

**2004 SUMMARY REPORT  
of  
COLLEGE TRAIL 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. Sanders  
Jennifer Wudi  
Mark Pfister

January 2005

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY   | 4  |
| LAKE IDENTIFICATION AND LOCATION  | 5  |
| BRIEF HISTORY OF COLLEGE TRAIL LAKE   | 5  |
| SUMMARY OF CURRENT AND HISTORICAL LAKE USES   | 5  |
| LIMNOLOGICAL DATA   |    |
| Water Quality   | 8  |
| Aquatic Plant Assessment  | 14 |
| Shoreline Assessment  | 16 |
| Wildlife Assessment   | 19 |
| EXISTING LAKE QUALITY PROBLEMS  | 21 |
| POTENTIAL OBJECTIVES FOR THE COLLEGE TRAIL LAKE MANAGEMENT PLAN   | 23 |
| OPTIONS FOR ACHIEVING THE LAKE MANAGEMENT PLAN OBJECTIVES   |    |
| Objective I: Create a Bathymetric Map Including a Morphometric Table  | 24 |
| Objective II: Illinois Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program  | 25 |
| Objective III: Nuisance Algae Management Options  | 26 |
| Objective IV: Shoreline Erosion Control   | 32 |
| Objective V: Eliminate or Control Exotic Species  | 40 |
| Objective VI: Enhance Wildlife Habitat Conditions   | 45 |
| Objective VII: Canada Goose Management  | 52 |
| TABLES AND FIGURES  |    |
| Figure 1. Approximate watershed delineation of College Trail Lake, 2004.  | 6  |
| Figure 2. The 2004 shoreline outline of College Trail Lake overlaid on the 1939 aerial photograph.  | 7  |
| Figure 3. Land uses in the College Trail Lake watershed, 2000.  | 9  |
| Figure 4. 2004 water quality sampling site and access location on College Trail Lake.   | 10 |
| Figure 5. Monthly Secchi disk transparency (in feet) and epilimnetic total phosphorus (TP) concentrations (in mg/L) for College Trail Lake, 2004. | 11 |
| Table 4. Aquatic and shoreline plants on College Trail Lake, May – September 2004   | 16 |
| Figure 6. 2004 shoreline types on College Trail Lake.   | 17 |
| Figure 7. 2004 shoreline erosion on College Trail Lake.   | 18 |
| Table 5. Wildlife species observed on College Trail Lake, April – September 2004.   | 20 |

**APPENDIX A: DATA TABLES FOR COLLEGE TRAIL LAKE**

Table 1. 2004 water quality data for College Trail Lake.

Table 2. Land uses in the College Trail Lake watershed, based on 2000 data.

Table 3. Lake County average TSI phosphorus ranking 2000-2004.

Table 6. Native plants for use in stabilization and revegetation.

**APPENDIX B: METHODS FOR FIELD DATA COLLECTION AND LABORATORY ANALYSES**

**APPENDIX C: 2004 MULTIPARAMETER DATA FOR COLLEGE TRAIL LAKE**

**APPENDIX D: GRANT OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLEGE TRAIL LAKE**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

College Trail Lake is a private lake located within the College Trail Subdivision in Grayslake (Avon Township). It is part of the Mill Creek drainage of the Des Plaines River watershed. College Trail Lake's watershed is approximately 784 acres, and has a watershed to lake ratio of 92:1.

Water clarity, as measured by Secchi disk transparency readings, averaged 2.18 feet for the season, which is 29% below the county median (where 50% of the lakes are above and below this value) of 3.08 feet. This was due primarily to the high total suspended solid concentrations (seasonal average of 12.4 mg/L) that were 57% higher than the county median of 7.9 mg/L. This is not surprising since the lake has a highly urbanized watershed and serves as the main stormwater detention for the subdivision. Stormwater usually contains sediment, nutrients, and pollutants from the surrounding residential area.

College Trail Lake also had high concentrations of total dissolved solids (TDS) and high conductivity readings. The 2004 epilimnetic average for TDS was 497 mg/L, which is 10% higher than the county median of 454 mg/L. The 2004 average conductivity reading in the epilimnion was 0.8878 milliSiemens/cm, which is 16% higher than the county median of 0.7652 milliSiemens/cm. The May sample had the highest values for the season (TDS=691 mg/L, conductivity=1.300 milliSiemens/cm) and probably due to the heavy spring rains. The most likely cause for these high TDS concentrations and conductivity readings is input from dissolved solids washed into the lake from storm events. One of the most common dissolved solids is road salt used in winter road deicing.

Aquatic plants in the lake were scarce. The limited aquatic vegetation in the lake is likely due to the hard substrate of the lake bottom, the steep slopes of the near shore areas, and the limited light penetration to the lake bottom.

The entire shoreline of College Trail Lake was classified as developed. Lawn habitat was the most common shoreline type consisting of 88% of the shoreline. Riprap shoreline was the next most common type at 7%. The shoreline was assessed for the degrees and types of shoreline erosion. Over 90% (4,767 feet) of the shoreline was classified as slightly eroding, but only 95 feet (1.8%) of the shoreline was classified as moderately eroding. There were no areas around the lake that were classified as severely eroding.

Several exotics were found growing along the shoreline, including buckthorn and purple loosestrife. Removal or control of exotic species is recommended.

## **LAKE IDENTIFICATION AND LOCATION**

College Trail Lake (T45N, R10E, Section 25) is a private lake located within the College Trail Subdivision east of Atkinson Road and north of Center Street in Grayslake (Avon Township). It is part of the Mill Creek drainage of the Des Plaines River watershed. College Trail Lake's watershed is approximately 784 acres, and has a watershed to lake ratio of 92:1 (Figure 1). There is one main inlet to the lake, a large stormwater culvert that enters the lake at its southern shore. The outlet is a V-notch culvert on the northwestern end of the lake. Water leaves the lake and enters a tributary of Mill Creek, eventually flowing into Third Lake.

College Trail Lake encompasses approximately 8.5 acres and has a shoreline length of one mile. The current maximum depth was determined to be 10.4 feet, as measured in June 2004. Since no bathymetric (depth contour) map of College Trail Lake is known to exist, the volume of the lake 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, College Trail Lake has an estimated mean depth of 5.2 feet and an estimated volume of 44 acre-feet. Lake elevation is approximately 774 feet above sea level.

## **BRIEF HISTORY OF COLLEGE TRAIL LAKE**

College Trail Lake was created 1991 by the excavation of a depressional area, for water detention as part of the development of the College Trail Subdivision. Figure 2 shows a 1939 aerial photograph of the area, prior to the lake's creation.

## **SUMMARY OF CURRENT AND HISTORICAL LAKE USES**

College Trail Lake is used primarily for the aesthetic enjoyment of the subdivision residents and stormwater detention for the residential areas surrounding the lake. The Grayslake Park District owns and manages the lake. There are approximately 50 private homes and two public parks (College Trail Park and Cambridge Park) around the lake. Activities not permitted on the lake include swimming and the use of motors. Fishing and paddleboating are allowed.

No aquatic herbicides or algicides were used in the lake in 2004. Historically, some experimentation with weed harvesting occurred. Details of these treatments will be addressed in the **Aquatic Plant Assessment** section of this report.

The composition of land uses within a lake's watershed often influences its water quality. The major land use in the College Trail Lake watershed (based on 2000 land use maps) is single family (19.6%), followed by retail/commercial (18.6%), agricultural (18.1%),

Figure 1. Watershed.

Figure 2. 1939 aerial

transportation (12.9%), and public and private open space (11.4%; Figure 3 below and Table 1 in Appendix A). Based on the land uses in the watershed and the estimated volume of College Trail Lake, the approximate retention time of the lake is 22 days. Implications of the retention time will be addressed in the **Water Quality Assessment** section below.

## LIMNOLOGICAL DATA – WATER QUALITY

Water samples were collected monthly from May - September at the deep-hole location in the lake (Figure 4). See Appendix B for water sampling methods.

College Trail Lake's water quality is similar to many lakes in Lake County (Table 2 in Appendix A). Most of the water quality parameters measured were near the medians (where 50% of the lakes are above and below this value) of other lakes that we have monitored. Several important findings were noted.

Water clarity, as measured by Secchi disk transparency readings, averaged 2.18 feet for the season, which is 29% below the county median of 3.08 feet. The clarity readings remained consistent throughout the season with the deepest reading being recorded in July (2.46 feet) and shallowest in August (1.90 feet). The decline in clarity from July to August can be attributed to the 1.43 inches of rain that fell 48 hours prior to water sampling in August. In addition, the water sampling point is approximately 150 feet from the major stormwater inlet pipe that enters the lake. The 2004 average total suspended solid (TSS) concentrations in the epilimnion (12.4 mg/L) was 57% above the county median (7.9 mg/L). Clarity and TSS were correlated throughout the season (Figure 5). This is not surprising since the lake has an urban watershed and serves as the main stormwater detention for the subdivision. Stormwater usually contains sediment, nutrients, and pollutants from the surrounding residential area. The average TSS concentration was slightly higher in the hypolimnion (15.9 mg/L) with the highest concentration occurring in August (23.9 mg/L). In addition to the heavy rainfall prior to sampling in August, a strong thermocline was occurring at approximately eight feet, which may have suspended some of the solids at or near the sample depth (seven feet). To track future water quality trends, it is recommended that the lake become enrolled in the Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program (VMLP), which trains a volunteer to measure the Secchi disk readings on a bimonthly basis from April to October. For more information see **Objective II: Illinois Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program.**

The 2004 average TP concentration in College Trail Lake was 0.050 mg/L in the epilimnion. This is 21% lower than the county median of 0.063 mg/L. Values above 0.03 mg/L in the epilimnion are considered sufficient enough to cause nuisance algae blooms. Algae, primarily planktonic, was seen during the sampling season. The TP concentrations were stable throughout the 2004 season, with the exception of June, when the epilimnetic concentration was 0.076 mg/L, likely due to the heavy spring rains that occurred in May. One of the largest threats to the lake is probably fertilizer (which is often high in



Figure 3.

Figure 4.

Figure 5.

phosphorus) applied to the lawns in the watershed. It is recommended that homeowners use a no-phosphorus fertilizer on their lawns. More information on algae control can be found in **Objective III: Nuisance Algae Management Options**.

College Trail Lake also had high concentrations of nitrate nitrogen (NO<sub>3</sub>-N) in May and June in both the epilimnion and hypolimnion. The exact source of the nitrogen is unknown, but may be the result of the heavy rains that occurred in the spring. Concentrations dropped as the season progressed and were at non-detectable concentrations in August and September.

College Trail Lake also had high concentrations of total dissolved solids (TDS) and high conductivity readings. There is a strong correlation between these two parameters as the higher the concentration of TDS in the water, the higher the conductivity reading. The 2004 epilimnetic average for TDS was 497 mg/L, which is 10% higher than the county median of 454 mg/L. The 2004 average conductivity reading in the epilimnion was 0.8878 milliSiemens/cm, which is 16% higher than the county median of 0.7652 milliSiemens/cm. The May sample had the highest values for the season (TDS=691 mg/L, conductivity=1.300 milliSiemens/cm) due to the heavy spring rains. The most likely cause for these increases in TDS concentrations and conductivity readings is input from dissolved solids washed into the lake from storm events. One of the most common dissolved solids is road salt used in winter road deicing. Because of the high conductivity readings, one additional parameter, chlorides, was measured in May when the concentrations of all these parameters were the highest within the timeframe of the study. Chloride concentrations help determine if this was the case since most road salt is sodium chloride, calcium chloride, potassium chloride, magnesium chloride or ferrocyanide salts. The chloride concentration in May in College Trail Lake was 247 mg/L in the epilimnion and 251 mg/L in the hypolimnion. The 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. Based on historical data, it appears that the road salt is compounding in many lakes in the county. Some lakes in the county have seen a doubling of conductivity readings in the past 5-10 years. In a study by Environment Canada (equivalent to our USEPA), it was estimated that 5% of aquatic species such as fish, zooplankton and benthic invertebrates would be affected at chloride concentrations of about 210 mg/l. Additionally, shifts in algae populations in lakes were associated with chloride concentrations as low as 12 mg/l. Thus, the chloride concentrations may be negatively impacting the aquatic life in College Trail Lake and should be monitored in the future to prevent further degradation. Alternatives to road salt should be investigated.

The lake was not stratified during the May sampling date, but a weak thermocline was established at approximately five feet in June. In July and August, a stronger thermocline was located at eight feet, and by the September sampling date the thermocline had almost completely dissipated, but was weakly present at nine feet near the bottom. Dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations in College Trail Lake were relatively stable during the season. Anoxic conditions (when DO concentrations fall below 1.0 mg/L) did occur below eight feet in July and August. The stratification of the lake at the deep hole did appear to influence the TSS concentrations mentioned above, however, the overall impact

on the lake may have been minimal since the thermocline was eight feet or deeper during most of the season and most of the lake is less than eight feet deep (based on depth soundings). A bathymetric map is needed to perform an accurate assessment.

High nutrient concentrations are usually indicative of water quality problems. Algae need light and nutrients, most importantly carbon, nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P), to grow. Light and carbon are not normally in short supply (limiting). This means that nutrients (N&P) are usually the limiting factors in algal growth. Nitrogen, as well as carbon, naturally occur in high concentrations and come from a variety of sources (soil, air, etc.) that are more difficult to control than sources of phosphorus. To compare the availability of these nutrients, a ratio of total nitrogen to total phosphorus is used (TN:TP). Ratios < 10:1 indicate nitrogen is limiting. Ratios of >15:1 indicate phosphorus is limiting. Ratios >10:1, <15:1 indicate that there is enough of both nutrients for excessive algal growth. The average ratio between total nitrogen and total phosphorus for College Trail Lake in 2004 was 31:1, indicating a phosphorus-limited system. Lakes that are phosphorus-limited may be easier to manage, since controlling phosphorus is more feasible than controlling nitrogen or carbon.

Water levels on College Trail Lake fluctuated throughout the season. The maximum one-month change occurred between May and June when the lake level increased by 7.5 inches. The maximum change over the season (June to September) was a 7.8-inch decrease. Significant changes in water levels may have a negative impact on water quality. In addition, lakes with fluctuating water levels potentially have more shoreline erosion problems.

As mentioned previously, based on the 2000 land uses in the watershed, the approximate retention time of the lake is only 22 days. This can produce a “flushing” effect, since the water entering the lake quickly leaves without allowing nutrients and sediment to build up in the water column or on bottom. The “flushing” effect would only occur during times when water was actively flowing through the spillway as it was in May, June, and July of 2004. The short retention time may be a positive aspect for College Trail Lake, however, any water (and subsequently nutrients and sediment) not detained in the lake will eventually flow downstream and potentially negatively impact other waterbodies. Water leaving the lake enters Mill Creek that eventually flows into Third Lake.

Rain events probably contribute additional sediment or nutrients (like phosphorus) to a lake, which may have influenced the water sample results. Rain occurred within 48 hours prior to water sampling in June (0.03 inches), July (0.04 inches), and August (1.43 inches) as recorded at the Lake County Stormwater Management Commission rain gage in Round Lake Park. Noteworthy is the fact that while only 0.03 inches of rain fell prior to sampling in June, heavy rainfall was recorded in May, which caused flooding in many parts of the county. The spike in epilimnetic TP concentration in June and the high TSS concentration in the hypolimnion in August are examples of how rainfall, and the subsequent nutrient and sediment input into the lake from stormwater can impact the water quality.

Based on data collected in 2004, standard classification indices compiled by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) were used to determine the current condition of College Trail 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 can be calculated using total phosphorus values obtained at or near the surface. The TSI<sub>p</sub> for College Trail Lake in 2004 classified it as a eutrophic lake (TSI<sub>p</sub> = 60.5). Eutrophic lakes are the most common types of lakes throughout the lower Midwest, and they are particularly common among manmade lakes. See Table 3 in Appendix A for a ranking of average TSI<sub>p</sub> values for Lake County lakes (College Trail Lake is currently #61 of 161). 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 College Trail 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 the trophic state of the lake, both the swimming and recreation indices indicated only a partial degree of support. The overall use index for the lake was partial support.

## **LIMNOLOGICAL DATA – AQUATIC PLANT ASSESSMENT**

Aquatic plant species presence and distribution in College Trail Lake were assessed monthly from May through September 2004 (see Appendix B for methods). Only two aquatic plant species and several emergent shoreline plants were found (see Table 4, below). Terrestrial shoreline plants were also noted, but not quantified.

Horned pondweed was found at one site in July at a depth of 0.25 feet, and constitutes the only record of native aquatic vegetation in College Trail Lake. Also in July, numerous water hyacinth plants were found along the northern shoreline. Someone most likely released these plants into the lake in June or early July since they were not seen prior to this time. Water hyacinth is not native to this area, but are common plants in the aquatic garden trade. People sometimes release the plants into natural areas after the plants outgrow their aquatic garden containers, not knowing the damage it can cause. These plants can cause major problems in natural areas in southern states like Florida. However, since this plant has southern origins, it is not expected to survive the winter here. The release of any exotic plant is strongly discouraged.

The 1% light levels (the point where plant photosynthesis ceases) remained relatively consistent throughout the summer with the 1% level penetrating down to between six and seven feet, with the exception of June when it only penetrated down to 4.5 feet. This

decline in light penetration in June was probably the result of the heavy rainfall amount that occurred throughout the region during May.

The reasons for the limited aquatic vegetation in the lake are likely due to the hard substrate of the lake bottom, the steep slopes of the near shore areas, and the limited light penetration to the lake bottom. Due to the lake's relatively recent creation, the softer organic substrates that would be favorable for aquatic plant growth may not have accumulated. Any accumulated sediments may be concentrated away from the steep near shore areas that are currently receiving sufficient light penetration for plant growth. However, adequate growing conditions apparently did occur shortly after the lake was created since the Grayslake Park District experimented with weed harvesting from 1993-1996. The more likely factor limiting plant growth is the poor water clarity, which limits light penetration. Although no bathymetric map of College Trail Lake exists, depth soundings throughout the season indicate that most of the lake is between three than seven feet deep. Thus, if water clarity were improved the potential aquatic plant coverage along the lake bottom is significant. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources recommends 25-40% aquatic plant coverage to maintain ideal gamefish habitat conditions. Beneficial native plants (both submersed and emergent) should be encouraged to become established to enhance habitats for fish and other wildlife and well as improve water quality. Another option would be to purchase and plant native plants and to encourage their growth, however, no submersed plants should be planted prior to the improvement of either the water clarity or near shore substrate composition.

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 every floating and submersed plant species 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 2004, College Trail Lake had a FQI of 10.0. The median FQI of lakes that we have studied from 2000-2004 is 12.1.

**Table 4. Aquatic and shoreline plants on College Trail Lake, May - September 2004.**

|                                    |                                   |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <u>Aquatic Plants</u>              |                                   |
| Water Hyacinth <sup>#</sup>        | <i>Eichhornia crassipes</i>       |
| Horned Pondweed                    | <i>Zannichellia palustris</i>     |
| <u>Shoreline Plants</u>            |                                   |
| Common Milkweed                    | <i>Asclepias syriaca</i>          |
| Oxeye Daisy                        | <i>Chrysanthemum leucanthemum</i> |
| Spikerush                          | <i>Eleocharis</i> sp.             |
| Ash                                | <i>Fraxinus</i> sp.               |
| Purple Loosestrife <sup>#</sup>    | <i>Lythrum salicaria</i>          |
| Cottonwood                         | <i>Populus deltoides</i>          |
| Buckthorn <sup>#</sup>             | <i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>         |
| Curled Dock <sup>#</sup>           | <i>Rumex crispus</i>              |
| Willow                             | <i>Salix</i> sp.                  |
| Weeping Willow                     | <i>Salix alba tristis</i>         |
| Basswood/Linden                    | <i>Tilia americana</i>            |
| Cattail                            | <i>Typha</i> sp.                  |
| <sup>#</sup> <b>Exotic species</b> |                                   |

## LIMNOLOGICAL DATA – SHORELINE ASSESSMENT

A shoreline assessment was conducted in July 2004 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.

The entire shoreline of College Trail Lake was classified as developed. Lawn habitat was the most common shoreline type consisting of 88% of the shoreline (Figure 6). Riprap shoreline was the next most common type at 7%. The three other shoreline types around the lake, seawall, buffer, and shrub made up the remaining 5% of the shoreline. Buffer habitat, which is a strip of unmowed vegetation preferably consisting of native plants located at the water's edge, should be established around the lake, particularly where manicured lawns are located. This habitat can help filter the nutrients and pollutants from the surrounding watershed before they enter the lake, as well as providing habitat that is favored by many wildlife species, but not favored by residential Canada geese.

The shoreline was assessed for the degrees and types of shoreline erosion. Over 90% (4,767 feet) of the shoreline was classified as slightly eroding, but only 95 feet (1.8%) of the shoreline was classified as moderately eroding (Figure 7). There were no areas around the lake that were classified as severely eroding. The slightly eroded areas should be



Figure 5.

Figure 6.

monitored for future degradation. The moderate erosion consists of four small sections of shoreline. Two located along the middle of the western shoreline and two located at the southern shoreline, near the stormwater inlet pipe. These moderately eroded areas should be remediated immediately to prevent additional loss of shoreline and prevent continued degradation of the water quality through sediment inputs. When possible, the shorelines should be repaired using natural vegetation and not riprap or seawalls. More information can be found in **Objective IV: Shoreline Erosion Control**.

Several exotics were found growing along the shoreline, including buckthorn and purple loosestrife. Similar to aquatic exotics, these terrestrial exotics are detrimental to the native plant ecosystems around the lake. Removal or control of exotic species is recommended. More information can be found in **Objective V: Eliminate or Control Exotic Species**.

## **LIMNOLOGICAL DATA – WILDLIFE ASSESSMENT**

Good numbers of wildlife, particularly birds, were noted on and around College Trail Lake. See Appendix B for methods. Several of the species listed in Table 5 (below) were seen during spring or fall migration and were assumed not to be nesting around the lake.

Habitat around College Trail Lake was poor, due mostly to the lawn habitats that dominate the lake shoreline. Additional habitat may be created around the lake, such as establishing buffer strips, allowing deadfall (trees and large limbs) to remain in the water, and erecting birdhouses. Increased aquatic and emergent plant populations in and around the lake will also aid in the habitat improvement. More information can be found in **Objective VI: Enhance Wildlife Habitat Conditions**.

One wildlife problem that was identified was the large numbers of resident Canada geese that were seen throughout the season. Resident geese contribute large amounts of feces to the surrounding landscape and eventually washes into the lake, which can exacerbate the nutrient problems in the lake, leading to excessive algae blooms. Controlling resident geese can be difficult and in some cases permits are required by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. Growing buffer strips around the lake will help discourage geese from using lawns. Also, allowing the lake to completely freeze in the winter will potentially encourage geese to move away from the lake. More information can be found in **Objective VII: Canada Goose Management**.

We did not conduct any fish surveys in 2004.

**Table 5. Wildlife species observed on College Trail Lake, April – September 2004.**

Birds

|                        |                               |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Canada Goose           | <i>Branta canadensis</i>      |
| Mallard                | <i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>     |
| Great Blue Heron       | <i>Ardea herodias</i>         |
| Solitary Sandpiper     | <i>Tringa solitaria</i>       |
| Mourning Dove          | <i>Zenaidura macroura</i>     |
| Tree Swallow           | <i>Iridoprocne bicolor</i>    |
| American Crow          | <i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i>  |
| Blue Jay               | <i>Cyanocitta cristata</i>    |
| Black-capped Chickadee | <i>Poecile atricapillus</i>   |
| American Robin         | <i>Turdus migratorius</i>     |
| Cedar Waxwing          | <i>Bombycilla cedrorum</i>    |
| Red-winged Blackbird   | <i>Agelaius phoeniceus</i>    |
| Common Grackle         | <i>Quiscalus quiscula</i>     |
| Starling               | <i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>       |
| House Sparrow          | <i>Passer domesticus</i>      |
| Northern Cardinal      | <i>Cardinalis cardinalis</i>  |
| House Finch            | <i>Carpodacus mexicanus</i>   |
| American Goldfinch     | <i>Carduelis tristis</i>      |
| White-crowned Sparrow  | <i>Zonotrichia leucophrys</i> |
| Chipping Sparrow       | <i>Spizella passerina</i>     |

Mammals

|               |                             |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Gray Squirrel | <i>Sciurus carolinensis</i> |
|---------------|-----------------------------|

Amphibians and Reptiles

None noted

**\*Endangered in Illinois**

**+Threatened in Illinois**

## 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., aeration, chemical treatments for plant or algae control, dredging, fish stocking, etc.) are part of the lake's overall management plan. Currently, no bathymetric map of College Trail Lake exists.

- *High Nitrate Nitrogen Concentrations in May and June*

College Trail Lake had high concentrations of nitrate nitrogen ( $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ ) in May and June. The possible sources of this nitrogen are the heavy rains that occurred prior to and during these months. The concentrations declined as the season progressed, further supporting the theory that the source was stormwater from spring rains.

- *High Total Dissolved Solid Concentrations and High Conductivity Readings*

High concentrations of total dissolved solids and high conductivity readings were found in the lake, particularly in May. The likely source of these high numbers is road salt that is used in winter road deicing. Chloride concentrations were also measured in May (247 mg/L and 251 mg/L in the epilimnion and hypolimnion, respectively) and were at levels potentially harmful to aquatic life. Alternatives to road salt should be investigated.

- *Limited Aquatic Vegetation*

Only one native aquatic plant species, horned pondweed, was found in College Trail Lake. The hard substrate, steep bottom slopes near the shoreline, and limited available light penetration limited any growth. If possible, beneficial native plants (both submersed and emergent), should be encouraged to grow to enhance habitats for fish and other wildlife and as well as improve water quality. Additionally, the exotic water hyacinth was found in July, apparently intentionally released into the lake after outgrowing an aquatic garden.

- *Invasive Shoreline Plant Species*

Numerous exotic plant species (i.e., purple loosestrife and buckthorn) were found on the shores of College Trail Lake. Loosestrife and buckthorn are particularly problematic as they outcompete native plants and offer little value in terms of shoreline stabilization or wildlife habitat. These exotic plants should be removed and replaced with native shoreline plants.

- *Canada Geese*

Numerous resident Canada geese were observed throughout the season on lawns surrounding the lake. Geese can be problematic since they contribute large amounts of feces to the surrounding landscape and eventually washes into the lake, which can exacerbate the nutrients problems in the lake, leading to excessive algae blooms. Growing buffer habitat along the shoreline and allowing the lake to completely freeze during the winter will aid in the management of this bird on this lake.

## **POTENTIAL OBJECTIVES FOR THE COLLEGE TRAIL LAKE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

- I. Create a Bathymetric Map Including a Morphometric Table
- II. Illinois Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program
- III. Nuisance Algae Management Options
- IV. Shoreline Erosion Control
- V. Eliminate or Control Exotic Plant Species
- VI. Enhance Wildlife Habitat Conditions
- VII. Canada Goose Management

## **Objective I: Create a Bathymetric Map Including a Morphometric Table**

A bathymetric map (depth contour) map is an essential tool for effective lake management since it provides critical information about the physical features of the lake, such as depth, surface area, 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: Participate in the 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, approximately 165 lakes (out of 3,041 lakes in Illinois) are sampled by approximately 300 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.

Currently the number of volunteers in the six county northeast Illinois region has reached its limit with regard to how many volunteers NIPC can handle. New lakes wishing to be part of the VLMP will be taken on and trained by the Lake County Health Department Lakes Management Unit (LMU). If you would like to be placed on this training list or would simply like more information, contact the Lakes Management Unit Local Coordinator:

LMU Local Coordinator:  
Mary Colwell  
Lake County Health Department  
3010 Grand Ave.  
Waukegan, IL 60085  
(847) 377-8009

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 itself. 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 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 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 produce 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<sub>4</sub>) 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. There is also a non-copper based algicide on the market called GreenClean™ from BIOsafe Systems, which contains the active ingredient sodium carbonate peroxyhydrate. Regardless of active ingredient, 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 effective. 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 through 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 is 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°F) or when DO 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 is 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***

To calculate total cost it will be necessary to calculate surface acreage (SA) or acre-feet (AF) of the area(s) to be treated according to each lake's aquatic plant management plan. The chelated copper products (Clearigate<sup>®</sup>, Cutrine<sup>®</sup>, Captain<sup>®</sup>, K-Tea<sup>®</sup>, Komeen<sup>®</sup>) cost \$35-45 per gallon and are generally applied at 0.5-2.5 gallons per acre-foot depending on the product.

### **Option 3: Revegetation With Native Aquatic Plants**

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 6 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 were used costs would be substantially higher. Additional costs could be associated with constructing proper herbivory protection measures.

***Costs***

See Table 6 for plant pricing. Costs will be higher if a consultant/nursery is contracted for design and labor. Additional costs will include herbivory protection materials such as metal posts and protective wire mesh (chicken wire).

## **Objective IV: Shoreline Erosion Control**

Erosion is a potentially serious problem to lake shorelines and occurs as a result of wind, wave, or ice action or from overland rainwater runoff. While some erosion to shorelines is natural, human alteration of the environment can accelerate and exacerbate the problem. Erosion not only results in loss of shoreline, but negatively influences the lake's overall water quality by contributing nutrients, sediment, and pollutants into the water. This effect is felt throughout the food chain since poor water quality negatively affects everything from microbial life to sight feeding fish and birds to people who want to use the lake for recreational purposes. The resulting increased amount of sediment will over time begin to fill in the lake, decreasing overall lake depth and volume and potentially impairing various recreational uses.

### **Option 1: No Action**

#### ***Pros***

There are no short-term costs to this option. However, extended periods of erosion may result in substantially higher costs to repair the shoreline in the future.

Eroding banks on steep slopes can provide habitat for wildlife, particularly bird species (e.g., kingfishers and bank swallows) that need to burrow into exposed banks to nest. In addition, certain minerals and salts in the soils are exposed during the erosion process, which are utilized by various wildlife species.

#### ***Cons***

Taking no action will most likely cause erosion to continue and subsequently may cause poor water quality due to high levels of sediment or nutrients entering a lake. This in turn may retard plant growth and provide additional nutrients for algal growth. A continual loss of shoreline is both aesthetically unpleasing and may potentially reduce property values. Since a shoreline is easier to protect than it is to rehabilitate, it is in the interest of the property owner to address the erosion issue immediately.

#### ***Costs***

In the short-term, cost of this option is zero. However, long-term implications can be severe since prolonged erosion problems may be more costly to repair than if the problems were addressed earlier. As mentioned previously, long-term erosion may cause serious damage to shoreline property and in some cases lower property values.

### **Option 2: Install a Seawall**

Seawalls are designed to prevent shoreline erosion on lakes in a similar manner they are used along coastlines to prevent beach erosion or harbor siltation. Today, seawalls are generally constructed of steel, although in the past seawalls were made of concrete or wood (frequently old railroad ties). Concrete seawalls cracked or were undercut by wave



action requiring routine maintenance. Wooden seawalls made of old railroad ties are not used anymore since the chemicals that made the ties rot-resistant could be harmful to aquatic organisms. A new type of construction material being used is vinyl or PVC. Vinyl seawalls are constructed of a lighter, more flexible material as compared to steel. Also, vinyl seawalls will not rust over time as steel will.

### ***Pros***

If installed properly and in the appropriate areas (i.e., shorelines with severe erosion) seawalls provide effective erosion control. Seawalls are made to last numerous years and have relatively low maintenance.

### ***Cons***

Seawalls are disadvantageous for several reasons. One of the main disadvantages is that they are expensive, since a professional contractor and heavy equipment are needed for installation. Any repair costs tend to be expensive as well. If any fill material is placed in the floodplain along the shoreline, compensatory storage may also be needed. Compensatory storage is the process of excavating in a portion of a property or floodplain to compensate for the filling in of another portion of the floodplain. Permits and surveys are needed whether replacing and old seawall or installing a new one (see costs below).

Wave deflection is another disadvantage to seawalls. Wave energy not absorbed by the shoreline is deflected back into the lake, potentially causing sediment disturbance and resuspension, which in turn may cause poor water clarity and problems with nuisance algae, which use the resuspended nutrients for growth. If seawalls are installed in areas near channels, velocity of run-off water or channel flow may be accelerated. This may lead to flooding during times of high rainfall and run-off, shoreline erosion in other areas of the lake, or a resuspension of sediment due to the agitation of the increased wave action or channel flow, all of which may contribute to poor water quality conditions throughout the lake. Plant growth may be limited due to poor water clarity, since the photosynthetic zone where light can penetrate, and thus utilized by plants, is reduced. Healthy plants are important to the lake's overall water clarity since they can help filter some of the incoming sediment, prevent resuspension of bottom sediment, and compete with algae for nutrients. However, excessive sediment in the water and high turbidity may overwhelm these benefits.

Finally, seawalls provide no habitat for fish or wildlife. Because there is no structure for fish, wildlife, or their prey, few animals use shorelines with seawalls. In addition, poor water clarity that may be caused by resuspension of sediment from deflected wave action contributes to poor fish and wildlife habitat, since sight feeding fish and birds (i.e., bass, herons, and kingfishers) are less successful at catching prey. This may contribute to a lake's poor fishery (i.e., stunted fish populations).

### ***Costs***

Depending on factors such as slope and shoreline access, cost of seawall installation ranges from \$85-100 per linear foot for steel and \$95-110 per linear foot for vinyl. A licensed contractor installs both types of seawall. Additional costs may occur if the shoreline needs to be graded and backfilled, has a steep slope, or poor accessibility. Price does not include the necessary permits required. Additional costs will be incurred if compensatory storage is needed. Prior to the initiation of work, permits and/or surveys from the appropriate government agencies need to be obtained. For seawalls, a site development permit and a building permit are needed. Costs for permits and surveys can be \$1,500-2,000 for installation of a seawall. Contact the Army Corps of Engineers, local municipality, or the Lake County Planning and Development Department.

Around College Trail Lake, the costs to install a seawall along the moderately eroded shoreline (95 feet) would cost approximately \$8,075 – 9,500 for steel and \$9,025 – 10,450 for vinyl.

### **Option 3: Install Rock Rip-Rap or Gabions**

Rip-rap is the term for using rocks to stabilize shorelines. Size of the rock depends on the severity of the erosion, distance to rock source, and aesthetic preferences. Generally, four to eight inch diameter rocks are used. Gabions are wire cages or baskets filled with rock. They provide similar protection as rip-rap, but are less prone to displacement. They can be stacked, like blocks, to provide erosion control for extremely steep slopes. Both rip-rap and gabions can be incorporated with other erosion control techniques such as plant buffer strips. If any plants will be growing on top of the rip-rap or gabions, fill will probably be needed to cover the rocks and provide an acceptable medium for plants to grow on. Prior to the initiation of work, permits and/or surveys from the appropriate government agencies need to be obtained (see costs below).

### ***Pros***

Rip-rap and gabions can provide good shoreline erosion control. Rocks can absorb some of the wave energy while providing a more aesthetically pleasing appearance than seawalls. If installed properly, rip-rap and gabions will last for many years. Maintenance is relatively low, however, undercutting of the bank can cause sloughing of the rip-rap and subsequent shoreline. Areas with severe erosion problems may benefit from using rip-rap or gabions. In all cases, a filter fabric should be installed under the rocks to maximize its effectiveness.

Fish and wildlife habitat can be provided if large boulders are used. Crevices and spaces between the rocks can be used by a variety of animals and their prey. Small mammals, like shrews can inhabit these spaces in the rock above water and prey upon many invertebrate species, including many harmful garden and lawn pests. Also, small fish may utilize the structure underwater created by large boulders for foraging and hiding from predators.

### ***Cons***

A major disadvantage of rip-rap is the initial expense of installation and associated permits. Installation is expensive since a licensed contractor and heavy equipment are generally needed to conduct the work. Permits are required if replacing existing or installing new rip-rap or gabions and must be acquired prior to work beginning. If any fill material is placed in the floodplain along the shoreline, compensatory storage may also be needed. Compensatory storage is the process of excavating in a portion of a property or floodplain to compensate for the filling in of another portion of the floodplain.

While rip-rap and gabions absorb wave energy more effectively than seawalls, there is still some wave deflection that may cause resuspension of sediment and nutrients into the water column.

Small rock rip-rap is poor habitat for many fish and wildlife species, since it provides limited structure for fish and cover for wildlife. As noted earlier, some small fish and other animals will inhabit the rocks if boulders are used. Smaller rip-rap is more likely to wash away due to rising water levels or wave action. On the other hand, larger boulders are more expensive to haul in and install.

Rip-rap may be a concern in areas of high public usage since it is difficult and possibly dangerous to walk on due to the jagged and uneven rock edges. This may be a liability concern to property owners.

### ***Costs***

Cost and type of rip-rap used depend on several factors, but average cost for installation (rocks and filter fabric) is approximately \$35-50 per linear foot. Costs for gabions are approximately \$70-100 per linear foot when filled with rocks. The steeper the slope and severity of erosion, the larger the boulders that will need to be used and thus, higher installation costs. In addition, costs will increase with poor shoreline accessibility and increased distance to rock source. Costs for permits and surveys can be \$1,500-2,000 for installation of rip-rap or gabions, depending on the circumstances. Additional costs will be incurred if compensatory storage is needed. Contact the Army Corps of Engineers, local municipalities, and the Lake County Planning and Development Department.

Around College Trail Lake, the costs to install riprap along the moderately eroded shoreline (95 feet) would cost approximately \$3,325 – 4,750.

### **Option 4: Create a Buffer Strip**

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 A 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 overwintering 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 \$15 per linear foot, plus labor. Cost of installing willow posts is approximately \$20-25 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 \$1,500-2,000 depending on the types of permits needed.

## **Option 5: Install A-Jacks®**

A-Jacks® are made of two pieces of pre-cast concrete when fitted together resemble a child's playing jacks. These structures are installed along the shoreline and covered with soil and/or an erosion control product. Native vegetation is then planted on the backfilled area. They can be used in areas where severe erosion does not justify a buffer strip alone.

### ***Pros***

The advantage to A-Jacks® is that they are quite strong and require low maintenance once installed. In addition, once native vegetation becomes established the A-Jacks® can not be seen. They provide many of the advantages that both rip-rap and buffer strips have. Specifically, they absorb some of the wave energy and protect the existing shoreline from additional erosion. The added benefit of a buffer strip gives the A-Jacks® a more natural appearance, which may provide wildlife habitat and help filter run-off nutrients, sediment, and pollutants. Less run-off entering a lake may have a positive effect on water quality.

### ***Cons***

The disadvantage is that installation cost can be high since labor is intensive and requires some heavy equipment. A-Jacks® need to be pre-made and hauled in from the manufacturing site. These assemblies are not as common as rip-rap, thus only a limited number of contractors may be willing to do the installation.

### ***Costs***

The cost of installation is approximately \$50-75 per linear foot, but does not include permits and surveys, which can cost \$1,500-2,000 and must be obtained prior to any work implementation. Additional costs will be incurred if compensatory storage is needed.

To repair the moderately eroding areas (95 feet) on College Trail Lake with A-Jacks® would cost approximately \$9,025 – 7,125.

### **Option 6: Install Biolog, Fiber Roll, or Straw Blanket with Plantings**

These products are long cylinders of compacted synthetic or natural fibers wrapped in mesh. The rolls are staked into shallow water. Once established, a buffer strip of native plants can be planted along side or on top of the roll (depending if rolls are made of synthetic or natural fibers). They are most effective in areas where plantings alone are not effective due to already severe erosion. In areas of severe erosion, other techniques may need to be employed or incorporated with these products.

### ***Pros***

Biologs, fiber rolls, and straw blankets provide erosion control that secure the shoreline in the short-term and allow native plants to establish which will eventually provide long-term shoreline stabilization. They are most often made of bio-degradable materials, which break down by the time the natural vegetation becomes established (generally within 3 years). They provide additional strength to the shoreline, absorb wave energy, and effectively filter run-off from terrestrial sources. These factors help improve water quality in the lake by reducing the amount of nutrients available for algae growth and by reducing the sediment that flows into a lake.

### ***Cons***

These products may not be as effective on highly erodible shorelines or in areas with steep slopes, as wave action may be severe enough to displace or undercut these products. On steep shorelines grading may be necessary to obtain a 2:1 or 3:1 slope or additional erosion control products may be needed. If grading or filling is needed, the appropriate permits and surveys will have to be obtained.

### ***Costs***

Costs range from \$40 to \$45 per linear foot of shoreline, including plantings. This does not include the necessary permits and surveys, which may cost \$1,500 – 2,000 depending on the type of earthmoving that is being done. Additional costs may be incurred if compensatory storage is needed.

## **Objective V: Eliminate or Control Exotic 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, its roots exude a chemical that discourages other plant growth, and it is quick to become established on disturbed soils. Reed canary grass is an aggressive plant species that was introduced as a shoreline stabilizer. It is found on lakeshores, stream banks, marshes and exposed moist ground. Although it does serve to stabilize shorelines to some extent, it has low food value and does not provide winter habitat for wildlife. It is very successful in taking over disturbed areas and, 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 (*Alliaria officianalis*) or honeysuckle (*Lonicera* spp.) as well as some aggressive native species, such as box elder (*Acer negundo*).

The 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, but its removal early on is best. 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.



### ***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 whenever 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 affected.

### ***Costs***

Costs with this option are zeroing 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: Biological Control**

Biological control (bio-control) is a means of using natural relationships already in place to limit, stop, or reverse an exotic species' expansion. In most cases, insects that prey upon the exotic plants in its native ecosystem are imported. Since there is a danger of bringing another exotic species into the ecosystem, state and federal agencies require testing before any bio-control species are released or made available for purchase.

Recently two leaf beetles (*Galerucella pusilla* and *G. californiensis*) and two weevils, one a root-feeder (*Hylobius transversovittatus*) and one a flower-feeder (*Nanophyes marmoratus*) have offered some hope to control purple loosestrife by natural means. These insects feed on the leaves, roots, or flowers of purple loosestrife, eventually weakening and killing the plant or, in the case of the flower-feeder, prevent seeding. In large stands of loosestrife, the beetles and weevils naturally reproduce and in many locations, significantly reduce plant densities. The insects are host specific, meaning that

they will attack no other plant but purple loosestrife. Currently, the beetles have proven to be most effective and are available for purchase. There are no designated stocking rate recommendations, since using bio-control insects are seen as an inoculation and it may take 3-5 years for beetle populations to increase to levels that will cause significant damage. Depending on the size of the infested area, it may take 1,000 or more adult beetles per acre to cause significant damage.

### ***Pros***

Control of exotics by a natural mechanism is preferable to chemical treatments. Insects, being part of the same ecological system as the exotic plant (i.e., the beetles and weevils and the purple loosestrife) are more likely to provide long-term control. Chemical treatments are usually non-selective while bio-control measures target specific plant species. This technique is beneficial to the ecosystem since it preserves, even promotes, biodiversity. As the exotic plant dies back, native vegetation can reestablish the area.

### ***Cons***

Few exotics can be controlled using biological means. Currently, there are no bio-control techniques for plants such as buckthorn, reed canary grass, or a host of other exotics. One of the major disadvantages of using bio-control is the costs and labor associated with it.

Use of biological mechanisms to control plants such as purple loosestrife is still under debate. Similar to purple loosestrife, the beetles and weevils that control it are not native to North America. Due to the poor historical record of introducing non-native species, even to control other non-native species, this technique has its critics.

### ***Costs***

The New York Department of Natural Resources at Cornell University (email: [bb22@cornell.edu](mailto:bb22@cornell.edu), 607-255-5314, or visit the website: [www.invasiveplants.net](http://www.invasiveplants.net)) sells overwintering adult leaf beetles (which will lay eggs the year of release) for \$1 per beetle and new generation leaf beetles (which will lay eggs beginning the following year) at \$0.25 per beetle. The root beetles are sold for \$5 per beetle. Some beetles may be available for free by contacting the Illinois Natural History Survey (INHS; 217-333-6846). The INHS also conducts a workshop each spring at Volo Bog for individuals and groups interested in learning how to rear their own beetles.

### **Option 3: 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 since regrowth is common. 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 4: 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 impractical (i.e., large expanses of a wetland or woodland), chemical treatments may not be an option because in order to chemically treat the area, a broadcast application would be needed. Because many of the herbicides 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 an herbicide-soaked device. Trees are normally treated by cutting off a ring of bark around the trunk (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®, Round-up™, Eagre™, or AquaPro™), are sold in 2.5 gallon jugs, and cost approximately \$200 and \$350, 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. A girdling tool costs about \$150.

## **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 affects 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 placed 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 where 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), establish a “no wake” area, boat horsepower or speed limits, or establish restricted boating hours. These are examples of time and space zoning for lake usage. Enforcement and public education are needed if this option is to be successful. In some areas, off-duty law enforcement officers can be hired to patrol 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. Limited boat traffic may lead to less wave action to batter shorelines and cause erosion, which results in suspension of nutrients and sediment in the water column. 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, this problem may be solved if a significant portion of the daylight hours and the use of the middle part of the lake (assuming the lake is deep enough) are allowed for powerboating. For example, powerboating could be allowed between 9 AM and 6 PM within the boundaries established by “no wake” restricted area buoys.

### ***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.

## **Objective VII: Canada Goose Management**

Canada geese (*Branta canadensis*) are migratory waterfowl common throughout North America. Geese in urban areas can be undesirable primarily due to the large amount of feces they leave behind. Recreational activities on lawns and parks are impeded due to goose feces. Large amounts of feces may end up in the water, either directly from geese on the water or rainwater runoff from lawns where feces have accumulated. Goose feces are high in organic phosphorus. High nutrient levels, particularly phosphorus, can contribute to excessive algae growth in lakes. This may inhibit other recreational activities such as boating or swimming, as well as create poor habitat for fish and wildlife, and possibly bad odors when the algae decays.

Geese become problematic for many reasons. They seek locations that have open water, adequate food supplies, and safety from predators. If these factors are present, geese may not migrate. Since geese exhibit a high level of site fidelity, they return to (or stay at) the same area each year. Thus, adults will likely come back to the same area year after year to nest. If conditions remain optimal, one pair of geese can quickly multiply causing additional problems. Increased development in Lake County has inadvertently created ideal habitat for goose populations. Manicured lawns mowed to the edge of lakes and detention ponds provide geese with open areas with ample food and security. Other conditions that encourage goose residency include open water during winter (primarily the result of aerators in lakes and ponds), mild winters, and people feeding birds with bread or similar human food.

Large populations of geese pose a potential disease threat both to resident and wild populations of waterfowl. This problem may be more serious in residential populations since these birds stay in one area for long periods of time are more likely to transmit any disease to neighboring groups of geese. There is no threat of disease transmission to humans or domestic dogs and cats since most of the diseases are specific to birds.

### **Option 1: No Action**

#### ***Pros***

This option has no costs, however, increasing numbers of geese will most likely exacerbate existing problems and probably create new ones, which in the future may cost more than if the problems are addressed immediately.

#### ***Cons***

If current conditions continue and no action is taken, numbers of Canada Geese and problems associated with them will likely increase. An increase of goose feces washed into a lake will increase the lake's nutrient load and eventually may have a detrimental impact on water quality through excessive algae growth. One study (Manny et al. 1975) documented that each goose excretes 0.072 lbs of feces per day. This may not seem like a significant amount, but if 100 geese are present (many lakes in the county can experience 1,000 or more at a time) that equates to over 7 lbs of feces per day! Algae blooms may negatively impact recreational

uses such as swimming, boating, and fishing. In addition, when algae dies, odor problems and depleted oxygen levels in the water occur. Increased numbers of geese may also result in overgrazed areas of grass.

### ***Costs***

There are a few short-term financial costs with this option. Costs of cleaning feces off lawns or piers are probably more psychological or physical than financial. Long-term costs may be more indirect, including increased nutrient deposition into lakes which may promote excessive algae and plants. Costs incurred may include money needed to control algae with algaecides.

### **Option 2: Removal**

Since Canada Geese are considered migratory waterfowl, both state and federal laws restrict taking or harassing geese. Under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, it is illegal to kill or capture geese outside a legal hunting season or to harass their nests without a permit. If removal of problematic geese is warranted or if nest and egg destruction is an option, permits need to be obtained from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (217- 782-6384) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (217-241-6700).

Hunting is one of the most effective techniques used in goose management. However, since many municipalities have ordinances prohibiting the discharge of firearms, reduction of goose numbers by hunting in urban areas (i.e., lakes, ponds, and parks) may not be an option. Hunting does occur on many lakes in the county, but certain regulations apply (e.g., 100 yard minimum distance from any residential property). Contact the Illinois Department of Natural Resources for dates and regulations regarding the waterfowl hunting seasons. Also, contact local and county law enforcement agencies regarding any ordinances concerning hunting within municipal boundaries.

Egg addling, or destroying the egg by shaking, piercing, or freezing, can be used to reduce or eliminate a successful clutch. Eggs should be returned to the nest so the hen goose does not re-lay another clutch. However, if no eggs hatch, she may still lay another clutch. Leaving one or two eggs unaltered and allowing them to hatch may prevent another clutch from being laid and reduces the total year's reproduction. Egg addling requires a state and federal permit.

The capture and relocation of geese is no longer a desirable option. First, relocated geese may return to the same location where they were captured. Second, there is a concern over potential disease transmission from relocated geese to other goose populations. Finally, since goose numbers in Illinois are already high there is no need to supplement other populations in the area.

### ***Pros***

Removing a significant portion of a problem goose population can have a positive effect on the overall health of a lake. Reduction of feces on lawns and parks is beneficial to recreation users of all types. Less feces in the water means less

phosphorus available for nuisance plant and algae growth. Thus, the overall water quality of the lake may be improved by this reduction in phosphorus.

### ***Cons***

If the habitat conditions still exist, more geese will likely replace any that were removed. Thus, money and time used removing geese may not be well spent unless there is a change in habitat conditions.

### ***Costs***

A Illinois residential waterfowl hunting license (including state and federal waterfowl stamps) is \$39.00 for the 2002-2004 hunting season. For depredation permits, there is a \$25 fee for the federal permit. Once the federal permit is issued the state permit can be obtained at no charge.

## **Option 3: Dispersal/Repellent Techniques**

Several techniques and products are on the market that claim to disperse or deter geese from using an area. These techniques can be divided into two categories: harassment and chemical. With both types of techniques it is important to implement any action early in the season, before geese establish territories and begin nesting. Once established, the dispersal/repellent techniques may be less effective and geese more difficult to coerce into leaving.

The goal with harassment techniques is to frighten geese from an area using sounds or objects. Various products are available that simulate natural predators (i.e., plastic hawks and owls) or otherwise make geese nervous (i.e., balloons, shiny tape, and flags). Other products emit noises, such as propane cannons, which can be set on a timer to go off at programmed intervals (e.g., every 20-30 seconds), or recorded goose distress calls which can be played back over a loudspeaker or tape player. Over time these techniques may be ineffective, since geese become acclimated to these devices. Most of these products are more effective when used in combination with other techniques.

Another technique that has become popular is using dogs or swans to harass geese. Dogs can be used primarily in the spring and fall to keep birds from using an area by herding or chasing geese away from a particular area. Any dogs used for this purpose should be well trained and under the owners control at all times. Professional trainers can be contracted to use their dogs for this purpose. Dogs should not be used during the summer when geese are unable to fly due to molting. Swans are used because they are naturally aggressive in defending their territory, including chasing other waterfowl away from their nesting area. Since wild swans cannot be used for this technique, non-native mute swans are used. However, mute swans are not as aggressive and in some case are permissive of geese. Again, using a combination of techniques would be most effective.

Chemical repellents can be used with some effectiveness. New products are continually coming out that claim to rid an area of nuisance geese. Several products (ReJeX-iT® and GooseChase™) are made from methyl-anthranilate, a natural occurring compound, and can be sprayed on areas where geese are feeding. The spray makes the grass distasteful

and forces geese to move elsewhere to feed. Another product, Flight Control™, works similarly, but has the additional benefit of absorbing ultra violet light making the grass appear as if it was not a food source. The sprays need to be reapplied every 14-30 days, depending upon weather conditions and mowing frequency.

### ***Pros***

With persistence, harassment and/or use of repellants can result in reduced or minimal usage of an area by geese. Fewer geese may mean less feces and cleaner yards and parks, which may increase recreational uses along shorelines. If large numbers of geese were once present, the reduction of fecal deposits into the lake may help minimize the amount of phosphorus entering the water. Less phosphorus in the water means less “food” available for plant and algae growth, which may have a positive effect of water quality. Finally, any areas overgrazed by geese may have a chance to recover.

### ***Cons***

The effectiveness of harassment techniques is reduced over time since geese will adapt to the devices. However, their effectiveness can be extended if the devices are moved to different locations periodically, or used in conjunction with other techniques.

Use of dogs can be time consuming, since the dog must be trained and taken care of. Dogs must also be used frequently in the beginning of the season to be effective at deterring geese. This requires time of the dog owner as well. Dogs (frequently herding dogs, like border collies) that are effective at harassing or herding geese are typically may not be the best pets for the average homeowner. They are bred as working dogs and consequently have high levels of energy that requires the owner’s attention.

Repelling or chasing away geese from an area only solves the goose problem for that area and most likely moves the geese (and the problem) to another area. As long as there is suitable habitat nearby, the geese will not wander very far.

### ***Costs***

Costs for the propane cannons are approximately \$660 (\$360 for the cannon, \$300 for a timer), not including the propane tank. The cost of ReJeX-iT® is \$80/gallon, GooseChase™ is \$95/gallon, and Flight Control™ costs \$200/gallon. One gallon covers one acre of turf using ReJeX-iT® and, GooseChase™, and two acres using Flight Control™.

### **Option 4: Exclusion**

Erecting a barrier to exclude geese is another option. In addition to a traditional wood or wire fence, an effective exclusion control is to suspend netting over the area where geese are unwanted. Geese are reluctant to fly or walk into the area. A similar deterrent that is often used is a single string or wire suspended a foot or so above the ground along the length of the shoreline.

### ***Pros***

Depending on the type of barrier used, areas of exclusion will have less fecal mess and may have higher recreational uses. Vegetation that was overgrazed by geese may also be able to recover.

### ***Cons***

This technique will not be effective if the geese are using a large area. Also, use of the area by people is severely limited if netting is installed. Fences can also limit recreational uses. The single string or wire method may be effective at first, but geese often learn to go around, over, or under the string after a short period of time. Finally, excluding geese from one area will force them to another area on a different part of the same lake or another nearby lake. While this solves one property owners problem, it creates one (or makes one worse) for another. Also, problems associated with excess feces entering the lake (i.e., increased phosphorus levels) will continue.

### ***Costs***

The costs of these techniques are minimal, unless a wood or wire fence is constructed. String, wire, or netting can be purchased or made from materials at local stores.

## **Option 5: Habitat Alteration**

One of the best methods to deter geese from using an area is through habitat alteration. Habitats that consist of mowed turfgrass to the edge of the shoreline are ideal for geese. Low vegetation near the water allows geese to feed and provides a wide view with which to see potential predators. In general, geese do not favor habitats with tall vegetation. To achieve this, create a buffer strip (approximately 10-20 feet wide) between the shoreline and any mowed lawn. Planting natural shoreline vegetation (i.e., bulrushes, cattails, rushes, grasses, shrubs, and trees, etc.) or allowing the vegetation to establish naturally can create buffer strips. A table in Appendix A has a list of native plants, seeding rates, and approximate costs that can be used when creating buffer strips.

Geese prefer ponds and lakes that have shorelines with gentle slopes to ones with steep slopes. While this alone will not prevent geese from using an area, steeper slopes used along with other techniques will be more effective. This option may not be practical for existing lake shorelines since any grading and/or filling would require permits and surveys, which would drive up the costs of redoing the shoreline considerably.

Aeration systems that run into the fall and winter prevent the lake from freezing, thus not forcing geese to migrate elsewhere. To alleviate this problem, turn aerators off during fall and early winter. Once the lake freezes over and the geese have left, wait a few weeks before turning the aerators on again if needed.



### ***Pros***

Altering the habitat in an area can not only make the habitat less desirable for geese, but may be more desirable for many other species of wildlife. A buffer strip has additional benefits by filtering run-off of nutrients, sediments, and pollutants and protecting the shoreline from erosion from wind, wave, or ice action. Finally, the more of the area that is in natural vegetation, the less turfgrass that needs to be constantly manicured and maintained.

### ***Cons***

Converting a portion or all of an area to tall grass or shrub habitat may reduce the lake access or visibility. However, if this occurs, a small path can be made to the lake or shorter plants may be used at the access location in the buffer strip.

### ***Costs***

If minimal amount of site preparation is needed to create a buffer strip, costs can be approximately \$10 per linear foot, plus labor. 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. Compensatory storage is the process of excavating in a portion of a property or floodplain to compensate for the filling in of another portion of the floodplain. The permitting process is costly, running as high as \$1,000-2,000 depending on the types of permits needed.

Once established, a buffer strip of native plants needs little maintenance. If aerators are not run for several months, there will be a reduction in electrical costs.

### **Option 6: Do Not Feed Waterfowl!**

There are few “good things”, if any, that come from feeding waterfowl. Birds become dependent on handouts, become semi-domesticated, and do not migrate. This causes populations to increase and concentrate, which may create additional problems such as diseases within waterfowl populations. The nutritional value in many of the “foods” (i.e., white bread) given to geese and other waterfowl are quite low. Since geese are physiologically adapted to eat a variety of foods, they can actually be harmed by filling-up on human food. Geese that are accustomed to hand feeding may become aggressive toward other geese or even the people feeding the geese.

### ***Costs***

There are no costs to this option, except the public education that is needed to encourage people not to feed waterfowl. In some cases, signs could be posted to discourage waterfowl feeding.

**Reference:**

Manny, B. A., R. G. Wetzel, and W. C. Johnson. 1975. Annual contribution of carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus by migrant Canada geese to a hardwater lake. *Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol.* 19:949-951.