthy native plant population can reduce algal growth. Many lakes with long-standing algal problems have a very sparse plant population or none at all. This is due to reduction in light penetration brought about by years of excessive algal blooms and/or mats. Revegetation should only be done when existing nuisance algal blooms are under control using one of the above management options. If the lake has poor clarity due to excessive algal growth or turbidity, these problems must be addressed before a revegetation plan is undertaken. Without adequate light penetration, revegetation will not work. At maximum, planting depth light levels must be greater than 1-5% of the surface light levels for plant growth and photosynthesis. If aquatic herbicides are being used to control what vegetation does exist there use should be scaled back or abandoned all together. This will allow the vegetation to grow back, which will help in controlling the algae in addition to other positive impacts associated with a healthy plant population.

There are two methods by which reestablishment can be accomplished. The first is use of existing plant populations to revegetate other areas within the lake. Plants from one part of the lake are allowed to naturally expand into adjacent areas thereby filling the niche left by the nuisance algae. Another technique utilizing existing plants is to transplant vegetation from one area to another. The second method of reestablishment is to import native plants from an outside source. A variety of plants can be ordered from nurseries that specialize in native aquatic plants. These plants are available in several forms such as seeds, roots, and small plants. These two methods can be used in conjunction with one another in order to increase both quantity and biodiversity of plant populations. Additionally, plantings must be protected from herbivory by waterfowl and other wildlife. Simple cages made out of wooden or metal stakes and chicken wire are erected around planted areas for at least one season. The cages are removed once the plants are established and less vulnerable. If large-scale revegetation is needed it would be best to use a consultant to plan and conduct the restoration. Table 5 lists common, native plants that should be considered when developing a revegetation plan. Included in this list are emergent shoreline vegetation (rushes, cattails, etc) and submersed aquatic plants (pondweeds, *Vallisneria*, etc). Prices, planting depths, and planting densities are included and vary depending on plant species.

Pros

By revegetating newly opened areas that were once infested with nuisance species, the lake will benefit in several ways. Once established, expanded native plant populations will help to control growth of nuisance algae by shading and competition for resources. This provides a more natural approach as compared to other management options. In addition, using established native plants to control excessive invasive plant growth is less expensive than other options. Expanded native plant populations will also help with sediment stabilization. This in turn will have a positive effect on water clarity by reducing suspended solids and nutrients that decrease clarity and cause excessive algal growth. Properly revegetating shallow water areas with plants such as cattails, bulrushes, and water lilies can help reduce wave action that can lead to shoreline erosion. Increases in desirable vegetation will increase the plant biodiversity and also provide better quality habitat and food sources for fish and other wildlife. Recreational uses of the lake such as fishing and boating will also improve due to the improvement in water quality and the suppression of weedy species.

Cons

There are few negative impacts to revegetating a lake. One possible drawback is the possibility of new vegetation expanding to nuisance levels and needing control. However, this is an unlikely outcome. Another drawback could be high costs if extensive revegetation is needed using imported plants. If a consultant is used costs would be substantially higher. Additional costs could be associated with constructing proper herbivory protection measures.

Costs

See Table 5 in Appendix A for pricing.

Objective IV: Enhance Shoreline Vegetation

The shoreline around Lucky Lake consists of vegetation that is non-native and/or of poor quality. Many of the species are invasive and should be removed and replanted with native plants.

Option 1: Create a Buffer Strip

This option is strongly recommended for Lucky Lake.

Another effective method of controlling shoreline erosion is to create a buffer strip with existing or native vegetation. Native plants have deeper root systems than turfgrass and thus hold soil more effectively. Native plants also provide positive aesthetics and good wildlife habitat. Cost of creating a buffer strip is quite variable, depending on the current state of the vegetation and shoreline and whether vegetation is allowed to become established naturally or if the area needs to be graded and replanted. Allowing vegetation to naturally propagate the shoreline would be the most cost effective, depending on the severity of erosion and the composition of the current vegetation. Non-native plants or noxious weedy species may be present and should be controlled or eliminated.

Stabilizing the shoreline with vegetation is most effective on slopes no less than 2:1 to 3:1, horizontal to vertical or flatter. Usually a buffer strip of at least 25 feet is recommended, however, wider strips (50 or even 100 feet) are recommended on steeper slopes or areas with severe erosion problems. Areas where erosion is severe or where slopes are greater than 3:1, additional erosion control techniques may have to be incorporated such as biologs, A-Jacks®, or rip-rap.

Buffer strips can be constructed in a variety of ways with various plant species. Generally, buffer strip vegetation consists of native terrestrial (land) species and emergent (at the land and water interface) species. Terrestrial vegetation such as native grasses and wildflowers can be used to create a buffer strip along lake shorelines. A table in Appendix A gives some examples, seeding rates and costs of grasses and seed mixes that can be used to create buffer strips. Native plants and seeds can be purchased at regional nurseries or from catalogs. When purchasing seed mixes, care should be taken that native plant seeds are used. Some commercial seed mixes contain non-native or weedy species or may contain annual wildflowers that will have to be reseeded every year. If purchasing plants from a nursery or if a licensed contractor is installing plants, inquire about any guarantees they may have on plant survival. Finally, new plants should be protected from herbivory (e.g., geese and muskrats) by placing a wire cage over the plants for at least one year.

A technique that is sometimes implemented along shorelines is the use of willow posts, or live stakes, which are harvested cuttings from live willows (*Salix* spp.). They can be planted along the shoreline along with a cover crop or native seed mix. The willows will resprout and begin establishing a deep root structure that secures the soil. If the shoreline is highly erodible, willow posts may have to be used in conjunction with another erosion control technique such as biologs, A-Jacks ®, or rip-rap.

Emergent vegetation, or those plants that grow in shallow water and wet areas, can be used to control erosion more naturally than seawalls or rip-rap. Native emergent vegetation can be either hand planted or allowed to become established on its own over time. Some plants, such as native cattails (*Typha* sp.), quickly spread and help stabilize shorelines, however they can be aggressive and may pose a problem later. Other species, such as those listed in a table in Appendix B should be considered for native plantings.

Pros

Buffer strips can be one of the least expensive means to stabilize shorelines. If no permits or heavy equipment are needed (i.e. no significant earthmoving or filling is planned), the property owner can complete the work without the need of professional contractors. Once established (typically within 3 years), a buffer strip of native vegetation will require little maintenance and may actually reduce the overall maintenance of the property, since the buffer strip will not have to be continuously mowed, watered, or fertilized. Occasional high mowing (1-2 times per year) for specific plants or physically removing other weedy species may be needed.

The buffer strip will stabilize the soil with its deep root structure and help filter run-off from lawns and agricultural fields by trapping nutrients, pollutants, and sediment that would otherwise drain into the lake. This may have a positive impact on the lake's water quality since there will be less "food" for nuisance algae. Buffer strips can filter as much as 70-95% of sediment and 25-60% of nutrients and other pollutants from runoff.

Another benefit of a buffer strip is potential flood control protection. Buffer strips may slow the velocity of flood waters, thus preventing shoreline erosion. Native plants also can withstand fluctuating water levels more effectively than commercial turfgrass. Many plants can survive after being under water for several days, even weeks, while turfgrass is intolerant of wet conditions and usually dies after several days under water. This contributes to increased maintenance costs, since the turfgrass has to be either replanted or replaced with sod. Emergent vegetation can provide additional help in preserving shorelines and improving water quality by absorbing wave energy that might otherwise batter the shoreline. Calmer wave action will result in less shoreline erosion and resuspension of bottom sediment, which may result in potential improvements in water quality.

Many fish and wildlife species prefer the native shoreline vegetation habitat. This habitat is an asset to the lake's fishery since the emergent vegetation cover may be used for spawning, foraging, and hiding. Various wildlife species are even dependent upon shoreline vegetation for their existence. Certain birds, such as marsh wrens (*Cistothorus palustris*) and endangered yellow-headed blackbirds (*Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus*) nest exclusively in emergent vegetation like cattails and bulrushes. Hosts of other wildlife like waterfowl, rails, herons, mink, and frogs to mention just a few, benefit from healthy stands of shoreline vegetation. Dragonflies, damselflies, and other beneficial invertebrates can be found thriving in vegetation along the shoreline as well. Two invertebrates of particular importance for lake management, the water-milfoil weevils (*Euhrychiopsis lecontei* and *Phytobius leucogaster*), which have been shown to naturally reduce stands of exotic Eurasian water-milfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*). Weevils need proper over wintering habitat such as leaf litter and mud which are typically found on naturalized shorelines or shores with good buffer strips. Many species of amphibians, birds, fish, mammals, reptiles, and invertebrates have suffered precipitous declines in recent years primarily due to habitat loss. Buffer strips may help many of these species and preserve the important diversity of life in and around lakes.

In addition to the benefits of increased fish and wildlife use, a buffer strip planted with a variety of native plants may provide a season long show of various colors from flowers, leaves, seeds, and stems. This is not only aesthetically pleasing to people, but also benefits wildlife and the overall health of the lake's ecosystem.

Cons

There are few disadvantages to native shoreline vegetation. Certain species (i.e. cattails) can be aggressive and may need to be controlled occasionally. If stands of shoreline vegetation become dense enough, access and visibility to the lake may be compromised to some degree. However, small paths could be cleared to provide lake access or smaller plants could be planted in these areas.

Costs

If minimal amount of site preparation is needed, costs can be approximately $10 per linear foot, plus labor. Cost of installing willow posts is approximately $15-20 per linear foot. The labor that is needed can be completed by the property owner in most cases, although consultants can be used to provide technical advice where needed. This cost will be higher if the area needs to be graded. If grading is necessary, appropriate permits and surveys are needed. If filling is required, additional costs will be incurred if compensatory storage is needed. The permitting process is costly, running as high as $1,000-2,000 depending on the types of permits needed.

Objective V: Control Exotic Plant Species

Numerous exotic plant species have been introduced into our local ecosystems. Some of these plants are aggressive, quickly out-competing native vegetation and flourishing in an environment where few natural predators exist. Plants such as purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*), buckthorn (*Rhamnus cathartica*), and reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) are three examples. The outcome is a loss of plant and animal diversity. This section will address terrestrial shoreline exotic species.

Purple loosestrife is responsible for the "sea of purple" seen along roadsides and in wetlands during summer. It can quickly dominate a wetland or shoreline. Due in part to an extensive root system, large seed production (estimates range from 100,000 to 2.7 million seeds per plant), and high seed germination rate, purple loosestrife spreads quickly. Buckthorn is an aggressive shrub species that grows along lake shorelines as well as most upland habitats. It shades out other plants and is quick to become established on disturbed soils. Reed canary grass is an aggressive plant that if left unchecked will dominate an area, particularly a wetland or shoreline, in a short period of time. Since it begins growing early in the spring, it quickly out-competes native vegetation that begins growth later in the year. Control of purple loosestrife, buckthorn, and reed canary grass are discussed below. However, these control measures can be similarly applied to other exotic species such as garlic mustard (*Allilaria officianalis*) or honeysuckle (*Lonicera* spp.) as well as some aggressive native species, such as box elder (*Acer negundo*).

Presence of exotic species along a lakeshore is by no means a death sentence for the lake or other plant and animal life. If controlled, many exotic species can perform many of the original functions that they were brought here for. For example, reed canary grass was imported for its erosion control properties. It still contributes to this objective (offering better erosion control than commercial turfgrass), but needs to be isolated and kept in control. Many exotics are the result of garden or ornamental plants escaping into the wild. One isolated plant along a shoreline will probably not create a problem by itself. However, problems arise when plants are left to spread, many times to the point where treatment is difficult or cost prohibitive. A monitoring program should be established, problem areas identified, and control measures taken when appropriate. This is particularly important in remote areas of lake shorelines where the spread of exotic species may go unnoticed for some time.

Option 1: No Action

No control will likely result in the expansion of the exotic species and the decline of native species. This option is not recommended if possible. Along the shoreline of Lucky Lake, several exotic species were found. Many small buckthorn shrubs were seen along the northwestern shoreline. Under this option, these shrubs will quickly out-compete all native plants.

Pros

There are few advantages with this option. Some of the reasons exotics were brought into this country are no longer used or have limited use. However, in some cases having an exotic species growing along a shoreline may actually be preferable if the alternative plant is commercial turfgrass. Since turfgrass has shallow roots and is prone to erosion along shorelines, exotics like reed canary grass or common reed (*Phragmites australis*) will control erosion more effectively. Native plants should take precedent over exotics when possible. A table in Appendix A lists several native plants that can be planted along shorelines.

Cons

Native plant and wildlife diversity will be lost as stands of exotic species expand. Exotic species are not under the same stresses (particularly diseases and predators) as native plants and thus can out-compete the natives for nutrients, space, and light. Few wildlife species use areas where exotic plants dominate. This happens because many wildlife species either have not adapted with the plants and do not view them as a food resource, the plants are not digestible to the animal, or their primary food supply (i.e., insects) are not attracted to the plants. The result is a monoculture of exotic plants with limited biodiversity.

Recreational activities, especially wildlife viewing, may be hampered by such monocultures. Access to lake shorelines may be impaired due to dense stands of non-native plants. Other recreational activities, such as swimming and boating, may not be effected.

Costs

Costs with this option are zero initially, however, when control is eventually needed, costs will be substantially more than if action was taken immediately. Additionally, the eventual loss of ecological diversity is difficult to calculate financially.

Option 2: Control by Hand

Controlling exotic plants by hand removal is most effective on small areas (< 1 acre) and if done prior to heavy infestation. Some exotics, such as purple loosestrife and reed canary grass, can be controlled to some degree by digging, cutting, or mowing if done early and often during the year. Digging may be required to ensure the entire root mass is removed. Spring or summer is the best time to cut or mow, since late summer and fall is when many of the plant seeds disperse. Proper disposal of excavated plants is important since seeds may persist and germinate even after several years. Once exotic plants are removed, the disturbed ground should be planted with native vegetation and closely monitored. Many exotic species, such as purple loosestrife, buckthorn, and garlic mustard are proficient at colonizing disturbed sites.

Pros

Removal of exotics by hand eliminates the need for chemical treatments. Costs are low if stands of plants are not too large already. Once removed, control is simple with yearly maintenance. Control or elimination of exotics preserves the ecosystem's biodiversity. This will have positive impacts on plant and wildlife presence as well as some recreational activities.

Cons

This option may be labor intensive or prohibitive if the exotic plant is already well established. Costs may be high if large numbers of people are needed to remove plants. Soil disturbance may introduce additional problems such as providing a seedbed for other non-native plants that quickly establish disturbed sites, or cause soil-laden run-off to flow into nearby lakes or streams. In addition, a well-established stand of an exotic like purple loosestrife or reed canary grass may require several years of intense removal to control or eliminate.

Costs

Cost for this option is primarily in tools, labor, and proper plant disposal.

Option 3: Herbicide Treatment

Chemical treatments can be effective at controlling exotic plant species. However, chemical treatment works best on individual plants or small areas already infested with the plant. In some areas where individual spot treatments are prohibitive or unpractical (i.e., large expanses of a wetland or woodland), chemical treatments may not be an option due to the fact that in order to chemically treat the area a broadcast application would be needed. Since many of the herbicides that are used are not selective, meaning they kill all plants they contact; this may be unacceptable if native plants are found in the proposed treatment area.

Herbicides are commonly used to control nuisance shoreline vegetation such as buckthorn and purple loosestrife. Herbicides are applied to green foliage or cut stems. Products are applied by either spraying or wicking (wiping) solution on plant surfaces. Spraying is used when large patches of undesirable vegetation are targeted. Herbicides are sprayed on growing foliage using a hand-held or backpack sprayer. Wicking is used when selected plants are to be removed from a group of plants. The herbicide solution is wiped on foliage, bark, or cut stems using a herbicide soaked device. Trees are normally treated by cutting a ring in the bark (called girdling). Herbicides are applied onto the ring at high concentrations. Other devices inject the herbicide through the bark. It is best to apply herbicides when plants are actively growing, such as in the late spring/early summer, but before formation of seed heads. Herbicides are often used in conjunction with other methods, such as cutting or mowing, to achieve the best results. Proper use of these products is critical to their success. Always read and follow label directions.

Pros

Herbicides provide a fast and effective way to control or eliminate nuisance vegetation. Unlike other control methods, herbicides kill the root of the plant, which prevents regrowth. If applied properly, herbicides can be selective. This allows for removal of selected plants within a mix of desirable and undesirable plants.

Cons

Since most herbicides are non-selective, they are not suitable for broadcast application. Thus, chemical treatment of large stands of exotic species may not be practical. Native species are likely to be killed inadvertently and replaced by other non-native species. Off target injury/death may result from the improper use of herbicides. If herbicides are applied in windy conditions, chemicals may drift onto desirable vegetation. Care must also be taken when wicking herbicides as not to drip on to non-targeted vegetation such as native grasses and wildflowers. Another drawback to herbicide use relates to their ecological soundness and the public perception of them. Costs may also be prohibitive if plant stands are large. Depending on the device, cost of the application equipment can be high.

Costs

Two common herbicides, triclopyr (sold as Garlon™) and glyphosate (sold as Rodeo® or Round-up™, Eagre™, or AquaPro™), cost approximately $100 and $65 per gallon, respectively. Only Rodeo® is approved for water use. A Hydrohatchet®, a hatchet that injects herbicide through the bark, is about $300.00. Another injecting device, E-Z Ject® is $450.00. Hand-held and backpack sprayers costs from $25-$45 and $80-150, respectively. Wicking devices are $30-40.

Objective VI: Enhance Wildlife Habitat Conditions

The key to increasing wildlife species in and around a lake can be summed up in one word: habitat. Wildlife need the same four things all living creatures need: food, water, shelter, and a place to raise their young. Since each wildlife species has specific habitat requirements, which fulfill these four basic needs, providing a variety of habitats will increase the chance that wildlife species may use an area. Groups of wildlife are often associated with the types of habitats they use. For example, grassland habitats may attract wildlife such as northern harriers, bobolinks, meadowlarks, meadow voles, and leopard frogs. Marsh habitats may attract yellow-headed blackbirds and sora rails, while manicured residential lawns attract house sparrows and gray squirrels. Thus, in order to attract a variety of wildlife, a mix of habitats are needed. In most cases quality is more important than quantity (i.e., five 0.1-acre plots of different habitats may not attract as many wildlife species than one 0.5 acre of one habitat type).

It is important to understand that the natural world is constantly changing. Habitats change or naturally succeed to other types of habitats. For example, grasses may be succeeded by shrub or shade intolerant tree species (e.g., willows, locust, and cottonwood). The point at which one habitat changes to another is rarely clear, since these changes usually occur over long periods of time, except in the case of dramatic events such as fire or flood.

In all cases, the best wildlife habitats are ones consisting of native plants. Unfortunately, non-native plants dominate many of our lake shorelines. Many of them escaped from gardens and landscaped yards (i.e., purple loosestrife) while others were introduced at some point to solve a problem (i.e., reed canary grass for erosion control). Wildlife species prefer native plants for food, shelter, and raising their young. In fact, one study showed that plant and animal diversity was 500% higher along naturalized shorelines compared to shorelines with conventional lawns (University of Wisconsin – Extension, 1999).

Option 1: No Action

This option means that the current land use activities will continue. No additional techniques will be implemented. Allowing a field to go fallow or not mowing a manicured lawn would be considered an action.

Pros

Taking no action may maintain the current habitat conditions and wildlife species present, depending on environmental conditions and pending land use actions. If all things remain constant there will be little to no effect on lake water quality and other lake uses.

Cons

If environmental conditions change or substantial land use actions occur (i.e., development) wildlife use of the area may change. For example, if a new housing development with manicured lawns and roads is built next to an undeveloped property, there will probably be a change in wildlife present.

Conditions in the lake (i.e., siltation or nutrient loading) may also change the composition of aquatic plant and invertebrate communities and thus influence biodiversity. Siltation and nutrient loading will likely decrease water clarity, increase turbidity, increase algal growth (due to nutrient availability), and decrease habitat for fish and wildlife.

Costs

The financial cost of this option may be zero. However, due to continual loss of habitats many wildlife species have suffered drastic declines in recent years. The loss of habitat effects the overall health and biodiversity of the lake's ecosystems.

Option 2: Increase Habitat Cover

This option can be incorporated with Option 3 (see below). One of the best ways to increase habitat cover is to leave a minimum 25 foot buffer between the edge of the water and any mowed grass. Allow native plants to grow or plant native vegetation along shorelines, including emergent vegetation such as cattails, rushes, and bulrushes (see the table in Appendix A for costs and seeding rates). This will provide cover from predators and provide nesting structure for many wildlife species and their prey. It is important to control or eliminate non-native plants such as buckthorn, purple loosestrife, garlic mustard, and reed canary grass, since these species outcompete native plants and provide little value for wildlife.

Occasionally high mowing (with the mower set at its highest setting) may have to be done for specific plants, particularly if the area is newly established, since competition from weedy and exotic species is highest in the first couple years. If mowing, do not mow the buffer strip until after July 15 of each year. This will allow nesting birds to complete their breeding cycle.

Brush piles make excellent wildlife habitat. They provide cover as well as food resources for many species. Brush piles are easy to create and will last for several years. They should be place at least 10 feet away from the shoreline to prevent any debris from washing into the lake.

Trees that have fallen on the ground or into the water are beneficial by harboring food and providing cover for many wildlife species. In a lake, fallen trees provide excellent cover for fish, basking sites for turtles, and perches for herons and egrets.

Increasing habitat cover should not be limited to the terrestrial environment. Native aquatic vegetation, particularly along the shoreline, can provide cover for fish and other wildlife.

Pros
Increased cover will lead to increased use by wildlife. Since cover is one of the most important elements required by most species, providing cover will increase the chances of wildlife using the shoreline. Once cover is established, wildlife usually have little problem finding food, since many of the same plants that provide cover also supply the food the wildlife eat, either directly (seeds, fruit, roots, or leaves) or indirectly (prey attracted to the plants).

Additional benefits of leaving a buffer include: stabilizing shorelines, reducing runoff which may lead to better water quality, and deterring nuisance Canada geese. Shorelines with erosion problems can benefit from a buffer zone because native plants have deeper root structures and hold the soil more effectively than conventional turfgrass. Buffers also absorb much of the wave energy that batters the shoreline. Water quality may be improved by the filtering of nutrients, sediment, and pollutants in run-off. This has a “domino effect” since less run-off flowing into a lake means less nutrient availability for nuisance algae, and less sediment means less turbidity, which leads to better water quality. All this is beneficial for fish and wildlife, such as sight-feeders like bass and herons, as well as people who use the lake for recreation. Finally, a buffer strip along the shoreline can serve as a deterrent to Canada geese from using a shoreline. Canada geese like flat, open areas with a wide field of vision. Ideal habitat for them are areas that have short grass up to the edge of the lake. If a buffer is allowed to grow tall, geese may choose to move elsewhere.

Cons
There are few disadvantages to this option. However, if vegetation is allowed to grow, lake access and visibility may be limited. If this occurs, a small path can be made to the shoreline. Composition and density of aquatic and shoreline vegetation are important. If vegetation consists of non-native species such as or Eurasian water milfoil or purple loosestrife, or in excess amounts, undesirable conditions may result. A shoreline with excess exotic plant growth may result in a poor fishery (exhibited by stunted fish) and poor recreation opportunities (i.e., boating, swimming, or wildlife viewing).

Costs
The cost of this option would be minimal. The purchase of native plants can vary depending upon species and quantity. Based upon 100 feet of shoreline, a 25-foot buffer planted with a native forb and grass seed mix would cost between $165-270 (2500 sq. ft. would require 2.5, 1000 sq. ft. seed mix packages at $66-108 per package). This does not include labor that would be needed to prepare the site for planting and follow-up maintenance. This cost can be reduced or minimized if native plants are allowed to grow. However, additional time and labor may be needed to insure other exotic species, such as buckthorn, reed canary grass, and purple loosestrife, do not become established.

Option 3: Increase Natural Food Supply

This can be accomplished in conjunction with Option 2. Habitats with a diversity of native plants will provide an ample food supply for wildlife. Food comes in a variety of forms, from seeds to leaves or roots to invertebrates that live on or are attracted to the plants. Plants found in the table in Appendix A should be planted or allowed to grow. In addition, encourage native aquatic vegetation, such as water lily (*Nuphar* spp. and *Nymphaea tuberosa*), sago pondweed (*Stuckenia pectinatus*), largeleaf pondweed (*Potamogeton amplifolius),* and wild celery (*Vallisneria americana*) to grow. Aquatic plants such as these are particularly important to waterfowl in the spring and fall, as they replenish energy reserves lost during migration.

Providing a natural food source in and around a lake starts with good water quality. Water quality is important to all life forms in a lake. If there is good water quality, the fishery benefits and subsequently so does the wildlife (and people) who prey on the fish. Insect populations in the area, including beneficial predatory insects, such as dragonflies, thrive in lakes with good water quality.

Dead or dying plant material can be a source of food for wildlife. A dead standing or fallen tree will harbor good populations of insects for woodpeckers, while a pile of brush may provide insects for several species of songbirds such as warblers and flycatchers.

Supplying natural foods artificially (i.e., birdfeeders, nectar feeders, corn cobs, etc.) will attract wildlife and in most cases does not harm the animals. However, “people food” such as bread should be avoided. Care should be given to maintain clean feeders and birdbaths to minimize disease outbreaks.

Pros

Providing food for wildlife will increase the likelihood they will use the area. Providing wildlife with natural food sources has many benefits. Wildlife attracted to a lake can serve the lake and its residents well, since many wildlife species (i.e., many birds, bats, and other insects) are predators of nuisance insects such as mosquitoes, biting flies, and garden and yard pests (such as certain moths and beetles). Effective natural insect control eliminates the need for chemical treatments or use of electrical “bug zappers” that have limited effect on nuisance insects.

Migrating wildlife can be attracted with a natural food supply, primarily from seeds, but also from insects, aquatic plants or small fish. In fact, most migrating birds are dependent on food sources along their migration routes to replenish lost energy reserves. This may present an opportunity to view various species that would otherwise not be seen during the summer or winter.

Cons

Feeding wildlife can have adverse consequences if populations become dependent on hand-outs or populations of wildlife exceed healthy numbers. This frequently happens when people feed waterfowl like Canada geese or mallard ducks.

Feeding these waterfowl can lead to a domestication of these animals. As a result, these birds do not migrate and can contribute to numerous problems, such as excess feces, which is both a nuisance to property owners and a significant contribution to the lake's nutrient load. Waterfowl feces are particularly high in phosphorus. Since phosphorus is generally the limiting factor for nuisance algae growth in many lakes in the Midwest, the addition of large amounts of this nutrient from waterfowl may exacerbate a lake's excessive algae problem. In addition, high populations of birds in an area can increase the risk of disease for not only the resident birds, but also wild bird populations that visit the area.

Finally, tall plants along the shoreline may limit lake access or visibility for property owners. If this occurs, a path leading to the lake could be created or shorter plants may be used in the viewing area.

Costs

The costs of this option are minimal. The purchase of native plants and food and the time and labor required to plant and maintain would be the limit of the expense.

Option 4: Increase Nest Availability

Wildlife are attracted by habitats that serve as a place to raise their young. Habitats can vary from open grasslands to closed woodlands (similar to Options 2 and 3).

Standing dead or dying trees provide excellent habitat for a variety of wildlife species. Birds such as swallows, woodpeckers, and some waterfowl need dead trees to nest in. Generally, a cavity created and used by a woodpecker (e.g., red-headed or downy woodpecker, or common flicker) in one year, will in subsequent years be used by species like tree swallows or chickadees. Over time, older cavities may be large enough for waterfowl, like wood ducks, or mammals (e.g., flying squirrels) to use. Standing dead trees are also favored habitat for nesting wading birds, such as great blue herons, night herons, and double-crested cormorants, which build stick nests on limbs. For these birds, dead trees in groups or clumps are preferred as most herons and cormorants are colonial nesters.

In addition to allowing dead and dying trees to remain, erecting bird boxes will increase nesting sites for many bird species. Box sizes should vary to accommodate various species. Swallows, bluebirds, and other cavity nesting birds can be attracted to the area using small artificial nest boxes. Larger boxes will attract species such as wood ducks, flickers, and owls. A colony of purple martins can be attracted with a purple martin house, which has multiple cavity holes, placed in an open area near water.

Bat houses are also recommended for any area close to water. Bats are voracious predators of insects and are naturally attracted to bodies of water. They can be enticed into roosting in the area by the placement of bat boxes. Boxes should be constructed of rough non-treated lumber and placed >10 feet high in a sunny location.

Pros
Providing places were wildlife can rear their young has many benefits. Watching wildlife raise their young can be an excellent educational tool for both young and old.

The presence of certain wildlife species can help in controlling nuisance insects like mosquitoes, biting flies, and garden and yard pests. This eliminates the need for chemical treatments or electric "bug zappers" for pest control.

Various wildlife species populations have dramatically declined in recent years. Since, the overall health of ecosystems depend, in part, on the role of many of these species, providing sites for wildlife to raise their young will benefit not only the animals themselves, but the entire lake ecosystem.

Cons
Providing sites for wildlife to raise their young have few disadvantages. Safety precautions should be taken with leaving dead and dying trees due to the potential of falling limbs. Safety is also important when around wildlife with young, since many animals are protective of their young. Most actions by adult animals are simply threats and are rarely carried out as attacks.

Parental wildlife may chase off other animals of its own species or even other species. This may limit the number of animals in the area for the duration of the breeding season.

Costs
The costs of leaving dead and dying trees are minimal. The costs of installing the bird and bat boxes vary. Bird boxes can range in price from $10-100.00. Purple martin houses can cost $50-150. Bat boxes range in price from $15-50.00. These prices do not include mounting poles or installation.

Option 5: Limit Disturbance

Since most species of wildlife are susceptible to human disturbance, any action to curtail disturbances will be beneficial. Limiting disturbance can include posting signs in areas of the lake where wildlife may live (e.g., nesting waterfowl) or, in the case of Lucky Lake, prohibiting motors on the lake.

Pros
Limiting disturbance will increase the chance that wildlife will use the lake, particularly for raising their young. Many wildlife species have suffered population declines due to loss of habitat and poor breeding success. This is due in part to their sensitivity to disturbance.

This option also can benefit the lake in other ways. No motorboat traffic may help reduce erosion caused by wake waves or the suspension of nutrients and sediment in the water column from boat activity. Less nutrients and sediment in the water column may improve water quality by increasing water clarity and limiting nutrient availability for excessive plant or algae growth.

Recreation activities such as canoeing and paddleboating may be enhanced by the limited disturbance.

Cons
One of the strongest oppositions to this option would probably be from the powerboat users and water skiers. However, since these activities are not allowed on Lucky Lake, this should not be an issue.

Costs
The costs of this option include the purchase and placement of signs and public educational materials as well as enforcement. Off-duty law enforcement officers usually charge $25/hour to enforce boating laws or local ordinances.