

Lake Redstone, Sauk County
2022-32 9-Key Element Watershed and
Lake Management Plan
Appendices
January 2022

Appendix A: “9 Key Elements” for Watershed-Based Plans EPA Nonpoint Source (Section 319) Program

1. An identification of the **causes and sources** or groups of similar sources that will need to be controlled to achieve the load reductions estimated in the watershed-based plan (and to achieve any other watershed goals identified in the watershed-based plan), as discussed in item (2) immediately below. Sources that need to be controlled should be identified at the significant subcategory level with estimates of the extent to which they are present in the watershed (e.g., X number of dairy cattle feedlots needing upgrading, including a rough estimate of the number of cattle per facility; Y acres of row crops needing improved nutrient management or sediment control; or Z linear miles of eroded streambank needing remediation).
2. An estimate of the **load reductions expected for the management measures** described under paragraph (3) below (recognizing the natural variability and the difficulty in precisely predicting the performance of management measures over time). Estimates should be provided at the same level as in item (1) above (e.g., the total load reduction expected for dairy cattle feedlots; row crops; or eroded streambanks).
3. A description of the **NPS management measures** that will need to be implemented to achieve the load reductions estimated under paragraph (2) above (as well as to achieve other watershed goals identified in the watershed-based plan), and an identification (using a map or a description) of the critical areas in which those measures will be needed to implement the plan.
4. An estimate of the amounts of **technical and financial assistance** needed, associated **costs**, and/or the sources and **authorities** that will be relied upon, to implement the plan.
5. An **information/education** component that will be used to enhance public understanding of the project and encourage their early and continued participation in selecting, designing, and implementing the NPS management measures that will be implemented.
6. A **schedule** for implementing the NPS management measures identified in the plan that is reasonably expeditious.
7. A description of interim, **measurable milestones** for determining whether NPS management measures or other control actions are being implemented.
8. A set of **criteria that can be used to determine whether loading reductions are being achieved over time and substantial progress is being made towards attaining water quality standards** and, if not, the criteria for determining whether the plan needs to be revised or, if a NPS TMDL has been established, whether the NPS TMDL needs to be revised.
9. A **monitoring** component to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation efforts over time, measured against the criteria established under item (8) immediately above.

Appendix B
Strategic Lake Management
Planning Review

Lake Redstone

Sauk County, Wisconsin

WBIC. 1280400
DNR No. SPL-362-16

November 13, 2017

SPL-362-16 Final Report

Strategic Lake Management Planning Review
Lake Redstone
Sauk County, Wisconsin

Prepared for:
Lake Redstone Protection District
La Valle, WI 53941

Prepared by:
Dave Blumer - Lake Educator

Lake Education and Planning Services, LLC
302 21-1/4 Street
Chetek, WI 54728
715-642-0635

Contents

Introduction	9
Purpose	10
Watershed Planning and Implementation: 9-Key Elements Plan.....	11
Watershed.....	14
Building Partnerships	16
Identification of Key Stakeholders	16
Issues of Concern and Public Outreach	16
Inventory of Existing Data.....	18
1981 UW-Madison Lake Redstone: Water Quality and Management (UW Study).....	18
After the 1981 UW Study.....	20
1995-1997 Agricultural Watershed Inventory and Water Quality Model Study.....	20
After the Mid 1990’s Studies	22
2002 WDNR Hypolimnetic Water Withdrawal Study (Marshall, et al., 2002)	23
Stratification and Mixing in Lakes	23
Sediment Release Study – Internal Loading of Phosphorus	25
2002 GIS-Based Sediment Delivery Model Study (MSA, 2002)	26
After the Early 2000’s Studies.....	27
Mid-2000’s Tributary and Water Quality Studies	28
Future Water and Nutrient Budgeting.....	28
Installation of Recording Streamflow-Gaging Stations on the West and East Branch of Big Creek ...	29
Installation of Automatic Water Samplers (pressure transducers) on Smaller Tributaries to the East and West Branches of Big Creek	29
Late 2000’s Activities	30
Critical Habitat Designation	30
2011 West Branch of Big Creek Watershed Sediment Management Study.....	32
Aquatic Plant and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Management Planning.....	33
Sauk and Juneau County Projects 2012-2016.....	33
Baraboo River Watershed Project (2015-2019).....	34
2016 Sediment Sampling Project.....	34
Water Quality Summary - Lake	35
Water Clarity (Secchi Depth).....	36

Chlorophyll <i>a</i>	37
Phosphorus (P)	38
Iron (Fe) and Aluminum (Al).....	39
Manganese (Mn)	40
Sulfate (S) and Chloride (Cl)	40
Nitrogen (N)	40
Sodium (Na) and Potassium (K)	41
Heavy Metals	41
Alkalinity and Hardness, Magnesium (Mg), Calcium (Ca)	42
Acidity (pH).....	42
Conductivity	43
Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	44
Water Quality Summary – Tributaries	45
Recommendations for Future Management Planning and a Lake Management Planning Grant	
Application	47
Lake Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Assessment Survey	47
Sediment Pond Feasibility Study.....	48
Dredging.....	48
Native Aquatic Plant Restoration.....	49
Adding Nitrogen Parameters to Water Quality Sampling.....	49
Preparation of a Comprehensive Lake Management Plan	49
Lake Management Planning Grant Application	51
Works Cited.....	52

FIGURES

FIGURE 1 – STEPS IN WATERSHED PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION (UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, 2008) .	11
FIGURE 2 - CROSSWALK BETWEEN THE SIX STEPS OF WATERSHED PLANNING AND THE SECTION 319 NINE MINIMUM ELEMENTS (EPA, 2013)	12
FIGURE 3 - CROSSMAN CREEK AND LITTLE BARABOO RIVER WATERSHED	14
FIGURE 4 – LAND USE IN THE CROSSMAN CREEK AND LITTLE BARABOO RIVER WATERSHED.....	14
FIGURE 5 – DIRECT WATERSHED OF LAKE REDSTONE (WDNR, 2016).....	15
FIGURE 6 – PHOSPHORUS BUDGET IN 1981 (INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES, 1981).....	18
FIGURE 7 – 1981 LAND USE (INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES, 1981).....	19
FIGURE 8 – THERMAL STRATIFICATION AND LAKES (UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA - DULUTH, 2016).....	24
FIGURE 9 – SUMMER MIXING IN SHALLOW AND DEEP LAKES (GROVHAC, INC., 2016)	24
FIGURE 10 – TYPICAL U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY RECORDING STREAMFLOW-GAGING STATION WITH AUTOMATIC WATER SAMPLER FOR LOAD DETERMINATIONS (GARN, ELDER, & ROBERTSON, 2003).....	29
FIGURE 11 – INSTALLATION OF PRESSURE TRANSDUCERS (DATA LOGGER) TO MEASURE DEPTH OF WATER (PAPANICOLAOU, 2017)	29
FIGURE 12 – LEVEL 1-3 STREAM ORDER TRIBUTARIES TO LAKE REDSTONE (KOENIG, 2014)	30
FIGURE 13 – WEST BRANCH OF BIG CREEK PORTION OF THE LAKE REDSTONE WATERSHED (LEFT); ESTIMATED ANNUAL SOIL LOSS (RIGHT) (MONTGOMERY ASSOCIATES RESOURCE SOLUTIONS, LLC, 2011)	32
FIGURE 14 - GENERAL WATER CONDITION CONTINUUM (WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, 2016 (DRAFT VERSION))	35
FIGURE 15 – LAKE REDSTONE WATERSHED TRIBUTARY MONITORING SITES FOR WATER QUALITY	45
FIGURE 16- SEDIMENT TRAP AT MOURNING DOVE BAY (MONTGOMERY ASSOCIATES RESOURCE SOLUTIONS, LLC, 2011)	48

TABLES

TABLE 1 – SECCHI DISK READINGS OF WATER CLARITY ON LAKE REDSTONE	37
TABLE 2 – CHLOROPHYLL A SAMPLING RESULTS ON LAKE REDSTONE	38
TABLE 3 – SURFACE WATER TOTAL PHOSPHORUS SAMPLING RESULTS ON LAKE REDSTONE.....	38
TABLE 4- BOTTOM WATER TOTAL PHOSPHORUS SAMPLING RESULTS ON LAKE REDSTONE	39
TABLE 5 – SURFACE WATER ORTHOPHOSPHATES (SOLUBLE REACTIVE PHOSPHORUS) SAMPLING RESULTS ON LAKE REDSTONE	39
TABLE 6 - BOTTOM WATER ORTHOPHOSPHATES (SOLUBLE REACTIVE PHOSPHORUS) SAMPLING RESULTS ON LAKE REDSTONE	39
TABLE 7 – NITROGEN SAMPLES FROM THE DEEP HOLE ON LAKE REDSTONE	41
TABLE 8 – 1980-2016 WATER QUALITY PARAMETERS FROM THE DEEP HOLE ON LAKE REDSTONE	43
TABLE 9 – LAKE REDSTONE WATERSHED TRIBUTARY WATER QUALITY DATA 2006-07, 2010-14, 2015-16	46
TABLE 10 – LAKE REDSTONE WATERSHED TRIBUTARY WATER QUALITY DATA – ORTHOPHOSPHATES, 2006-07, 2010-14, 2015-16 ..	46

Introduction

Every two years, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) is required by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) through the Clean Water Act to create a list of impaired waters in the state. The EPA further requires that a TMDL eventually be prepared for waters on the list. TMDL means Total Maximum Daily Load and is a document that calculates the maximum amount of a given pollutant that can occur in a waterbody before there is a potential for negative consequences. It also allocates reductions to given pollutant sources that are necessary to either maintain or restore the waterbody. Some of the most common pollutants are total phosphorus and chlorophyll. Phosphorus is an essential nutrient of plant, animal and human. In water, it exists primarily as orthophosphate (PO_4^{3-}) or in organic compounds. Total phosphorus (TP) defines the sum of all phosphorus compounds that occur in various forms. Chlorophyll is the green pigment in most aquatic plants including algae in the water. As such it is used as a measurement of the amount of algae in the water. A TMDL serves as a planning tool and potential starting point for restoration or protection activities with the ultimate goal of attaining or maintaining water quality standards set for a given body of water like Lake Redstone.

Lake Redstone is a 612 acre reservoir created in the mid 1960's when a 38-foot high earthen dike was installed across Big Creek in northwestern Sauk County with the intent of creating >1500 lots for development. The lake reached full pool in 1966 and water quality issues including algae blooms, low dissolved oxygen, and sedimentation, emerged almost immediately. The lake reflects the extensive agricultural watershed it drains (>19,000 acres) with heavy, late summer algal blooms. Aquatic vegetation in the lake is sparse due to poor light penetration and few shallow areas and Eurasian water milfoil is found in the lake. Organic decomposition depletes the oxygen below 12 feet during the summer. Because of these conditions, Lake Redstone was placed on the Wisconsin "impaired waters" list in 2014.

An impaired water is a waterbody that does not meet water quality criteria that support its designated use. A designated use is a legally recognized description set by a regulatory entity like the WDNR, of a desired use for a given waterbody such as aquatic life support, body contact recreation, fish consumption, or public drinking water supply. It is these designated uses that help determine water quality expectations and/or water quality goals. Lake Redstone, as a deep lowland drainage lake, was officially listed in 2014 for total phosphorus concentrations that exceeded designated thresholds for recreational use ($\geq 30 \mu\text{g/L}$) for at least 3 monthly values between June 1 and September 15 from data collected within the last five years. Total phosphorus values did not exceed thresholds for fish and aquatic life ($\geq 30 \mu\text{g/L}$). Further assessments in 2016 showed total phosphorus data continued to exceed thresholds for recreational use and in addition, chlorophyll data exceeded thresholds for both recreational (> 5% of days in sampling season have "nuisance algal blooms" ($> 20 \mu\text{g/L}$)) and fish and aquatic life ($\geq 27 \mu\text{g/L}$ (≥ 63 TSI)). High levels of algae prompted a "high" priority ranking by the WDNR and recommended the development of a TMDL within 10 years.

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to begin the process of developing a Comprehensive Lake Management Plan to address water quality in Lake Redstone. While not exactly a TMDL, a Comprehensive Lake Management Plan addresses as many of the sources of lake degradation as possible including nutrient loading (natural and human derived sources), non-native invasive species, land use near the lake and within the larger watershed, aquatic plants and algae, and lake use. Addressing water quality in a lake essentially means addressing the entire watershed of the lake, so a comprehensive plan equates to a watershed plan. A watershed is an area of land that drains all the streams and rainfall to a common outlet such as the outflow of a reservoir, mouth of a bay, or any point along a stream channel. The word watershed is sometimes used interchangeably with drainage basin, basin, or catchment. The watershed consists of surface water--lakes, streams, reservoirs, and wetlands--and all the underlying ground water. Larger watersheds contain many smaller watersheds. It all depends on the outflow point; all of the land that drains water to a given outflow point is the watershed for that outflow location. Watersheds are important because the water quality within that watershed is affected by things, human-induced or not, happening in the land area "above" the identified outflow point (U.S. Geological Survey, 2016).

Watershed plans are a means to resolve and prevent water quality problems that result from both point source and nonpoint source problems. Point source pollution means any discernible, confined and discrete conveyance, including but not limited to any pipe, ditch, channel, tunnel, conduit, well, discrete fissure, container, rolling stock, concentrated animal feeding operation, or vessel or other floating craft, from which pollutants are or may be discharged (EPA Clean Water Act Section 502 General Definitions). Nonpoint source (NPS) pollution, also known as polluted runoff, is a leading cause of water quality problems in Wisconsin. Polluted runoff is caused by rainfall or snowmelt moving over and through the ground picking up natural and human-made pollutants, depositing them into rivers, lakes, wetlands and groundwater. Pollutants include fertilizers, nutrients (like phosphorus and nitrogen), oil, grease, sediment and bacteria from agricultural, urban and residential areas (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 2014). Watershed plans are intended to provide an analytic framework to restore water quality in impaired waters, and to protect water quality in other waters adversely affected or threatened by point source and nonpoint source pollution (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2008).

Due to the complex and diffuse nature of nonpoint source pollution, the substantial costs to address it, and frequent reliance on voluntary action by individual landowners, successfully addressing nonpoint source pollution to achieve water quality standards often requires years of support from a coalition of stakeholders, programs, and funding sources. Watershed planning helps address water quality problems in a holistic manner by fully assessing the potential contributing causes and sources of pollution, then prioritizing restoration and protection strategies to address these problems.

Watershed Planning and Implementation: 9-Key Elements Plan

In 2008, the EPA published a guide for developing watershed plans (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2008). The process outlined in this document is fully supported by the WDNR. There are six steps for watershed planning and implementation included in this document (Figure 1). Each step has several tasks associated with it. Within the six steps and their associated tasks are nine key elements that are critical for achieving improvements in water quality. These 9-Key Elements are required in watershed plans that are federally funded with Clean Water Act Section 319 funds, but also strongly recommended for all other plans to address water quality impairments.




Figure 1 – Steps in Watershed Planning and Implementation (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2008)

More specifically, the 9 Key Elements are as follows:

- a. Identify causes and sources of pollution
- b. Estimate pollutant loading into the watershed and the expected load reductions
- c. Describe management measures that will achieve load reductions and targeted critical areas
- d. Estimate amounts of technical and financial assistance and the relevant authorities needed to implement the plan
- e. Develop an information/education component
- f. Develop a project schedule
- g. Describe the interim, measurable milestones
- h. Identify indicators to measure progress
- i. Develop a monitoring component

These nine elements are embodied within the six steps of the watershed planning and implementation process (Figure 2).




Figure 2 - Crosswalk between the six steps of watershed planning and the section 319 nine minimum elements (EPA, 2013)

Through a WDNR small-scale lake management planning grant awarded in 2016, the Lake Redstone Protection District (LRPD) began the process of assembling a Comprehensive Lake Management/Watershed Plan for the lake. The LRPD has identified key stakeholders and issues of concern to be included in a Comprehensive Plan from Step 1; and collected existing data, created a watershed inventory, and identified data gaps to be filled from Step 2. The first of the 9-Key Elements (identifying causes and sources of pollution that need to be controlled) is addressed in this report. The remaining Key Elements and actions in Steps 1&2, and Steps 3&4 will be included in a future lake management planning grant application by the LRPD. This report summarizes what was learned and lays out a strategy for moving forward.

Watershed

Lake Redstone is located in the Crossman Creek and Little Baraboo River watershed which is 213.80 mi² (Figure 3). The Crossman Creek and Little Baraboo River Watershed lies in northwestern Sauk County, southern Juneau County, northeastern Richland County, and the southeast corner of Vernon County. It is also in the Driftless, or unglaciated region of Wisconsin. The watershed includes the main stem of the Baraboo River from Wonewoc to Reedsburg. Land use in the watershed is primarily agricultural (60%), forest (31%) and a mix of suburban (6%) and other uses (4%) (Figure 4). This watershed has 466.61 stream miles, 244.11 lake acres and 6,321.59 wetland acres. The watershed is ranked high in both overall nonpoint source pollution and groundwater nonpoint source pollution; however it is expected that these sources can be controlled with best management practices.




Figure 3 - Crossman Creek and Little Baraboo River Watershed




Figure 4 – Land Use in the Crossman Creek and Little Baraboo River Watershed

The direct watershed of Lake Redstone (Figure 5) is a smaller, sub-watershed within the larger Crossman Creek and Little Baraboo River Watershed. It covers approximately 30 square miles, most of which is in Juneau County. Because of the problems associated with nonpoint source pollutions, the watershed of Lake Redstone has been the focus of many studies identifying causes and sources of pollution that need to be controlled (9-Key Element) and projects implemented to reduce sediment and phosphorus loading. These projects will be inventoried in the next section of this report.




Figure 5 – Direct watershed of Lake Redstone (WDNR, 2016)

Building Partnerships

The first step of the watershed planning and implementation process identified by the EPA (Building Partnerships) includes the following actions: identify key stakeholders, identify issues of concern, set preliminary goals, develop indicators, and conduct public outreach. In 2006, the Lake Redstone Protection District (LRPD) entered into a strategic planning process to guide actions to be taken by the LRPD to improve the lake (Erickson, 2006). During the initial set-up, several of the actions included were completed and remain pertinent to this report. This process continues to this day, with the last strategic planning session taking place in November 2016.

Identification of Key Stakeholders

A stakeholder is any person, group, or organization that can place a claim on the organization's resources, attention, or output, or is affected by its output (Bryson, 1995). With that thought in mind, the LRPD identified the following key stakeholder groups that are important to management planning and implementation success during their initial lake planning process in 2006:

- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
- Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) in Sauk and Juneau Counties
- Sauk County
- Juneau County
- Town of LaValle
- Property Owners on Lake Redstone
- Lake Redstone Property Owners' Association
- General Lake Users
- Agricultural and Animal Operations in the Watershed
- State Legislators
- Reedsburg School District

Issues of Concern and Public Outreach

Back in 2006, in an effort to better understand the issues facing Lake Redstone, the LRPD conducted a survey of all 1074 households in the district. The response rate to this survey was 32%. Based on the information from the survey and an internal board assessment, a list of eleven of the most strategic issues facing the LRPD was created. From this list the following issues were determined to be of highest concern:

- How to better educate and communicate with users of Lake Redstone, both resident and day users;
- How to safely and effectively prevent and/or remove sediment build-up in Lake Redstone;
- How to better manage the number of exotic, invasive species found in and around Lake Redstone; and
- How to reduce the amount of nutrients entering Lake Redstone.

The most recent set of issues (November 2016) are as follows:

- How to improve water quality by removing/controlling/preventing sediment and nutrients from entering Lake Redstone;
- How to better manage/prevent the spread of exotic, invasive species in and around Lake Redstone; and
- How to better involve and educate constituents.

Each strategic issue has one or more individual strategies and multiple actions associated with it, identified by the LRPD and its partners, that will help resolve the issue. One such strategy is to meet with partners annually to discuss what has been done, what is currently being done, and what is being planned for the future. The last “partners meeting” was held on November 7, 2016.

Inventory of Existing Data

Since the Lake Redstone Protection District was first formed in 1976, it has been working to collect information and implement projects that would make improvements to water quality in Lake Redstone. Most of these projects have been centered on reducing sediment and phosphorus loading from the watershed to the lake.

1981 UW-Madison Lake Redstone: Water Quality and Management (UW Study)

The first major study of the lake was completed in 1981 by the University of Wisconsin (UW)-Madison Water Resources Management Program, Institute for Environmental Studies (Institute for Environmental Studies, 1981). The purpose of the UW Study was to identify the causes of nutrient and sediment overloading that had created water quality problems; and to prevent management alternatives designed to restore and protect the lake. The analysis included both technical data and perceptions of the area residents. This was the first public use survey of the residents of the lake, and the first serious look at sources of phosphorus and sediment to the lake. Figure 6 shows the breakdown of phosphorus loading from various sources identified during the UW Study.




Figure 6 – Phosphorus Budget in 1981 (Institute for Environmental Studies, 1981)

Public input was also a part of the UW Study and a paper survey was sent to all 1270 property owners on Lake Redstone seeking their comment through a variety of questions. The survey had a 43% return rate (545 surveys) with 69% of homeowners and 32% of undeveloped lots represented. The survey identified two important topics of concern to Lake Redstone residents: water quality perception and user conflict. Survey results indicated more people were concerned with user conflicts than water quality and that more people were satisfied with water quality than were not. Most of those unsatisfied with water quality were only occasional visitors to their lake property. Many responses from this survey had “no opinion” as it pertains to water quality, prompting researchers to suggest a greater emphasis on information and involvement programs in the future to increase awareness.

Land use in the watershed was inventoried during the UW Study with nearly 65% involving agriculture including contoured cropland, cultivated, pasture, and pastured woodlots (Figure 7).




Figure 7 – 1981 Land Use (Institute for Environmental Studies, 1981)

More than 1800 head of cattle were identified in the watershed during the UW Study, the majority being dairy stock. Based on tributary monitoring done in 1978-79, the UW Study concluded that more than 325 tons of sediment per square mile of watershed was being eroded away and either being stored within the watershed or making it directly to the lake. Sediment stored within the watershed and not reaching the lake is a good thing, however even it can be flushed into the lake periodically by large snowmelt and rain events. Water quality data collected during this study suggested a Carlson’s Trophic State Index value of 65 placing Lake Redstone in the nutrient rich or eutrophic category.

Trophic State Indices (TSIs) are an attempt to provide a single quantitative index for the purpose of classifying and ranking lakes, most often from the standpoint of assessing water quality. The Carlson (1977) Index has attained general acceptance in the surface water community as a reasonable approach to do this. The Carlson TSI value is a measure of the trophic status of a body of water using several measures of water quality including: depth of sunlight penetration into the water (clarity), chlorophyll-a concentrations (algal biomass), and total phosphorus levels (usually the nutrient in shortest supply for algal growth).

TSI values range along a scale from 0-100 that is based upon relationships between water clarity and surface water concentrations of algal chlorophyll, and total phosphorus for a set of North American lakes. Its major assumptions are that suspended particulate material in the water controls water clarity, and that algal biomass is the major source of particulates. The lowest TSI value of zero would correspond to water clarity of 64 meters; a TSI value of 100 would correspond to water clarity of only 6.4 cm (less than 3 inches) (University of Minnesota - Duluth, 2016). Typically TSI values above 50 are considered high, indicating nutrient rich, fertile lakes with poor water clarity. These types of lakes generally have lots of algae present in the water giving it a green or greenish-brown appearance.

The UW Study concluded that improvements to the watershed and water quality of Lake Redstone could be made, and laid out four possible sets of actions to do so, each with varying levels of effective management actions and cost. The first set consisted of informational programs and individual or group actions that lake property owners could take. This option was the lowest cost, but its effectiveness depended on residents being willing to participate and good leadership provided by the Lake District. The second set of actions focused on in-lake actions that would temporarily improve water quality at a fairly high cost. It included dredging, aeration, creation of wetlands, and management of algae & aquatic

plants. The third set of actions focused on the watershed and included heavy emphasis on implementing agricultural best management practices (BMPs), but also on establishing wetlands, installing sediment trapping structures, and installing road bank and construction site erosion control. The fourth set of actions combined elements of all three previously mentioned.

After the 1981 UW Study

Between the 1981 UW Study and the next round of comprehensive lake study in the mid-1990's many (nine) of the bays on Lake Redstone were dredged; four sediment detention ponds were installed upstream of Martin-Meadowlark bay (1984); rock chutes were installed on Oriole Bay (1989) and Mourning Dove and Eagle bays (1995); and other actions aimed at reducing sediment loading to the lake were completed. In addition, the Crossman Creek watershed (of which Lake Redstone is a part) was the focus of a nonpoint source priority watershed project sponsored by WDNR, Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP), Juneau, Richland, and Sauk County Land Conservation Departments that started in 1983 and was completed in the mid 1990's. The goals of the project were to protect and improve water quality and fisheries habitat by controlling erosion from farm fields, reducing streambank erosion, reducing or controlling barnyard runoff, and better management of manure spreading in the watershed, ultimately aiming for a TSI value of 58 which lake modeling showed could be generated with a 70% reduction in nutrient load.

A lake model is a mathematical equation that helps to “visualize” how past actions have led to a current condition or helps to “visualize” how future actions could alter the current condition (McGinley, 2014). Like all equations, known data is inserted and used to test the model for accuracy. Once a given model has been determined accurate, then data values can be changed to help predict what would occur under different scenarios. There are many lake models that can be used to predict what changes in trophic status could be generated with changes to the watershed and nutrient loading sources. Several different models have been used in Lake Redstone to set target goals and to estimate changes that would occur if those goals were met.

After modeling indicated that it was reasonable to assume that a 70% reduction in nutrient load could lead to better TSI values in the lake (58 was the goal), the priority watershed project identified various sites within the watershed that could be targeted for corrective measures to reduce nutrient loading to the lake. High and medium priority sites were selected for corrective actions. Farmer participation in the program was voluntary and when the priority watershed project was completed, only 60% of eligible landowners had signed up and only 65% of the identified projects related to those landowners were actually completed. Upon completion of the priority watershed project, it was felt that the goal of a 70% phosphorus reduction and 50% sediment reduction had not been met. However, when the watershed was re-evaluated approximately 10 years later, that conclusion was reversed.

1995-1997 Agricultural Watershed Inventory and Water Quality Model Study

In 1996 MSA Professional Services completed a study (MSA, 1998) of the watershed to determine the location of farming operations and land use. At the same time, the WDNR completed a water quality modeling study (Panuska, 1997) of the Lake Redstone watershed. Data from the MSA Study was compared to the data in the 1981 UW Study to document changes in land use, farming operations, and

livestock between then and 1996. The DNR study was used to compare changes in phosphorus and sediment loading to the lake.

In the UW Study, approximately 45% of the total land use was cropland and approximately 20% was pasture or pasture/woodlot. The MSA Study estimated that cropland only made up 15-20% and estimated that 25-30% of the total cropland was in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), a federal cost-share and rental payment program that encourages farmers to convert highly erodible cropland and other environmentally sensitive areas to vegetative cover including grasslands, food plots, windbreaks, buffer strips, and riparian buffers. The MSA Study also documented a 28% reduction in the number of livestock in the watershed, and suggested that that a declining trend in livestock would likely continue. These findings suggested a 66% reduction in potential phosphorus loading from animal operations from 1984-1996 according to the MSA Study.

During the summer of 1996 the WDNR conducted a detailed inflow and in-lake sampling study in an attempt to develop seasonal water and nutrient budgets for Lake Redstone to be use in additional lake modeling. Results indicated that growing season phosphorus loads to Lake Redstone came from the following sources: 66% from watershed runoff, 29% from internal recycling, and about 2% from groundwater. Although 29% of the phosphorus was predicted to be coming from internal recycling of phosphorus within the lake, it was concluded that this portion of the load was not contributing to algal growth in the lake. When data collected during the 1996 DNR Study was plugged into lake modeling, the TSI value generated was 58. The results of the MSA watershed inventory indicated approximately a 66% reduction in phosphorus loading since 1985. As discussed previously, the 1985 priority watershed project had limited success in implementing Best Management Practices (BMPs), and reducing phosphorus loading to the lake. However, as identified in the MSA Study, changes in farming operations in the watershed between 1984 and 1996 resulted in an overall reduction of nutrient loads to the tributaries of Lake Redstone. In effect, phosphorus loads were reduced and the lake responded in accordance with what was predicted. In order for this trend to continue, the following recommendations were made in the 1997 DNR Study:

- Continue cooperative efforts in working with watershed farmers to reduce sources of phosphorus to the lake,
- Prevent ground water contamination (and possibly lake discharge) by providing up-to-date septic system management,
- Minimize site runoff of nutrients by using low or no phosphorus fertilizers on the lake shore, and installing lake shore buffers,
- Develop and implement an education program that informs lake residents about issues related to water quality and lake protection and that discusses realistic goals and expectations about Lake Redstone's water quality,
- Work with Sauk County to ensure periodic maintenance and yearly operation of the dam's emergency bypass,

- Continue monitoring the occurrence and distribution of Eurasian water milfoil (an exotic nuisance plant) and possibly spot treat with selective herbicides to protect native plants and minimize expansion,
- Purchase a dissolved oxygen meter and begin periodic winter monitoring to track conditions and provide information for future planning,
- Record information such as ice cover dates, ice and snow thickness and water column dissolved oxygen levels at a variety of locations, and
- Continue coordination with the WDNR Fisheries Manager on issues related to fish management.

After the Mid 1990's Studies

The results of the 1996-97 studies were encouraging, and from 1998 to 2004, the Lake District worked to follow the recommendations in the 1997 DNR Study. The Lake District remained committed to working with the farming community to identify additional methods such as roof drains, grassed waterways, buffers and other BMPs that would be mutually beneficial to both the farmers and the lake. To this, the Lake District sponsored another project in 1997 aimed at making feedlot roof gutter improvements. Specifications for the roof gutter project were completed by MSA, and over the next several years eight farming operations made improvements which were paid for in part by the Lake District.

The Lake District also applied for and received funding through the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP). EQIP is a voluntary conservation program that helps agricultural producers in a manner that promotes agricultural production and environmental quality as compatible goals. Through EQIP, agricultural producers receive financial and technical assistance to implement structural and management conservation practices that optimize environmental benefits on working agricultural land (NRCS, 2017).

A dissolved oxygen meter was purchased and regular water quality testing in the lake was started. A Shoreland Restoration Workshop was organized and then followed up with the installation of three demonstration shoreland restoration projects on the lake. Soil testing around the lake was completed to see if phosphorus-laden fertilizer applied to lawns by lakeshore property owners was really necessary to keep the grass healthy. The testing showed that more phosphorus was not needed to keep lawns around the lake green and healthy.

Management of Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM), an aquatic invasive plant species, continued through the use of aquatic herbicides. In cooperation with the WDNR an aquatic plant survey was completed to see if EWM and the EWM management program were causing any negative impacts to native plant species in the lake. Common carp, an aquatic invasive fish species was documented in the lake and in response the Lake District began promoting an annual "Carporee" where contests were held for the largest and most carp removed during a bow and arrow fishing competition.

Prior to this time period, the LRPD had been using copper sulfate to treat algae blooms in the lake. This practice was stopped when indications were that the presence of copper in the sediment could be

detrimental to many of the lake's important benthic critters, and potentially restrict beneficial aquatic plant growth.

2002 WDNR Hypolimnetic Water Withdrawal Study (Marshall, et al., 2002)

Two additional lake studies were completed during this time frame as well. In response to the 1996-97 reporting that 29% of the phosphorus load in the lake was coming from internal recycling of nutrients already in the lake, a hypolimnetic (bottom water) withdrawal study was completed in 2002 by the WDNR in cooperation with the Lake District and Sauk County. Bottom of the lake water samples were collected and analyzed for phosphorus content from four locations in the lake including in the deeper, stratified portion of the lake immediately adjacent to the dam. The data collected showed that only the deep water area adjacent to the dam remained stratified for a long enough period of time for bottom withdrawal of water to be able to reduce phosphorus loading in the lake. The remaining sites that were tested remained mixed through the majority of the open-water season.

Stratification and Mixing in Lakes

Deeper lakes or deeper parts of shallow lakes will often stratify during the summer season. Stratification in lakes means that the lake water divide in to different layers based on water density and temperature. Water differs from most other compounds because it is less dense as a solid than as a liquid. Consequently ice floats, while water at temperatures just above freezing sinks. As most compounds change from a liquid to a solid, the molecules become more tightly packed and consequently the compound is denser as a solid than as a liquid. Water, in contrast, is most dense at 4°C and becomes less dense at both higher and lower temperatures. Because of this density-temperature relationship, many lakes in climates like Wisconsin tend to separate into distinct layers (stratify).

During the summer months colder water sinks to the bottom and warmer water rises to the surface. The two layers of water are separated to some degree by a "thermocline", defined as the depth of water at which the temperature changes the most rapidly over a very short depth interval, typically a few inches to a few feet (Figure 8). This generally occurs in deep lakes in WI only during the warm summer months. In both the spring and fall water temperatures throughout the water column of the lake become similar. In the spring the water temperature directly under the ice is about 32°F, while the water temperature at the bottom of the lake is about 40°F. Warming in the spring melts the ice and warms up the water until it is the same top to bottom. In the fall, water is warmer at the surface of the lake than it is in the bottom of the lake. Cooling temperatures reduce the surface water temperature until once again the water temperature is the same top to bottom. In both of these cases, when water temperature is the same top to bottom a mixing event occurs throughout the lake. A lake that does this is called a dimictic lake. The spring and fall mixing events are called "turnover" (Figure 8). During turnover, some good things happen like adding oxygen to the water so fish can survive, but also some bad things happen like adding excess nutrients back into the water that may fuel algae blooms.





Figure 8 – Thermal Stratification and lakes (University of Minnesota - Duluth, 2016)

Shallow lakes in Wisconsin will often remain “mixed” throughout the summer season; or stratify for short periods only, then mix again. Mixing means that water temperatures at the surface of the lake and at the bottom of the lake never really establish enough of a temperature change to stratify, or only do so for a very short period of time before stratification falls apart. Lakes that stratify and de-stratify numerous times within a summer are known as polymictic lakes. Data collected in 2000 show that Lake Redstone only remains stratified for the whole summer in the deep water area adjacent to the dam. In all other parts of the lake, mixing caused by wind and wave action (natural and those caused by boats) occurs frequently (Figure 9). During the summer this mixing adds phosphorus to the surface waters of Lake Redstone promoting additional algal growth.




Figure 9 – Summer mixing in shallow and deep lakes (Grovhac, Inc., 2016)

Hypolimnetic withdrawal or drawing water out of the lake from the deeper, phosphorus laden bottom of the lake was listed along with numerous other potential management alternatives for Lake Redstone as part of 1981 UW-Study. The Lake District proposed hypolimnetic withdrawal in the late 1990’s in an effort to reduce internal phosphorus loading and complement ongoing efforts to reduce external nutrient loads from the watershed. As previously mentioned, the 2002 DNR study showed that the only part of the lake that stratifies long enough to mobilize and sustain high phosphorus concentrations in the bottom waters was near the dam. In the greater reservoir basin, long, windswept surfaces and relatively shallow water depth prevented stable stratification and partial mixing occurred. Based on weekly measurements of water clarity in 2000, the small deep-water stratified bay near the dam

displayed the best water quality while weak stratification and mixing in the rest of the lake fueled greater algal blooms.

The 2002 DNR Study concluded that pronounced stratification near the dam prevented significant internal phosphorus transfer during the summer season. Internal phosphorus loading that fueled algal blooms was a greater factor in the other parts of the lake. The proposed hypolimnetic withdrawal would at best only provide modest water quality benefit given that phosphorus reduction would only occur near the dam. Additionally, the amount of water that could be withdrawn would likely be limited in order to protect a diverse downstream fishery in Big Creek and the Baraboo River due to the very high concentrations of hydrogen sulfide and ammonia (both harmful to aquatic life) in the bottom water. If the water withdrawn from the lake was not limited, some form of wastewater treatment would be needed, increasing the cost substantially.

Without wastewater treatment, required low withdrawal rates would not have a significant positive effect on the overall phosphorus budget in the lake. Very high hydrogen sulfide concentrations further complicated the issue since significant nuisance odors (rotten egg smell) would be generated within the popular county park that encompasses the dam.

Sediment Release Study – Internal Loading of Phosphorus

Phosphorus is a key nutrient that usually limits primary production in freshwater systems. Increased or excess P loading can lead to cultural eutrophication, degradation of water quality, and development of toxic cyanobacterial blooms. Excessive anthropogenic P loading also leads to various problems, such as loss of oxygen, fish kills, and a loss of biodiversity within the lake. Phosphorus sources can originate from the watershed (i.e. external loading) or from P stored as sediment that is later released and recycled into the water column for uptake by algae (i.e. internal loading) (James, 2016).

Internal phosphorus (P) loading is a term used to describe P movement and recycling between sediment in a lake and the water column. Since sediment P is ultimately derived from the watershed, land use practices that over-fertilize the soil and promote hydrological runoff can result in considerable deposition over decades and centuries of P-rich sediment in lake basins. Lakes are essentially traps for sediment and thus reflect the activities in its watershed. Internal P loading is, in essence, in-lake recycling of P that was derived from the watershed. It is important to quantify external and internal P loading in order to identify important P sources for targeted management strategies (James, 2016).

Simply reducing watershed P loading to eutrophic lakes without also managing internal P loading may not be enough to reverse impaired water quality. Even though internal P loading is ultimately derived from the watershed, it can take years to decades to flush sediment P out of the system after watershed BMP implementation, resulting in delayed recovery and continued impairment. In addition, a symptom of decades of P retention as sediment in lakes is the buildup of a surface sediment P concentration bulge that is usually difficult to bury over time and persists as an important internal P source during hypolimnetic anoxia, stimulating and sustaining algal blooms despite other efforts of remediation (James, 2016).

Extensive water quality data has been collected from four sites in Lake Redstone (Winnebago Court-North, Mourning Dove-Middle, Navajo-South, and Deep Hole) to document surface and bottom water phosphorus concentrations in the lake and this data has been used to estimate internal loading of sediment. An equally extensive data set exists for non-point source loading of phosphorus from the watershed. However a complete evaluation of the actual sediment loading that occurs in the lake has never been done. William James, a professor at UW-Stout in Menomonie WI is one of the foremost researchers of sediment release rates for phosphorus. Each year he does one or more sediment release studies with his students in the UW-STOUT Discovery Center. Through the collection of sediment samples and lab analysis, the amount of phosphorus release into the lake from the sediment is determined under anaerobic (no oxygen) conditions, high pH and other scenarios. A study completed by the Discovery Center or similar entity could finally answer the question about what extent internal loading impacts Lake Redstone.

In lieu of a full phosphorus sediment release study, some additional water quality data could be collected in the three lake sites and the Deep Hole by the dam. Specifically iron and phosphorus sampling throughout the water column may be beneficial to determine if phosphorus released internally is getting into the epilimnion for use by algae, or if sufficient iron exists in the water column to rebind with the available phosphorus when dissolved oxygen in the water column is recharged by fall turnover or periodic mixing events (Kleeburg, 2013).

2002 GIS-Based Sediment Delivery Model Study (MSA, 2002)

As a follow up to the mid 1990's Agricultural Land Use Inventory and Water Quality Modeling Study that continued to suggest that sediment laden runoff from agricultural fields was a major contributor to the phosphorus load in the lake, a GIS-based Sediment Delivery Study was completed. Similar to what was done in the mid-1980's Crossman Creek Priority Watershed Study, the objective of the 2002 MSA Study was to identify and rank critical areas in the watershed where runoff from farm fields may be contributing the majority of phosphorus rich sediment to Lake Redstone. Sediment delivery is an estimate of the amount of soil coming off the fields under certain conditions. As in other studies a lake model was chosen to predict reductions in phosphorus load that could be reached by identifying the worst areas of the watershed for soil delivery and then making changes to those areas.

GIS stands for "geographic information system" and is a method to capture, store, manipulate, analyze, manage, and present spatial or geographical data digitally or in a digital format. What makes a GIS-based model different from what was done before is that this more modern version utilizes digital technology to map the watershed and identify spatial intersections. Spatial intersections, as it pertains to this project means places on a map of the watershed where certain features of concern overlap. As an example, areas in the watershed where terrain, soil type, distance to the closest direct runoff path to the lake, and other factors may lead to high levels of sediment delivered to the lake can be identified quickly and easily without actually visiting the area in person. Another example would be finding areas where high soil loss overlap with the high sediment delivery to identify the most critical areas to focus management actions. The ability to do this is accomplished by using a spatial modeling program that reads resource information such as topography (ex. contour lines) and soils, and presents the results (areas) to the user. Aerial photos of the watershed were incorporated into the GIS system. The location

and area of farm tracts were determined from the photos. The soil delivery maps were created using the watershed map as a base map, and then digitally adding new layers of information to the base map.

The 2002 MSA Study identified over 600 farm tracts present within the Lake Redstone watershed. Of those farm tracts, 146 were considered to have high soil loss (greater than 4 tons/acre/year). Seven farm tracts had soil loss estimates greater than 10 tons/acre/year and a high of 27.2 tons/acre/year. However, all seven of these farm tracts combined only contributed about 3% of the total loading.

Overall, 22 farm tracts were identified as potentially losing greater than 80 tons of soil each year. The estimated soil loss for the highest ranked farm tract was 305 tons/tract/year. Three farm tracts were estimated to lose greater than 200 tons/year, and 14 were over 100 tons/year.

The modeling used in this project also estimated the potential capability of the land to transport sediment to a stream within the watershed. The potential to transport sediment from an area of land to a stream was ranked as high, medium or low, but because the watershed is highly dissected by streams and has high topographic relief (highlands and lowlands), a large portion of the watershed was ranked as high soil delivery areas.

Finally, high priority farm tracts were identified. High priority farm tracts have soil loss greater than 4 tons/acre/year and are located within the high sediment delivery areas. Portions of 114 high soil loss farm tracts were located within high soil delivery areas. Eight of these farm tracts had total soil loss estimates from high delivery areas greater than 80 tons/year, with five of these exceeding 100 tons/year. Knowing these areas made it possible to focus best management practices like buffer strips, contour strip cropping, grassed waterways, diversions, and streambank stabilization in places where they will be most beneficial.

Recommendations from this study included ground-truthing the findings from the top eight ranked farm tracts which have soil loss estimates from high delivery areas greater than 80 tons/year. Ground-truthing means visiting the site in person to see what is actually occurring there. During the site visit the farm tract and the land leading to the adjacent stream should be inspected for evidence of soil erosion. Crop rotation plans for each of the tracts should be reviewed, and the owner and/or tenant farmer should be informed about Best Management Practices (BMPs) and encouraged to implement ones appropriate for the tract. Examples of possible BMPs include buffer strips, contour strip cropping, grassed waterways, diversions, and streambank stabilization.

After the Early 2000's Studies

Between the early 2000's studies and the mid 2000's tributary and water quality studies, the LRPD implemented several projects in cooperation with other partners. An Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP) grant was awarded to implement BMPs known as the Clearwater diversions. A soil stabilization project was also completed above Timmons Road.

In an effort to demonstrate shoreland improvement projects, the LRPD contracted with a local shoreland restoration expert to completely restore three properties on the lake as demonstration properties aimed at increasing the interest level of other property owners to restore their shores.

Invasive species became a greater issue during this time frame, prompting the LRPD to contract chemical treatment of aquatic plants/Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM) in the lake. An annual carp bow-fishing event to reduce the number of big carp in the lake was also started during this time frame.

Also during this time, soil testing of area lawns around the lake was completed showing that no additional fertilizer needed to be applied to lawns to keep them green and growing.

As previously mentioned, under the guidance of the UW-Extension program, the LRPD also began a lake management planning process aimed at identifying stakeholders, identifying strengths and weaknesses of the Lake District, seeking public input, and prioritizing issues of concern. This process continues to this day with the last planning meeting completed in November 2016.

Mid-2000's Tributary and Water Quality Studies

Beginning in 2006, additional tributary and lake water quality data was collected, analyzed, and compared to similar mid-1990's data. Vierbicher Associates completed a two-year (2006-07) tributary monitoring project of the East and West branches of Big Creek, the two main tributaries entering Lake Redstone (VierbicherAssociates, 2007). From 2007 to 2009 BARR Engineering completed a Watershed and Lake Modeling Study incorporating the data from 2006 & 2007 (BARR, 2009). The BARR study also compared 2007-08 tributary and lake water quality monitoring results to those of 1996-97. Both of these studies were flawed. Tributary data collected by Vierbicher had many issues with equipment malfunction, beavers, vandalism, possible incorrect depth settings, etc. The BARR report used much of the data provided by Vierbicher in its analysis leading to conclusions that were disputed by the WDNR in a review of the BARR report completed in early 2010 (Oldenburg, 2010). The 2010 WDNR Review also brought into question tributary data and the loading assumptions made in the 1996-97 WDNR study particularly for the West Branch of Big Creek.

Future Water and Nutrient Budgeting

Flow data and associated phosphorus and sediment loading calculations for Lake Redstone tributaries were completed in the mid 1990's and again in the mid 2000's. In both cases, there was some question as to the accuracy of the data collected. It is necessary to once again collect stream flow and loading into Lake Redstone, but if it is going to be done, it should be done by an organization that knows what they are doing, has the equipment to do it, and the expertise to make sure the data collected is accurate. One such organization is the United States Geological Survey. It is recommended that the USGS be brought in to collect flow data. At the same time, additional sampling could be done to calculate nutrient and sediment loading values, but most important is to get accurate flow and volume. A fair amount of nutrient and sediment sampling has been done in the two main branches of Big Creek, and in many of the smaller tributaries that feed the main branches, but not flow data.

Installation of Recording Streamflow-Gaging Stations on the West and East Branch of Big Creek

Surface water inflow and outflow may be determined by recording streamflow-gaging stations (Figure 13) near the mouths of major tributaries and at the lake outlet. Surface water flows can also be sampled and analyzed for phosphorus and sediment concentrations. Streamflow data, along with the concentration data, are used to determine the annual phosphorus inputs and losses. It is recommended that this level of streamflow data be collected on the East and West branches of Big Creek.



Figure 10 – Typical U.S. Geological Survey recording streamflow-gaging station with automatic water sampler for load determinations (Garn, Elder, & Robertson, 2003).

Installation of Automatic Water Samplers (pressure transducers) on Smaller Tributaries to the East and West Branches of Big Creek

Submersible pressure transducers increasingly are being used for monitoring stage at surface-water gages. This is due to their ease of installation and maintenance, relatively low cost, and minimal requirements for shelter size, factors which provide more versatility in locating the instrumentation. For surface-water applications, a desirable transducer is accurate over a large range of stage and temperature; maintains its calibration; is easy to install and remove for repair; and is not prone to failure induced by water leakage or voltage surges (Freeman, et al., 2004).



Figure 11 – Installation of pressure transducers (data logger) to measure depth of water (Papanicolaou, 2017)

Several smaller, level one or two stream order tributaries have had TP and TSS data collected from them since at least 2014 by Sauk County and the LRPD (Figure 15). It is recommended that pressure transducers be installed on up to 6 level one or two streams based on previous TP and TSS data collected by Sauk County and the LRPD (Lucht, Pekala, Daus, Wafle, Pfaff, and Nemitz Roads).




Figure 12 – Level 1-3 stream order tributaries to Lake Redstone (Koenig, 2014)

Late 2000’s Activities

In the late 2000’s Lake Redstone experienced some torrential rain events leading to massive flooding of and damage to the watershed and nearshore area of the lake. After the 2008 flood several project were completed to repair damages caused. Long-term watershed stream monitoring was begun, and more cooperation (with Dutch Hollow Lake, the Town of LaValle, and Sauk County) was initiated to monitor for and increase community awareness of aquatic invasive species. This effort included the first watercraft inspection program through Clean Boats, Clean Waters, a WDNR and UW-Extension Lakes supported initiative.

Critical Habitat Designation

One of the more controversial studies completed on Lake Redstone was a Critical Habitat Survey and Designation Report completed by the WDNR from 2005-2007 with the final report being completed in January 2009 (Sefton & Graham, 2009). Lake Redstone was chosen for this study for two primary reasons: 1) To protect areas within the lake that are most important for preserving the character and qualities of the lake; and 2) To preserve the reaches of shore that are predominately natural in appearance or that screen man-made or artificial features for the enjoyment of lake residents and visitors.

Critical Habitats are called Public Rights Features in Wisconsin Administrative Code NR1.06. They are characteristics of a lake that fulfill the rights of the public for quality and quantity of water, fishing, swimming, navigation and reaches of shore which are predominately natural in appearance or that screen man-made or artificial features. The study determined that Lake Redstone included the following

public rights features: fish and wildlife habitat, including specific sites necessary for breeding, nesting, nursery and feeding; plant communities and physical features that help protect water quality; and reaches of bank, shore or bed which are predominately natural in appearance or that screen man-made or artificial features (Sefton & Graham, 2009).

The designation of critical habitat affects the decision process on Waterway and Wetlands Permits under Ch. 30, Wis. Statutes; and decisions on permitting of aquatic plant management under Ch. NR107 and NR109 of the Wis. Adm. Code. This did not mean these activities would be prohibited, but it did mean that they will undergo more careful review to ensure that the activity does not adversely affect the critical habitat in the area.

There were 20 areas designated as Critical Habitat for Lake Redstone. Fourteen of these were classified as Sensitive Areas for their aquatic vegetation and six were classified as Other Public Rights Features for containing reaches of shore that are predominately natural in appearance or that screen man-made or artificial features, and/or fish and wildlife habitat values. All are classified as Public Rights Features. Fourteen recommendations were made in the report to promote and protect the health of Lake Redstone (Sefton & Graham, 2009):

- Maintain natural shoreland buffers of native vegetation to protect water quality, fish and wildlife habitat and areas with predominantly natural appearance;
- Maintain snag and cavity trees for cavity nesting species, canopy trees for roosting and perching of birds and downed trees for wildlife habitat;
- Maintain the unique natural appearance of the sandstone cliffs and rock outcrops;
- Maintain hemlock-white pine relicts, minimize tree removal and maintain vegetative visual buffers that screen development;
- Maintain overhanging trees and shrubs, fallen trees along the shoreline and large woody cover and boulders in the water for fish and wildlife habitat;
- Encourage lakefront property owners to plant native vegetation (trees, shrubs, perennial forbs and grasses) as a buffer zone to reduce shoreline erosion and runoff of nutrients and other pollutants that affect water quality;
- Minimize removal of native aquatic vegetation to protect fish and wildlife habitat;
- Limit aquatic plant management to methods specific to exotics and/or for navigation channels and reasonable swimming or fishing areas;
- Update the Aquatic Plant Management Plan every 5 years to reflect current lake conditions and emerging management techniques;
- Control invasive plants;
- Maintain aquatic invasive signs at all boat landings to educate lake users about protecting the lake from introduction of new exotic species and consider establishing a Clean Boats, Clean Waters watercraft inspection program;
- Assess location and dimensions of proposed grading on the banks, dredging, placement of pea gravel beds or sand blankets, boat ramps, new or replacement piers, recreational devices such

as rafts or trampolines, and shoreline erosion control (subject to site-specific wave energy calculations) to protect water quality, fish and wildlife habitat and natural appearance;

- Encourage use of bio logs and native vegetation for shoreline erosion control, subject to review of site-specific wave energy calculations; and
- In locations of actively eroding shoreline, consider expanding slow-no-wake buffer zones to reduce erosion caused by boating.

2011 West Branch of Big Creek Watershed Sediment Management Study

In 2011 the LRPD commissioned a study by Montgomery Associates: Resource Solutions and General Engineering Company to evaluate the major sediment sources in the West Branch of Big Creek watershed (Figure 10) and to identify feasible sediment management measures (Montgomery Associates Resource Solutions, LLC, 2011). The study made use of previous studies, the knowledge of local residents and officials, and new field observations and analyses to come up with potential sediment management alternatives based on estimated annual soil loss from the West Branch portion of the watershed.




Figure 13 – West Branch of Big Creek portion of the Lake Redstone Watershed (left); estimated annual soil loss (right) (Montgomery Associates Resource Solutions, LLC, 2011)

The only recommendations to come from this study that are actually feasible are the following:

- Reduce upland soil loss through an advocacy role, working with Juneau and Sauk Counties, building relationships with farmers, providing educational information, and supporting and promoting the existing federal conservation programs including additional cost-sharing for specific BMPs,
- Implement targeted dredging to restore suitable lake depths in areas that have already experienced significant sediment buildup, and

- Determine the feasibility of installing structural sediment traps at high priority sites.

Aquatic Plant and Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Management Planning

Partly in response to the critical habitat designations, the LRPD hired a consultant in 2012 to help them develop a WDNR approvable aquatic plant management plan (APMP) for EWM, curly-leaf pondweed (CLP), purple loosestrife, and other AIS in Lake Redstone (Blumer, 2015). The same plan explored past and existing management actions for native aquatic plants. Several grants were received to help fund the APMP, and after its approval in 2015, additional grants have been applied for and received to implement it. The APMP made the following recommendations for management:

- Protect, preserve and enhance native aquatic plant communities in Lake Redstone,
- Complete annual monitoring and mapping of aquatic plants most affected by plant management actions,
- Implement physical/manual removal actions to control aquatic invasive species and nuisance growth of native aquatic plants,
- Implement herbicide application to control aquatic invasive species and nuisance growth of native aquatic plants,
- Monitor and manage non-native, invasive plant species other than CLP and EWM identified in Lake Redstone,
- Educate the lake populace so that they become well-acquainted with aquatic invasive species identification, prevention techniques, planning processes, and management actions,
- Promote greater understanding in the lake populace of how their actions impact the aquatic plant and lake community,
- Continue compilation and collection of lake related data to enhance and support current and future lake management planning and implementation,
- Complete APM Plan implementation and maintenance for a period of five years following adaptive management practices, and
- Evaluate and summarize the results of the management actions implemented during the 5-year timeframe of this plan and repeat the whole-lake point-intercept aquatic plant survey implemented in 2012.

Many of the recommendations/actions in the Critical Habitat Survey, Sediment Management Study, and Aquatic Plant Management Plan have been and are continuing to be implemented.

Sauk and Juneau County Projects 2012-2016

Both Sauk and Juneau Counties have been actively working with the LRPD to educate farmers in the watershed, provide cost-sharing for best management projects, improve communication with farmers, and brainstorming additional actions that could be done to reduce sediment and phosphorus loading from the watershed into Lake Redstone. Since 2012, many projects have been either implemented, discussed, or are still in a proposal stage. The following should only be considered a partial list, but represents the efforts being made.

- Dry Dam projects on several local farms

- Summer Intern working through the counties to communicate with farmers
- Feeder Stream Monitoring Projects to pinpoint significant sources of sediment and phosphorus
- Cost-sharing for no till and cover crops
- Cost-sharing to build manure storage containment structures and roofed barnyards
- Nutrient management planning
- Cover crop and rainfall simulator demonstrations
- Small waterway seeding projects
- Gully erosion repair projects
- Promotion of CRP, contour strips, and animal agriculture (hay and forage crops)
- Guest speakers on agricultural topics

Baraboo River Watershed Project (2015-2019)

In January 2015, the USDA announced that the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) was going to fund the Baraboo River Watershed Project (BRWP) prepared by the Sauk County Conservation, Planning and Zoning Department in cooperation with Richland, Vernon, Monroe, Juneau, and Columbia Counties and the USDA/NRCS. The RCPP focuses on public-private partnerships enabling private companies, local communities and other non-government partners to invest in efforts to keep our land resilient and water clean, and promote tremendous economic growth in agriculture, construction, tourism and outdoor recreation, and other industries. With the BRWP, partners will collaborate to provide technical and financial assistance to agricultural producers and forest landowners to help implement conservation practices that improve soil health, water quality, restore wildlife habitat, and improve agricultural productivity. Common conservation practices include streambank stabilization, cover crops, nutrient management, and grassed waterways. The project runs from 2015-2019 and provides over \$2 million in public-private conservation investments to the Baraboo River Watershed.

According to Melissa Keenan, Resource Conservationist for Sauk County the objectives of the BRWP are preventing soil loss on cropland and pastures; reducing agricultural runoff to surface and ground water; and improving aquatic and wildlife habitat. The first step in doing this is to identify priority farms through the Erosion Vulnerability Analysis for Agricultural Lands (EVAAL). EVAAL identifies areas within a watershed which may be vulnerable to soil erosion; assesses risk for sheet and rill erosion using USLE and gully erosion using the Stream Power Index (SPI) while de-prioritizing internally drained areas (IDA); and produces an erosion vulnerability index value which can be used to prioritize fields within the watershed. Once this is done, the goal is to address 50% of the soil loss using RUSLE2; agricultural runoff using SNAP Plus software and the Wisconsin Barnyard Runoff Model (BARNY). Aquatic and wildlife habitat will be improved by dedicating 10% of RCPP funds for aquatic and wildlife habitat monitoring and dissolved oxygen sampling within streams and the Baraboo River. Actions in this project include outreach and education, technical assistance, financial assistance, and stream monitoring for total phosphorus and total suspended solids, and biotic indices through macroinvertebrates (Keenan, 2015).

2016 Sediment Sampling Project

In preparation to potentially dredge Lake Redstone, the LRPD worked with Ayres Associates to sample deposited lake bed sediments, measure lake depths, and estimate the volume of deposited sediment.

The information included in the sediment sampling report will assist the LRPD with developing a dredging plan. The study provides the necessary information for a dredging company to enable them to determine the feasibility, scope, and cost for dredging the lake. A total of 26 bays on Lake Redstone were studied, with all of them under consideration for dredging activities (Ayres Associates, 2016). The LRPD is currently evaluating the data in the Ayres report to determine its next step in the dredging process.

Water Quality Summary - Lake

Over 15,000 lakes and 84,000 miles of streams and rivers in Wisconsin are managed to ensure that their water quality condition meets state and federal standards. Water quality standards (WQS) are the foundation of Wisconsin’s water quality management program and serve to define goals for a waterbody by designating its uses, setting criteria to protect those uses, and establishing provisions to protect water quality from pollutants. Waters are monitored to collect water quality data to determine, or *assess*, its current status or condition. Water quality monitoring results and assessment data are stored in state and federal databases and the majority of data are available online to agencies and the public (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 2016 (Draft Version)).

The WDNR uses four levels of condition to represent waters’ placement in the overall water quality continuum (Figure 11). Waters assigned the condition category of excellent are considered to be attaining applicable WQS and fully supporting their assessed designated uses. Waters assigned the condition category of good or fair are also considered to be attaining applicable WQS and supporting their assessed designated uses. Waters assigned the poor condition category may not be attaining WQS or assessed designated use(s) (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 2016 (Draft Version)).

According to the WDNR using one measure of a lakes health, chlorophyll as it relates to the amount of algae in the water and “trophic state” (discussed earlier in this report) Lake Redstone (considered a reservoir) is listed as “Poor” according to water quality standards in place in WI (Wisconsin Lakes Page).




Figure 14 - General water condition continuum (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 2016 (Draft Version))

In addition, to a general assessment of available data, specific assessments are conducted to determine if a waterbody is “impaired” or not meeting WQS. Waters that do not meet WQS are placed on

Wisconsin's Impaired Waters List—also known as the 303(d) list—under Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA). Wisconsin is required to submit list updates every 2 years to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for approval. The methodology for conducting general and specific assessments is outlined, and updated for 2018, in this Wisconsin Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology (WisCALM) guidance document (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 2016 (Draft Version)).

Lake Redstone was first listed on the Impaired Waters List in 2014 when data showed that total phosphorus exceeded listing thresholds for recreational use, but not for fish and aquatic life; and chlorophyll exceeded both recreational and fish and aquatic life use. The listing was confirmed in the most recent 2016 listing cycle. Listing thresholds for recreational uses in deep-lowland, drainage lakes or reservoirs are total phosphorus readings ≥ 0.030 mg/L for each of two years; and for chlorophyll a is $> 5\%$ of days in the sampling season having nuisance algal blooms (> 0.020 mg/L). For fish and wildlife, the listing threshold for total phosphorus is the same as recreational uses (≥ 0.030 mg/L); and for chlorophyll a is ≥ 0.027 mg/L or a TSI value ≥ 63 for each of two years.

Since at least 1980, lake volunteers and/or the WDNR have been collecting water quality data from Lake Redstone and its tributaries. Volunteers monitor water clarity with a black and white Secchi disk. Some also collect water samples, which are sent to the State Lab of Hygiene to be analyzed. Volunteers are the source of the majority of Wisconsin's lake water quality data. Lake Redstone is also part of DNR's long term trend monitoring project. Additional monitoring has been done through projects funded in part by WDNR Lake Grants and Aquatic Invasive Species Grants. There are several parameters that have been documented, each with its own role to play in the overall evaluation of water quality in and entering Lake Redstone. This report defines each parameter and where possible, summarizes the data.

This report attempts to compile all existing data for the lake and its tributaries and look for gaps. It goes further to interpret others analysis of the data and whether it is considered credible or not.

Water Clarity (Secchi Depth)

Water clarity is not a chemical property of lake water. It is an indicator or measure of water quality related to chemical and physical properties. Water clarity has two main components: true color (materials dissolved in the water) and turbidity (materials suspended in the water such as algae and silt). The algae population is usually the largest and most variable component. Water clarity often indicates a lake's overall water quality, especially the amount of algae present. Algae are natural and essential, but too much of the wrong kind can cause problems. Secchi disc readings are taken using an 8-inch diameter weighted disc painted black and white. The disc is lowered over the downwind, shaded side of the boat until it just disappears from sight, and then raised until it is just visible. The average of the two depths is recorded as water clarity.

Water color can affect the Secchi disc reading. The color of lake water reflects the type and amount of dissolved organic chemicals it contains. Color's main significance is aesthetic. Color may also reduce light penetration, slowing weed and algae growth. Many lakes possess natural, tan-colored compounds (mainly humic and tannic acids) from decomposing plant material in the watershed. Brown water can

result from bogs draining into a lake. Before or during decomposition, algae may impart a green, brown or even reddish color to the water.

Turbidity is caused by particles of matter suspended in the water which dissipate light, which affects the depth at which plants can grow. Turbidity affects the aesthetic quality of water. Lakes receiving runoff from silt or clay soils often possess high turbidities. These values vary widely with the nature of the seasonal runoff. Suspended plants and animals also produce turbidity. Many small organisms have a greater effect than a few large ones. Turbidity caused by algae is the most common reason for low Secchi disc readings (Shaw, Mechenich, & and Klessig, 2003).

Secchi disc values vary throughout the summer as algal populations increase and decrease. Measuring several sites may be useful in some lakes, depending upon the uniformity of the lake. Year to year changes result from weather and nutrient accumulation. Weekly or biweekly Secchi records (April-October) over a number of years provide an excellent and inexpensive way to document long-term changes in water clarity. Table 1 lists the total number of Secchi disk readings for each of four sites in Lake Redstone. The Deep Hole is the original Citizen Lake Monitoring Network sample site and the site of WDNR long-term trend monitoring. The remaining three sites were added in the late 1990's.

Table 1 – Secchi Disk Readings of Water Clarity on Lake Redstone

Monitoring Site	Years	Months	# of Readings	Average (ft)	Min (ft)	Max (ft)
Winnebago (north)	1999-2016	April-October	97	3.64	1.5	15
Mourning Dove (middle)	1999-2016	April-October	96	3.81	1.5	14
Navajo (south)	1999-2016	April-October	106	4.56	1.6	22.96
Deep Hole	1980-2016	April-October	193	4.15	1	15.75

Chlorophyll *a*

Chlorophyll *a* is perhaps the single most important parameter in the assessment of the water quality of lakes, particularly in regard to how enriched they are due to the presence of nutrients such as phosphorus and - to a much lesser extent - nitrogen in the form of nitrate. Chlorophyll is the green pigment in most plants including algae. Excessive nutrient presence in lakes promotes the growth of algae which in overabundance cause serious environmental problems. In over-enriched - eutrophic - lakes "algal blooms" can occur. These are surface accumulations of cyanobacteria (formerly classified as blue-green algae), i.e. dense masses of algae which can be swept by the winds into bays or along the lake shore (where they can decay, causing further problems), and which can seriously disrupt the dissolved oxygen regime (Environmental Protection Agency - Ireland, 2001).

In day time, when conditions are bright or sunny, chlorophyll in the algae will carry out photosynthesis, consuming carbon dioxide and releasing oxygen to the waterbody. In darkness, however, the algae respire, consuming dissolved oxygen the levels of which may become critically low - low enough to cause fish mortality. Cyanobacteria, also known as blue-green algae can release trace organic components which can prove toxic to animals ingesting the water in which they are present; and give rise to taste and odor problems if the water is used as drinking water source.

Table 2 lists the total number of chlorophyll a samples collected at each of four sites in Lake Redstone. The Deep Hole is the original Citizen Lake Monitoring Network sample site and the site of WDNR long-term trend monitoring. The remaining three sites were added in the mid 2000's.

Table 2 – Chlorophyll a sampling results on Lake Redstone

Monitoring Site	Years	Months	# of Readings	Average (mg/L)	Min (mg/L)	Max (mg/L)
Winnebago (north)	2005-2016	June-October	40	0.045	0.0028	0.0925
Mourning Dove (middle)	2005-2016	June-October	39	0.042	0.0028	0.0971
Navajo (south)	2000, 2005-2016	June-October	44	0.033	0.0035	0.0845
Deep Hole	1980, 1988-2000, 2002, 2007-2016	June-October	68	0.037	0.003	0.0859

Phosphorus (P)

Phosphorus originates from a variety of sources, many of which are related to human activities. Major sources include human and animal wastes, soil erosion, detergents, septic systems and runoff from farmland or lawns (Shaw, Mechenich, & and Klessig, 2003). The significance of phosphorus is principally in regard to the phenomenon of eutrophication (over-enrichment) of lakes and, to a lesser extent, rivers. Excess phosphorus in water bodies, along with nitrogen as nitrate, promotes the growth of algae and other plants often leading to excess aquatic plant growth, algal blooms, shallow water slimes, and other problems. In more than 80% of Wisconsin's lakes, phosphorus is the key nutrient affecting the amount of algae and weed growth (Shaw, Mechenich, & and Klessig, 2003). Soluble reactive phosphorus (also referred to as orthophosphates) is phosphorus in a dissolved state and is most readily used by aquatic plants and algae. Particulate phosphorus attaches to soil and can be carried into a lake by surface runoff and build up in the sediment of the lake. Total phosphorus (TP), measured in mg/L is a combined measurement of soluble reactive and particulate phosphorus in the lake.

TP is measured in the surface water and often within a foot or two of the bottom of the lake. Surface TP measures what is currently in the water from surface water runoff and mixing with bottom waters. Bottom TP is used to measure the amount of TP being released from the sediment at the bottom of the lake and is typically higher than TP concentrations at the surface, particularly in areas of the lake where sediment builds up. On Lake Redstone this means the Deep Hole by the dam and at the Navajo (southern) sampling site.

Table 3 lists the total number of surface water TP samples collected at each of four sites in Lake Redstone. The Deep Hole is the original Citizen Lake Monitoring Network sample site and the site of WDNR long-term trend monitoring. The remaining three sites were added in the mid 2000's. Table 4 lists the total number of bottom water TP samples that were collected at each of four sites.

Table 3 – Surface water Total Phosphorus sampling results on Lake Redstone

Monitoring Site (surface)	Years	Months	# of Readings	Average (mg/L)	Min (mg/L)	Max (mg/L)
Winnebago (north)	2005-2016	Mar-Oct	54	0.064	0.021	0.129
Mourning Dove (middle)	2000, 2005-2016	Mar-Oct	57	0.066	0.023	0.236
Navajo (south)	2000, 2005-2016	Mar-Oct	65	0.081	0.02	0.851
Deep Hole	1988-2000, 2002, 2004, 2006-2016	Feb-Oct	102	0.051	0.012	0.195

Table 4- Bottom water Total Phosphorus sampling results on Lake Redstone

Monitoring Site (bottom)	Years	Months	# of Readings	Average (mg/L)	Min (mg/L)	Max (mg/L)
Winnebago (north)	2009-2016	Jan-Oct	51	0.072	0.038	0.14
Mourning Dove (middle)	2009-2016	Jan-Oct	62	0.113	0.024	0.692
Navajo (south)	2009-2016	Jan-Oct	61	0.326	0.0369	1.2
Deep Hole	1988-2000	Feb-Oct	60	0.317	0.012	1.5

Table 5 lists the total number of surface water orthophosphate samples collected at each of four sites in Lake Redstone. The Deep Hole is the original Citizen Lake Monitoring Network sample site and the site of WDNR long-term trend monitoring. The remaining three sites were added in the mid 2000’s. Table 6 lists the total number of bottom water TP samples that were collected at each of four sites.

Table 5 – Surface water orthophosphates (soluble reactive phosphorus) sampling results on Lake Redstone

Monitoring Site (surface)	Years	Months	# of Readings	No Detects (ND)	Average (mg/L)	Min (mg/L)	Max (mg/L)
Winnebago (north)	2006-07	May-Oct	9	2	0.011	0.002	0.04
Mourning Dove (middle)	2006-07	May-Oct	9	4	0.0134	0.003	0.048
Navajo (south)	2006-07	May-Oct	9	3	0.014	0.003	0.059
Deep Hole	1989-91, 1993,1996-99	April	8	3	0.007	0.003	0.018

Table 6 - Bottom water orthophosphates (soluble reactive phosphorus) sampling results on Lake Redstone

Monitoring Site (bottom)	Years	Months	# of Readings	No Detects (ND)	Average (mg/L)	Min (mg/L)	Max (mg/L)
Winnebago (north)	2006-07	May-Oct	9	2	0.009	0.002	0.043
Mourning Dove (middle)	2006-07	May-Oct	8	2	0.02	0.003	0.059
Navajo (south)	2006-07	May-Oct	8	1	0.061	0.003	0.159
Deep Hole	1989-91, 1993,1996-99	April	8	3	0.0074	0.004	0.021

A surface water concentration of total phosphorus below 0.02 mg/l for lakes and 0.03 mg/l for impoundments should be maintained to prevent nuisance algal blooms. Ideally, soluble reactive phosphorus concentrations should be 0.01mg/l or less at spring turnover to prevent summer algae blooms. TP and orthophosphate concentrations in Lake Redstone exceed these values more often than not since sampling began.

Iron (Fe) and Aluminum (Al)

Phosphorus does not dissolve easily in water. It forms insoluble precipitates (particles) with calcium, iron, and aluminum. In areas of Wisconsin where limestone is dissolved in the water marl (calcium carbonate), precipitates and falls to the bottom. Marl formations absorb phosphorus, reducing its overall concentration as well as algae growth in a lake.

Phosphorus can only bind with iron if oxygen is present. The amount of iron that might react with phosphorus varies widely in Wisconsin lakes. Lakes in the southern part of the state are often low in iron due to a higher pH and more sulfur, both of which limit iron solubility. This in turn affects whether phosphorus mixed into lakes during fall turnover precipitates or stays in solution during the winter. When lakes lose oxygen in winter or when the deep water (hypolimnion) loses oxygen in summer, iron and phosphorus again dissolve in water. Strong summer winds or spring and fall turnover may mix iron and phosphorus with surface water. For this reason, algae blooms may still appear in lakes for many years even if phosphorus inputs are controlled.

Phosphorus control has been attempted in some lakes by adding iron or another metal (aluminum) to precipitate phosphorus. Sewage treatment plants use the same process to remove phosphorus, using alum (aluminum sulfate) to bind with phosphorus. Unlike the precipitate that is formed when iron and phosphorus bind, the precipitate formed when aluminum and phosphorus bind does not re-dissolve when oxygen is depleted.

Manganese (Mn)

As with iron, manganese is found widely in soils and is a constituent of many ground waters. It, too, may be brought into solution in reducing conditions and the excess metal will be later deposited as the water is re-aerated. Normally manganese is contained in bottom sediments as insoluble particulate oxides, but when oxygen near the sediment surface becomes depleted, manganese is converted from oxide forms that are insoluble through bacterial action to manganese ions which are very soluble and now leach out of the sediments. A manganese concentration of just 0.5 mg/L is ten times the drinking water standard and can cause significant color, staining, and taste problems (Environmental Protection Agency - Ireland, 2001).

Sulfate (S) and Chloride (Cl)

Sulfate in lake water is primarily related to the types of minerals found in the watershed and to acid rain. Industries and utilities that burn coal, release sulfur compounds into the atmosphere that are then carried into lakes by rainfall. In Wisconsin, the highest lake sulfate levels are found in the southeast portion of the state where mineral sources and acid rain are more common. In water depleted of oxygen (anaerobic water), sulfate can be reduced to hydrogen sulfide. Hydrogen sulfide gas smells like rotten eggs and is toxic to aquatic organisms (Shaw, Mechenich, & Klessig, 2003).

The presence of chloride where it does not occur naturally indicates possible water pollution. Chloride does not affect plant and algae growth and is not toxic to aquatic organisms at most of the levels found in Wisconsin. Chloride is not common in Wisconsin soils, rocks or minerals, except in areas with limestone deposits. Sources of chloride include septic systems, animal waste, potash fertilizer (potassium chloride), and drainage from road-salting chemicals. Increases in chloride, either seasonally or over time, can mean that one or more of these sources are affecting the lake. An increase in chloride from human or animal waste suggests that other nutrients are also entering the lake. Higher chloride concentrations from spring to fall may be the effect of lawn fertilizer runoff or septic systems during heavy use by summer residents. Higher values in spring after the snow melts may signify runoff from drainage basins or highways as a major source of chloride. Since lakes vary in their natural chloride content, it is important to have background data or a long term database to document changes (Shaw, Mechenich, & Klessig, 2003).

Nitrogen (N)

Measured in mg/L, nitrogen is second only to phosphorus as an important nutrient for plant and algae growth. A lake's nitrogen sources vary widely. Nitrogen compounds often exceed 0.5 mg/l in rainfall, so that precipitation may be the main nitrogen source for seepage and some drainage lakes. In most cases, however, the amount of nitrogen in lake water corresponds to local land use. Nitrogen may come from fertilizer and animal wastes on agricultural lands, human waste from sewage treatment plants or septic

systems, and lawn fertilizers used on lakeshore property. Nitrogen may enter a lake from surface runoff or groundwater sources.

Nitrogen exists in lakes in several forms. Inorganic forms which include Nitrate (NO₃), Nitrite (NO₂), and Ammonia (NH₄) and can be used by aquatic plants and algae. If these inorganic forms of nitrogen exceed 0.3 mg/l (as N) in spring, there is sufficient nitrogen to support summer algae blooms. Total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN) is the combination of organically bound nitrogen and ammonia in the water. Organic nitrogen is often referred to as biomass nitrogen.

Nitrogen does not occur naturally in soil minerals, but is a major component of all organic (plant and animal) matter. Decomposing organic matter releases ammonia, which is converted to nitrate if oxygen is present. This conversion occurs more rapidly at higher water temperatures. In about 10% of Wisconsin's lakes, nitrogen (rather than phosphorus) limits algae growth. This occurs when the ratio of total nitrogen to total phosphorus is less than 10:1.

Larger plants also need nitrogen and may depend on spring runoff for septic systems to recharge the sediments with nitrogen. Growth of Eurasian milfoil has been correlated with such fertilization of the sediment.

Nitrogen data has been collected at the Deep Hole Site in Lake Redstone (Table 7).

Table 7 – Nitrogen Samples from the Deep Hole on Lake Redstone

Monitoring Site (surface)	Years	# of Readings	No Detects (ND)	Average (mg/L)	Min (mg/L)	Max (mg/L)
NH ₃ (ammonia)	89-91,93-97,99	16	4	0.178	0.005	0.524
TKN (Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen)	89,91,93-97,99,2002,2006-16	32	0	0.857	0.49	1.3
Nitrite and Nitrate (NO ₃ & NO ₂)	89-91,93-97,99,2002,2006-16	29	19	0.466	0.0373	0.71
Monitoring Site (bottom)	Years	# of Readings	No Detects (ND)	Average (mg/L)	Min (mg/L)	Max (mg/L)
NH ₃ (ammonia)	88-91,93,95-96,99-2000	16	0	1.999	0.206	5.74
TKN (Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen)	89,91,93,95-96,99,2002	9	0	1.929	0.6	5.64
Nitrite and Nitrate (NO ₃ & NO ₂)	89-91,93,95-96,99,2002	10	1	0.357	0.015	0.589

Sodium (Na) and Potassium (K)

Since natural levels of sodium and potassium ions in soil and water are very low, their presence may indicate lake pollution caused by human activities. Sodium is often associated with chloride. It finds its way into lakes from road salt, fertilizers, and human and animal waste. Potassium is the key component of commonly used potash fertilizer, and is abundant in animal waste. Both are measured in mg/L. Soils retain sodium and potassium to a greater degree than chloride or nitrate; therefore, sodium and potassium are not as useful as pollution indicators. Increasing sodium and potassium values over time can mean there are long-term effects caused by pollution. Although not normally toxic themselves, these compounds strongly indicate possible contamination from more damaging compounds (Shaw, Mechenich, & and Klessig, 2003).

Heavy Metals

Heavy metals refer to a group of elements that are generally considered toxic in a lake. The most commonly referred to metals in this category are arsenic, copper, mercury, and zinc, but it includes

many more. The term "heavy metals" is in reference to the high atomic weights of several metals in the broad group, although other metals regarded as in the same group have low atomic weights. Nonetheless, the term both is widely current and a useful descriptor. The following is a listing of the more commonly referred to metals in this class: Antimony, Cobalt, Nickel, Tin, Arsenic, Copper, Selenium, Titanium, Beryllium, Lead, Silver, Uranium, Cadmium, Mercury, Tellurium, Vanadium, Chromium, Molybdenum, Thallium, and Zinc. These individual substances are all more or less toxic to either man or fish or both, and their presence is highly undesirable in raw or finished public waters or in fishery waters, salmonid or cyprinid (Environmental Protection Agency - Ireland, 2001).

Alkalinity and Hardness, Magnesium (Mg), Calcium (Ca)

Measured in mg/L of CaCO_3 , the alkalinity of natural water is generally due to the presence of bicarbonates formed in reactions in the soils through which the water percolates. Calcium (Ca) and magnesium (Mg) are the primary ions measured when determining alkalinity. Alkalinity is a measure of the capacity of the water to neutralize acids and it reflects its so-called buffer capacity (its inherent resistance to pH change) (Environmental Protection Agency - Ireland, 2001). The amount of alkalinity largely determines lake water's pH. Water with low alkalinity has low pH value (high acid) and highly alkaline lakes have pH values above 7. A poorly buffered water will have a low or very low alkalinity and will be susceptible to pH reduction by, for example, "acid rain."

A lake's hardness and alkalinity are affected by the type of minerals in the soil and watershed bedrock, and by how much the lake water comes into contact with these minerals. If a lake gets groundwater from aquifers containing limestone minerals such as calcite (CaCO_3) and dolomite (CaMgCO_3), hardness and alkalinity will be high. High levels of hardness (greater than 150 mg/l) and alkalinity can cause marl (CaCO_3) to precipitate out of the water (Shaw, Mechenich, & and Klessig, 2003).

Hard water lakes tend to produce more fish and aquatic plants than soft water lakes. Such lakes are usually located in watersheds with fertile soils that add phosphorus to the lake. As a balancing mechanism, however, phosphorus precipitates with marl, thereby controlling algae blooms (Shaw, Mechenich, & and Klessig, 2003).

If the soils are sandy and composed of quartz or other insoluble minerals, or if direct rainfall is a major source of lake water, hardness and alkalinity will be low, leading to soft water lakes. This is the case in much of northern Wisconsin, where glacial deposits contain little limestone or other soluble minerals. Lakes with low amounts of alkalinity are more susceptible to acidification by acid rain and are generally unproductive (Shaw, Mechenich, & and Klessig, 2003).

In Wisconsin, hard water lakes have a total alkalinity that equals or exceeds 50 mg/L. Hard water lakes are less susceptible to acidification because they have a high concentration of hydroxyl, carbonate, and/or bicarbonate ions, which buffer acids. Soft water lakes have a total alkalinity that is less than 50 mg/L. Soft water lakes have low capacity to buffer acids. Lake Redstone is a hard water lake.

Acidity (pH)

The acidity of lake water is measured on a pH scale with values ranging from 0-14. A substance like pure, distilled water with a pH of 7 on the scale is considered neutral, neither acidic nor basic in nature. The

lower the pH value the more acidic the water. The higher the value the more basic the water is. In Wisconsin, pH ranges from 4.5 in some acid bog lakes to 8.4 in hard water, marl lakes. A lake with a pH of 6 is ten times more acid than a lake with a pH of 7. While moderately low pH does not usually harm fish, the metals that become soluble under low pH can be important. In low pH water, aluminum, zinc and mercury concentrations increase if they are present in lake sediment or watershed soils (Shaw, Mechenich, & and Klessig, 2003).

Mercury levels in fish are high in acidified lakes. While not usually toxic to fish, high aluminum and mercury levels pose a health problem for loons, eagles, osprey and humans who eat chemically tainted fish. Some aquatic organisms appear unable to maintain calcium levels when pH is low, and consequently develop weak bones and shells (Shaw, Mechenich, & and Klessig, 2003).

Surface water pH values outside of the 6-9 range or changes >0.5 units outside of the natural seasonal maximum (mean) and minimum (mean) are considered impaired (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 2016 (Draft Version)). Lake Redstone has an average pH over time of 7.67.

Conductivity

Conductivity or (specific conductance) measures water’s ability to conduct an electric current. Conductivity is reported in micromhos per centimeter (µmhos/cm) and is directly related to the total dissolved inorganic chemicals in the water. Values are commonly two times the water hardness unless the water is receiving high concentrations of contaminants introduced by humans. In itself conductivity is a property of little interest to a water analyst but it is an invaluable indicator of the range into which hardness and alkalinity values are likely to fall, and also of the dissolved solids content of the water (Environmental Protection Agency - Ireland, 2001). Conductivity measurements are often used to determine if septic systems are leaking into a lake as the conductivity in the water near a leaking system will typically be higher than in other parts of the lake.

Table 8 reflects data from additional water quality parameters collected at the Deep Hole on Lake Redstone between 1980 and 2016 by the WDNR and lake volunteers. Similar data exists at least three other sites, but not as much.

Table 8 – 1980-2016 Water quality parameters from the Deep Hole on Lake Redstone

Other Water Quality Parameters - Deep Hole				
Parameter	# of Samples	Average (mg/L)	Min (mg/L)	Max (mg/L)
Iron	21	0.61	0.1	3.5
Manganese	16	0.5175	0.13	1
Sulfate	18	5.76	3	8
Chloride	17	5.48	4.2	7
Sodium	18	2.93	2	3.3
Potassium	18	2.45	1.3	4.6
Heavy Metals (Copper, mg/kg)	30	16.86	2.1	40
Alkalinity	61	132.5	79.6	541
Hardness	8	116.63	93	130
Magnesium	18	13.61	10	18
Calcium	27	27.86	21	37
Acidity (pH, 0-14)	279	7.67	2.1	10.69
Conductivity (umhos/cm)	216	238.93	163.5	339

Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen (DO)

Oxygen (O₂) is the most important of the gases dissolved in water, since most aquatic organisms need it to survive. The solubility of oxygen and other gases depends on water temperature. The colder the water, the more gases it can hold. Boiling water removes all gases.

Oxygen is produced whenever green plants grow, even under water. Plants use carbon dioxide and water to produce simple sugars and oxygen, using sunlight as the energy source. Chlorophyll, the green pigment in plants, absorbs sunlight and serves as the oxygen production site. This process is called photosynthesis. Photosynthesis occurs only during daylight hours and only to the depths where sunlight penetrates. The amount of photosynthesis depends on the quantity of plants, nutrient availability, and water temperature. Plants and animals also constantly use oxygen to break down sugar and obtain energy by a process called respiration, basically the reverse of the photosynthesis.

During daylight hours, it is not uncommon to find extremely high oxygen values in surface waters (supersaturation), while at night or early morning before photosynthesis begins they may fall below those values. At lake depths below the reach of sunlight, the only reaction that occurs is oxygen-consuming respiration. The deep waters of productive lakes often experience oxygen depletion in the bottom waters.

Deep lakes in Wisconsin will usually stratify during the summer months. Stratification means the water in the lake separates into distinct levels due to temperature and water density. Warm water has less density than cold water and will rise to the upper reaches of the lake's water column in the summer. Cold water, which is denser, will sink to the lower depths of the lake. Two distinct layers are formed: warm, oxygen rich water at the surface of the lake; and cold, oxygen depleted water at the bottom of the lake. The two distinct layers are separated by a layer known as the thermocline. The thermocline effectively prevents oxygen rich surface water from mixing with oxygen depleted bottom water (Shaw, Mechenich, & and Klessig, 2003). Shallow lakes or lakes with shallow areas will usually stay mixed all year maintaining adequate levels of dissolved oxygen.

Concentrations of phosphorus, ammonia, iron and manganese are greatly influenced by the presence or lack of oxygen in lake water and sediments. Ammonia is a breakdown product of proteins. When little or no oxygen is present at the sediment-water interface, concentrations of ammonia can be quite high. Ammonia is toxic and represents a threat to aquatic life. Sediments in lakes can contain a lot of iron, manganese and phosphorus. These can be released in large quantities from the bottom of the lake when oxygen levels are very low (Environmental Protection Agency - Ireland, 2001). Phosphorus released from the sediment under oxygen depleted condition is called internal loading, which is often the cause of summer algae blooms in Wisconsin lakes.

Dissolved oxygen and temperature profiles were collected at the Deep Hole (36-ft) of Lake Redstone in 1999, 2004, and from 2006-2016. A profile includes collecting a reading for DO and Temp roughly every meter from the surface to the bottom. These data indicate that at the Deep Hole, Lake Redstone stratifies with the thermocline establishing between 3 & 4 meters from late May through September. Oxygen depletion in the area below the thermocline occurs from June through early September.

Dissolved oxygen and temperature profiles collected at three other sites: Winnebago (north, 14-ft deep), Mourning Dove (middle, 20-ft deep), and Navajo (south, 30-ft deep) between 1998 and 2016 indicate that Lake Redstone stratifies in all but the northern portion of the lake at around 3-4 meters between late June and early September. Oxygen depletion occurs below 14-ft from late June through early September.

Water Quality Summary - Tributaries

Lake Redstone is an impound on Big Creek. There are two main branches of Big Creek that drain more than 19,000 acres to the lake. The West Branch of Big Creek drains approximately half of the entire watershed and the East Branch and immediate shoreland around the lake drains the rest. Water quality data including total phosphorus (TP), orthophosphates (ortho), total suspended solids (TSS), dissolved oxygen (DO), temperature, and flow/volume has been collected, with major years for data collecting in 2006-07, and 2010-2014. Figure 12 shows all the sites where water quality data has been collected. There are several other sites where biotic indices (macroinvertebrates) have been measured.




Figure 15 – Lake Redstone Watershed Tributary Monitoring Sites for Water Quality

Table 9 reflects TP and TSS data for the sites in Figure 12. TP averages ≥ 0.075 mg/L in streams is considered past the threshold for an impaired water (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 2016 (Draft Version)). Table 10 reflects ortho data for the sites in Figure 12.

Table 9 – Lake Redstone Watershed Tributary Water Quality Data 2006-07, 2010-14, 2015-16

Lake Redstone Watershed Tributary Data - 2006-07, 2010-14, 2015-2016								
Site Name	Branch	Storet#	Years	Samples	Ave-TP	Min-TP	Max-TP	Ave-TSS
Wafle Road	West	none	2015-16	12	0.104	0.08	0.12	7.74
Pekala Road	West	10029135	2015-16	11	0.088	0.067	0.12	17.3
Daug's Road	West	none	2015-16	12	0.099	0.069	0.16	25.24
Lucht Road	West	none	2015-16	12	0.082	0.068	0.11	15.06
Pfaff Road	West	10032044	2010-14	12	0.159	0.084	0.473	13.07
Clark Road	West	10012316	2006-07, 2010-14	50	0.141	0.059	0.447	9
Cty F	West	10032045	2010-14	11	0.171	0.079	0.286	9.16
Nemitz Road	East	10010068	2010-14	12	0.11	0.048	0.295	10.45
LaValle Road	East	10012315	2006-07, 2010-14	50	0.166	0.032	0.981	14.57
Warbler Court	Lake	none	2015-16	12	0.079	0.039	0.13	3.84
Martin-Meadowlark	Lake	none	2014	?	0.08			7.23
Swallow Bay	Lake	10012313	2006-07, 2014	17	0.353	0.077	1.26	21.87

Table 10 – Lake Redstone Watershed Tributary Water Quality Data – Orthophosphates, 2006-07, 2010-14, 2015-16

Lake Redstone Watershed Tributary Data - 2006-07, 2010-14, 2015-2016							
Site Name	Branch	Storet#	Years	Samples	Ave-Ortho	Min-Ortho	Max-Ortho
Wafle Road	West	none	2015-16	12	0.067	0.046	0.089
Pekala Road	West	10029135	2015-16	11	0.055	0.015	0.096
Daug's Road	West	none	2015-16	12	0.042	0.026	0.064
Pfaff Road	West	10032044	2010-13	11	0.055	0.02	0.077
Clark Road	West	10012316	2006-07, 2010-13	48	0.063	0.017	0.259
Cty F	West	10032045	2010-13	10	0.047	0.023	0.081
Nemitz Road	East	10010068	2010-13	11	0.047	0.024	0.09
LaValle Road	East	10012315	2006-07, 2010-13	49	0.049	0.008	0.184
Warbler Court	Lake	none	2015-16	12	0.013	0.005	0.021
Martin-Meadowlark	Lake	none	2014	?			
Swallow Bay	Lake	10012313	2006-07	16	0.089	0.032	0.257

Recommendations for Future Management Planning and a Lake Management Planning Grant Application

Based on a thorough review of the data collected on Lake Redstone, its tributaries, and watershed the following recommendations are suggested.

Lake Shoreland and Shallows Habitat Assessment Survey

Recent guidance documents provided by the WDNR has created a standard methodology for surveying, assessing, and mapping habitat in lakeshore areas, including the Riparian Buffer, Bank, and Littoral Zone (WDNR; UW-Estension; Green, Jefferson, Waupaca County Land and Water Conservation Dept., 2016).

The data collected provides important and useful information resource managers, community stakeholders, and others who are interested in protecting and enhancing Wisconsin's lakes. Data collected can be used for any or all of the following:

- Teaching and outreach
- Prioritizing areas in need of improvements
- Identifying areas for protection and restorations
- Creating lake management plans
- Creating county comprehensive plans
- Aiding management at the county level
- Planning aquatic plant management
- Evaluation trends in lakeshore habitat over time
- Understanding trends in lake ecology (fish, wildlife, invasive species).

Examples of information gathered lake-wide through this survey include the % of impervious surface, mowed lawn or plants in the Riparian Buffer Zone; number of parcels around the lake with erosion concerns; total length of modified banks; density of human structures within 35-ft of the lakeshore; and density of coarse woody habitat in the lake.

The condition of the shoreline/land around Lake Redstone has been a concern, as many of the lots touching the lake are fully developed with mowed lawn to the edge of the water. There has been discussion related to ways to encourage property owners to make improvements to their shores either on their own or as prerequisites to aquatic plant treatment or dredging adjacent to their properties. Demonstration sites were even set up in years past. Recent grant funding through the WDNR Healthy Lakes Initiative makes it possible to get state cost-sharing to install small-scale shoreland BMPs including native plantings, rain gardens, runoff diversions, French drains, and Fish Sticks habitat improvement projects. All it takes is the commitment of the property owner to take part. By completing a shoreland assessment like discussed here, the LRPD would have a document that could guide years of implementation projects based on high, moderate, or low priority need for each parcel. Each parcel would be evaluated and prioritized using the same system, eliminating any perceived bias. The document would also give the LRPD information that could be used if it is ever decided to base plant management or dredging on the condition of the adjacent shoreline. The assessment would also fulfill one of the recommendations of Sauk County, for the LRPD to support a massive shoreland buffer/rain

garden campaign on the lake. This recommendation was made by Sauk County in response to a question about how the LRPD could support County efforts.

Sediment Pond Feasibility Study

In the past, sediment ponds/traps have been installed at the head of several washes into Lake Redstone. The 2011 Sediment Management Study recommended installing sediment traps at high priority sites across the entire watershed however, with an estimated 800 gullies in the West Branch watershed alone, literally hundreds could be installed. Recent conversations between the LRPD and the WDNR have suggested that cleaning out previously installed traps could be considered an important first step, followed, perhaps by a feasibility study to look at just the heads of the multiple bays on Lake Redstone to determine whether additional sediment traps similar to the one installed at the head of Mourning Dove Bay (Figure 16) would be effective sediment management tools.



Figure 16- Sediment Trap at Mourning Dove Bay (Montgomery Associates Resource Solutions, LLC, 2011)

Dredging

Related to building sediment traps, is dredging of multiple bays within Lake Redstone. Dredging has been a discussion item for at least the last 10 years, or longer. Back in the 1980's, 20 years after Lake Redstone was build, dredging of many of the bays was completed. Since that time, many BMPs have been installed on and around the lake and in the watershed to reduce sediment loading. These actions have reduced the sediment load to the lake, and more are planned to further reduce it. This bodes well for a dredging project, as it would be expected that cleaning the bays out to get them back to depths recorded in the 1980's would maintain them for many years to come, perhaps 30-40 years verses the 25 years gained from the last dredging project.

While the discussion of dredging has been going on for 10 years or more, getting to the point where it could actually be implemented has taken quite a bit of time. However, it is now a realistic management action that could be implemented as soon as 2018. A big step forward was the completion of the Sediment Sampling Project by Ayres Associates in 2016. Through this study, 26 bays in Lake Redstone were measured for lake depth, sampled for deposited lake bed sediments, and the volume of deposited

sediment estimated. Additionally, sediment samples were collected from each bay and sent to a lab for chemical and physical analysis.

Through this study, significant amounts of sediment were observed in most, but not all bays. Only arsenic exceeded accepted thresholds of safety, and only for Non-Industrial Direct Contact and Soil to Groundwater. According to the study, high arsenic levels will not be an issue for dredging work, as the level is well below the Surficial Soils Background Threshold Value (BTV) for arsenic (8 parts per million) set by the WDNR's Remediation and Redevelopment Program in 2013 (WDNR, 2013). The BTV for surface soils is based on a summary of USGS soil data from 664 locations across the state of Wisconsin, collected in 2006 and 2007.

The LRPD is moving forward with plans to implement dredging actions in at least the worst bays identified in 2016, with 2018 being the first year dredging actions will likely take place.

Native Aquatic Plant Restoration

Aquatic plant management actions over the last 5-years or longer have stressed the importance of protecting native aquatic vegetation while removing EWM. One of the concerns with dredging of the bays is that native vegetation that has made a comeback in certain bays of the lake will be again set back by dredging activities. It is possible that the areas could be left alone to naturally recover after disturbance, with selective control of EWM to reduce its impact on native vegetation. However a more direct action would be to include re-establishing native aquatic vegetation in post-dredging plans. There are many ways to do this, but traditionally it is a difficult task with limited success. Evaluating the methods of re-establishing native aquatic vegetation and coming up with a plan that might work on Lake Redstone after dredging occurs is an important action in support of dredging and should be included in the next lake management planning project.

Adding Nitrogen Parameters to Water Quality Sampling

Two other actions have been suggested for future management planning. To date, little nitrogen data has been collected from the lake and tributaries. Since nitrogen, along with phosphorus can be a significant factor in the fertility of a lake system, it has been suggested that water sampling include nitrogen variables. The forms of nitrogen that are of greatest interest to lake studies are nitrate-nitrite nitrogen ($\text{NO}_3 + \text{NO}_2$), total ammonia nitrogen (NH_4), and total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN). The inorganic nitrogen forms (nitrate and ammonia) are readily utilized by algae for growth. Research has found that inorganic nitrogen concentrations about 0.30 mg/L are able to stimulate algae growth (Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, 1998).

Preparation of a Comprehensive Lake Management Plan

Using past data and new data collected via a lake management planning grant, a Comprehensive Lake Management Plan (CLMP) for Lake Redstone should be prepared in accordance with the EPA and WDNR 9-Key Elements Planning Guidance. Lake Redstone is currently listed as a high priority lake for the development of a TMDL, a process that typically takes a long time to accomplish.

A TMDL is a pollution budget and includes a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that can occur in a waterbody and allocates the necessary reductions to one or more pollutant sources. A TMDL serves as a planning tool and potential starting point for restoration or protection activities with the ultimate goal of attaining or maintaining water quality standards. Under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, states, territories and authorized tribes (included in the term State here) are required to submit lists of impaired waters. These are waters that are too polluted or otherwise degraded to meet water quality standards. The law requires that the states establish priority rankings for waters on the lists and develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) for these waters (EPA, 2017).

According to the last correspondence with the WDNR, it is unknown when the process of developing a TMDL for Lake Redstone will begin (Personal Correspondence, Susan Graham, November 2016). However, it was felt that developing a CLMP would not negatively affect the TMDL process.

The CLMP would complete the last seven steps in the 9-Key Elements Planning Guidance and be a tool to help guide present and future actions to improve Lake Redstone.

Lake Management Planning Grant Application

To complete the recommendations in the previous section of this report, it is highly recommended that the Lake Redstone Protection District work with a consultant, the WDNR, and potential partners to develop a large-scale lake management planning grant application to be submitted in December 2017. It is very likely that a project of this scale would require multiple phases, as each individual phase is limited to maximum state share of \$25,000.00. However, if grant funds were awarded, a Comprehensive Lake Management Plan for Lake Redstone could be in place and ready for full implementation in 2020.

Works Cited

- (n.d.). (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources) Retrieved January 2017, from Wisconsin Lakes Page: <http://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/lakepages/LakeDetail.aspx?wbic=1280400&page=waterquality>
- Ayres Associates. (2016). *Lake Redstone Sediment Sampling*. Eau Claire, WI: Ayres Associates.
- BARR. (2009). *Lake Redstone Watershed and Lake Modeling Study*. Minneapolis: BARR Engineering.
- Blumer, D. L. (2015). *Aquatic Plant Management Plan - Lake Redstone*. Chetek, WI: Lake Education and Planning Services, LLC.
- Bryson, J. M. (1995). *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Environmental Protection Agency - Ireland*. (2001). Retrieved January 2017, from https://www.epa.ie/pubs/advice/water/quality/Water_Quality.pdf
- EPA. (2013). *A Quick Guide to Developing Watershed Plans to Restore and Protect Our Waters*. Washington DC: Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds - Nonpoint Source Control Branch.
- EPA. (2017). *EPA*. Retrieved from Implementing Clean Water Act Section 303(d): Impaired Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs): <https://www.epa.gov/tmdl>
- Erickson, J. (2006). *Lake Redstone Protection District Lake Planning Process*. Baraboo, WI: Sauk County UW-Extension.
- Freeman, L. A., Carpenter, M. C., Rosenberry, D. O., Rousseau, J. P., Unger, R., & S, a. M. (2004). *Use of Submersible Pressure Transducers in Water-Resource Investigations*. Reston, Virginia: US Geological Survey.
- Garn, H., Elder, J., & Robertson, D. (2003). *Why Study Lakes? An Overview of USGS Lake Studies in Wisconsin*. USGS.
- Grovhac, Inc. (2016). *gen-AIR-ator*. Retrieved from Aeration: <http://www.genairator.com/environment.aspx>
- Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. (1998). *Common Lake Water Quality Parameters*. Springfield: Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission. Retrieved from <http://www.epa.state.il.us/water/conservation/lake-notes/quality-parameters.pdf>
- Institute for Environmental Studies. (1981). *Lake Redstone: A Water Quality and Management Study*. Madison, WI: UW-Madison.
- James, W. (2016). Internal P Loading: A Persistent Management Problem in Lake Recovery. *Lake and Reservoir Management - NALMS*.

- Keenan, M. (2015). *Baraboo River Watershed RCPP*. Baraboo, WI: Sauk County Conservation, Planning, and Zoning Department. Retrieved October 2016
- Kleeburg, A. H. (2013). Redox sensitivity of iron in phosphorus binding does not impact lake restoration. *Water Research*, 1491-1502.
- Koenig, S. (2014). 2014 Lake Redstone Feeder Streams Monitoring Data. Baraboo, WI: Sauk County Conservation, Planning, and Zoning Department.
- Marshall, D., Jaeger, S., Panuska, J., Lathrop, R., Unmuth, J., & Decker, E. (2002). *Feasibility of Releasing Hypolimnetic Water to Reduce Internal Phosphorus Loading in Lake Redstone*. Madison, WI: WDNR.
- Montgomery Associates Resource Solutions, LLC. (2011). *West Branch of Big Creek Watershed Sediment Management Study, Final Report*. Cottage Grove, WI: Montgomery Associates Resource Solutions, LLC.
- MSA. (1998). *Lake Redstone Watershed Agricultural Inventory*. Madison, WI: MSA Professional Services, Inc.
- MSA. (2002). *GIS Sediment Delivery Model Report*. Madison, WI: MSA Professional Services, Inc.
- NRCS. (2017). *Natural Resources Conservation Service of Wisconsin*. Retrieved from Environmental Quality Incentives Program:
<https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/wi/programs/financial/eqip/>
- Oldenburg, P. (2010). Lake Redstone Modeling Review. *Correspondence/Memorandum*. State of Wisconsin.
- Panuska, J. a. (1997). *Water Quality Model Study for Lake Redstone, Sauk County*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.
- Papanicolaou, T. D. (2017, January). *University of Tennessee - Knoxville*. Retrieved from Consulting and Facilities: <http://tpapanicolaou.engr.utk.edu/consulting-facilities/>
- Sefton, D., & Graham, S. (2009). *Designation of Critical Habitat Lake Redstone, Sauk County, Wisconsin*. Fitchburg, WI: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.
- Shaw, B., Mechenich, C., & Klessig, L. (2003). *Understanding Lake Data*. Madison, WI: UW-Extension Lakes.
- U.S. Geological Survey. (2016, December 9). *The USGS Water Science School*. Retrieved from What is a watershed?: (<http://water.usgs.gov/edu/watershed.html>)
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. (2008). *Handbook for Developing Watershed Plans to Restore and Protect Our Waters*. Washington, DC: Office of Water Nonpoint Source Control Branch.

University of Minnesota - Duluth. (2016). *laked.access an empact metro project*. Retrieved from TSI:
<http://www.lakeaccess.org/lakedata/datainfotsi.html>

VierbicherAssociates. (2007). *Lake Monitoring Project East and West Branches of Big Creek, 2006 and 2007 Water Depth and Streamflow Data*. Reedsburg, WI: Vierbicher Associates, Inc.

WDNR. (2013). *Wisconsin Statewide Soil-Arsenic Background Threshold Value*. Madison: WDNR.

WDNR. (2016, December). *Surface Water Data Viewer*. Retrieved from
<http://dnrmapping.wi.gov/H5/?Viewer=SWDV>

WDNR; UW-Extension; Green, Jefferson, Waupaca County Land and Water Conservation Dept. (2016). *Lake Shoreland & Shalloows Habitat Monitoring Field Protocol*. Madison.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. (2014, November). Retrieved from Nonpoint source pollution: <http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/nonpoint/>

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. (2016 (Draft Version)). *Wisconsin 2018 Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology (WisCALM) for CWA Section 303(d) and 305(b) Integrated Reporting*. Madison, WI: WDNR Bureau of Water Quality.

Appendix C

Wisconsin River TMDL: Bathtub Lake Model Setup and Results for Minocqua Lake, Kawaguesaga Lake, and Redstone Lake

Introduction

This report summarizes the setup and results of Bathtub modeling for Kawaguesaga and Minocqua Lakes in Oneida County, and Redstone Lake in Sauk County. These lakes are on Wisconsin's 303(d) list of impaired waters for phosphorus related impairments and are part of the larger Wisconsin River basin Total Maximum Daily Load for total phosphorus.

Model Setup and Development

Steady-state modeling was conducted using Bathtub (Version 6.1, Walker 1996). Bathtub is a windows-based software program that provides a suite of empirical equations for predicting lake averages of phosphorus, chlorophyll, and Secchi transparency. Model outputs were only analyzed for phosphorus and no additional modeling evaluation was conducted for chlorophyll and Secchi.

Lake surface area and volume were based on values reported on WDNR lake survey maps (<http://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/maps/>). Mixed layer depth was based on model predictions. Redstone Lake was modeled as a single basin, while Minocqua and Kawaguesaga Lakes were modeled as two separate but connected basins. All model runs were based on annual loadings.

Table 1: Lake morphology information

Lake	WBIC	Surface Area (km ²)	Length (km)	Mean depth (m)	Mixed Layer Depth (m)
Minocqua	1542400	5.332	4.0	7.05	5.7
Kawaguesaga	1542300	2.792	2.9	5.18	4.7
Redstone	1280400	2.450	4.28	4.35	3.0

Long term annual average water and nutrient loads to each lake (Table 2) were estimated using the SWAT model developed for the Wisconsin River basin TMDL (WDNR 2016). Atmospheric loading rates were based on a precipitation rate of 0.8 m/yr and a phosphorus load of 30 mg/m²/yr.

Table 2: Water and nutrient loading information

Lake	Watershed Area (km ²)	Mean Annual Flow (hm ³ /yr)	Tributary Flow Weighted Mean TP (µg/L)	Tributary P loading (kg/yr)	Atmospheric P Loading (kg/yr)	SWAT Sub-basin(s)
Minocqua	164.51	54.3	22.8	1,240	99.0	134, 133, 168, 226
Kawaguesaga	15.63	4.99	21.4	107	51.8	135
Redstone	74.61	21.5		3,524	73.5	13, 15, 16

Surficial total phosphorus results for the modeled lakes were acquired from the department’s comprehensive 2014 Lake Assessment data set developed for Wisconsin’s 2014 Impaired Waters List. This data set encompassed the period from 2003 through 2012.

The total phosphorus sub-model was selected based on overall model fit. Model fit was adequate in all cases and no site-specific calibration was required.

Table 3: Monitoring and Modeling Results

Lake	Assessed Years	# Sample Results	Observed TP (µg/L)	Predicted TP (µg/L)	% diff	TP Sub-model
Minocqua	2003-2011	31	16.7	17.0	2%	Canfield Bachman - Lakes
Kawaguesaga	2003,2006, 2010-2012	14	17.7	17.3	2%	Canfield Bachman - Lakes
Redstone	2006-2012	13	57.1	61.0	6%	Canfield Bachman - Reservoirs

Loading Capacity

To determine loading capacity for each lake, upstream tributary concentrations were sequentially lowered until modeled in-lake total phosphorus matched the waterbody’s phosphorus criterion under NR 102.06 Wis. Admin. Code. Atmospheric phosphorus loading rates were held constant as were hydraulic loading rates.

Table 4: Loading Capacity

Lake Name	TP Criteria (µg/L)	Tributary P loading (kg/yr)	Tributary Flow Weighted Mean TP (µg/L)	Predicted in-Lake P (µg/L)	% reduction
Minocqua	15	1,032	19	15	17%
Kawaguesaga	15	94.8	19	15	11%
Redstone	30	1,175	60	30	67%

Wisconsin River TMDL: Lake Model Setup and Results for Lake Delton

Introduction

This report summarizes the setup and results of modeling for Lake Delton in Sauk County. This lake is on Wisconsin's 303(d) list of impaired waters for phosphorus related impairments and are part of the larger Wisconsin River Basin Total Maximum Daily Load for total phosphorus.

Model Setup and Development

Steady-state modeling was conducted using Wisconsin Lake Modeling Suite (WiLMS Version 3.318.1, WDNR 2001). WiLMS is a windows-based software program that provides a suite of empirical equations for predicting lake averages of phosphorus.

Lake surface area and volume were based on values reported on WDNR lake survey maps (<http://dnr.wi.gov/lakes/maps/>). All model runs were based on annual loadings not seasonal loading.

Table 1: Lake morphology information

Lake	WBIC	Surface Area (acres)	Mean Depth (ft)
Minocqua	1295400	249	12

Long term annual average water and nutrient loads to each lake (Table 2) were estimated using the SWAT model developed for the Wisconsin River basin TMDL (WDNR 2016). Atmospheric loading rates were based on the default loading rates from WiLMS and comprised a minor fraction of the total phosphorus budget (30 kg/yr).

Table 2: Water and nutrient loading information

Lake	Watershed Area (km ²)	Mean Annual Flow (hm ³ /yr)	Tributary P loading (kg/yr)	SWAT Sub-basin(s)
Delton	202.3	63.04	7,385	30, 31, 32

Surficial total phosphorus results for the modeled lakes were acquired from the department's comprehensive 2016 Lake Assessment data set developed for Wisconsin's 2016 Impaired Waters List. This data set encompassed the period from 2010 through 2014.

The total phosphorus sub-model was selected based on overall model fit.

Table 3: Monitoring and Modeling Results

Lake	Assessed Years	# Sample Results	Observed TP (µg/L)	Predicted TP (µg/L)	% diff	TP Sub-model
Delton	2010-2014	10	73	74	1%	Canfield Bachman – Artificial Lakes

Loading Capacity

To determine loading capacity for each lake, the WiLMS load back calculation routine was used to back calculate an annual loading to match the in-lake total phosphorus criterion under NR 102.06 Wis. Admin. Code. Atmospheric phosphorus loading rates were held constant as were hydraulic loading rates.

Table 4: Loading Capacity

Lake Name	TP Criteria (µg/L)	Tributary P loading (kg/yr)	% reduction
Delton	40	3,371	54%

Appendix D – Best Management Practices (BMPs)

Watershed and Agricultural BMPs

- Conservation tillage: crop residue (plant material from past harvests) is left on the soil surface to reduce runoff and soil erosion, conserve soil moisture, and keep nutrients and pesticides on the field. Conservation tillage typically increases crop residue levels above 60% on fields.
- Contour strip farming: farming hilly fields across the slope to impede runoff and soil movement downhill reducing erosion and sediment production.
- Nutrient management planning: managing and accounting for all nutrient inputs to a field, ensuring that there are sufficient nutrients available for crop needs while preventing excessive nutrient loading, which may result in leaching of the excess nutrients to the ground water, or contained in surface water runoff from the land into local lakes and waterways.
- Cover crops: crops that are grown at times when agricultural fields may otherwise be left with bare soils exposed between annual cash crops like corn and soybeans. Cover crops can be a cash crop of their own or be incorporated into the soil before the planting of the main crops.
- No-till farming: an agricultural technique for growing crops or pasture without disturbing the soil through tillage. No-till farming decreases the amount of soil erosion tillage causes in certain soils, especially in sandy and dry soils on sloping terrain. Other possible benefits include an increase in the amount of water that infiltrates into the soil, soil retention of organic matter, and nutrient cycling. These methods may increase the amount and variety of life in and on the soil. No-till farming typically maintains crop residue levels at 90% or greater on fields.
- Conservation buffers: grassed waterways, wetlands, and natural riparian areas that act as an additional barrier of protection by capturing potential pollutants before they move to surface waters.
- Cows can be kept away from streams by streambank fencing and installation of alternative water sources, and designated livestock stream crossings can provide a controlled crossing or watering access, thus limiting streambank erosion and streambed trampling.

Riparian Area BMPs (compiled from resources available from the University of Minnesota Extension Service).

- Limit covered areas that prevent water from seeping into the ground.
- Retain trees and shrubs; trees provide a natural umbrella by shedding water and can reduce runoff by as much as 50%.

- Be aware and watch for runoff and erosion on your property, particularly during storm events. Know where your runoff goes.
- Limit clearing and grading on slopes and minimize cutting and filling for roads, sidewalks, and footpaths.
- Where paved areas are necessary, locate them as close to the main road as possible to minimize the length of paved driveway.
- Leave wasted space such as corners near buildings that are not large enough for parking or driving unpaved.
- Locate driveways, sidewalks, stairways, and footpaths away from slopes because steeper slopes have greater erosion potential; if you must cross a hillside, follow the contour of the slope.
- Use steps when a walkway must go directly up and down a slope, particularly near the waterfront.
- Minimize driveway and road crossings over waterways including ditches and swales, and cross at a right angle to the stream if possible.
- Sweep driveways or sidewalks instead of washing them down with a hose, to prevent sediment, salt, and petroleum products from washing into waterways; cover stockpiles of salt and sand with a tarp or store them in a building.
- Install water bars on sloping paths, driveways, or roadways to slow and divert runoff.
- Use paving stones instead of solid concrete for walkways and patios; this allows water to seep around the stones instead of running off.
- When landscaping, stage construction so one area is stabilized before another area is disturbed.
- Avoid construction in areas with little vegetative cover, erodible soils (sands, or soils that appear fluffy when dry), that are mainly bedrock with a thin covering of soil, or that are on steep slopes.
- Control erosion during construction by using temporary methods such as diversions, silt fences, or hay bales to carry water away or to trap before it enters the lake.
- Inspect construction projects immediately after initial installation of erosion control measures, during construction, following any severe rainstorm, before reseeding, and when nearing the completion of construction work; temporary erosion controls should be removed; ensure that stabilization is complete and drainage ways are in proper working order.
- Install rain gutters along the edge of rooftops to help carry water off of the roof and away from the building to areas where soil won't be eroded; make sure there is erosion protection where the gutters outlet onto soil.

- Keep gutters free from debris and draining properly.
- Position rooftops so they are perpendicular to the slope, instead of parallel, to slow down runoff.
- Construct all docks to allow free flow of water beneath them to prevent erosion and sedimentation along the shore.
- Use the smallest possible dock to meet your needs.
- Never apply wood preservatives or paint to decks or docks while they are in or over the water.
- Minimize the amount of ground surface covered with decks and patios to avoid increasing runoff and erosion.
- Eliminate paths to the waterfront that cut directly up and down slopes or over bluffs because they decrease stability of the shoreline and increase erosion; replace with stairways when necessary.
- Maintain trees and other vegetation that will help reduce your home's visibility from the water and adjacent property.
- Store gasoline, oil, and other potentially hazardous materials away from the water in a building with a solid floor; store emergency clean-up materials with the chemicals.
- Drain greywater from hot tubs, laundry, and showers through the septic system or connect with sewer lines to avoid adding soaps, oils, and bacteria to your water.
- Locate firepits at least 50-ft away from the lake.
- Keep leaves and grass clippings out of ditches, waterways, and street curb and gutter – rake and bag, mulch, and/or compost.
- Practice careful auto, boat, and lawn implement care.
- Be careful not to “over care” for your lawn with fertilizers, pesticides, and other chemicals.

In-lake BMPs (compiled from resources available from the University of Minnesota Extension Services)

- Minimize disturbance of aquatic vegetation.
- Remove aquatic plants only where they seriously interfere with recreational use of water and then clear only the smallest possible area.
- Never use chemicals for controlling aquatic plants without first obtaining a permit from the DNR.

- Never use soap or shampoo on watercraft, docks, boat lifts, dishes, pets, or yourself while in the water.
- If swimming, boating, or fishing (including ice fishing) do not use the lake as a bathroom.
- Avoid spilling gas, oil, paint, varnish, or stripper; never pour over the water during fueling or boat maintenance; do not "top-off" fuel tanks while on the water; fuel the boat on the trailer or portable tanks on shore whenever possible.
- Properly store and dispose of all wastewater, both greywater (laundry, sump pumps, campers, houseboats) and human waste.
- Adjust your speed to reduce the wake and consequent wave action that can damage the shoreline.
- Observe surface water use guidelines, including "no-wake" and low speed zones, power loading, and motor startups in shallow water.
- Fish responsibly following local rules and regulations; it is illegal to deposit fish entrails or parts into public waters or onto lake or stream shores.
- Inspect boats and trailers to avoid moving non-native plants or animals from one water body to another.
- Drain live wells on shore, away from the lake before launching and again after removing your fishing boat from the lake.
- Dispose of live bait (worms and minnows) in waste receptacles, not in the lake or on the ground.
- Pick up pet waste and dispose of properly
- Properly dispose of all garbage, including litter you find in the lake.

Appendix E
Watershed Milestones
Table

Recommendations	9-Key Plan Reference	Indicator Units	SubWatershed	Milestones		Priority	Timeline	Approach	Method	Implementation	Funding
				0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs						
Objective1A: Reduce the amount of sediment and phosphorus loading from the watershed											
a) Convert 40% of current (2021) cropland acres to pasture	5.1.1	# of acres converted	Pfaff	215	215	High	20% in yrs 1-5, an additional 20% in yrs 6-10	The PLRW in cooperation with Sauk and Juneau Counties will provide information and approach agricultural producers in the watersheds to promote conversion.	Education and/or incentives	PLRW, Sauk County, Juneau County	Federal, State, and County agricultural programs, PLRW program funds, LRPD provided incentive enhancements through surface water grants and their own funds
			Daug	34	34						
			Lucht	49	49						
			Clark	55	55						
			LaValle	182	182						
Lower Redstone	244	244									
b) Application of BMPs that improve soil health to 75% of remaining cropland, primarily no-till planting and/or the use of covercrops	5.1.1	# of cropland acres with BMPs applied	Pfaff	344	301	High	Application of BMPs to 40% in yrs 1-5, an additional 35% in yrs 6-10	Maintain existing (2021) acreage with these BMPs (779 no-till, 355 covercrop) and strive to reach or exceed the stated objective	Education and incentives	PLRW, Sauk County, Juneau County, LRPD	Federal, State, and County agricultural programs, PLRW program funds, LRPD provided incentive enhancements through surface water grants and their own funds
			Daug	54	48						
			Lucht	80	69						
			Clark	89	77						
			LaValle	290	255						
			Lower Redstone	390	341						
TOTAL	1247	1091									
c) Reduce the number of acres impacted by animal feedlots by 100%	5.1.1	# of feedlots addressed	Pfaff	x		High	LaValle, Pfaff, and Daugs feedlots will be addressed in yrs 1-5; Clark and Lower Redstone in yrs 6-10	Identify and then work with the producers to design and implement improvements	Direct contact with owners of feedlots	Juneau County, Sauk County	Federal, State, and County agricultural programs, PLRW program funds, LRPD provided incentive enhancements through surface water grants and their own funds
			Daug	x		High					
			Lucht			Moderate					
			Clark		x	Moderate					
			LaValle	x	x	High					
Lower Redstone			Low								
d) Reduce the number of miles with gully/ravine erosion	3.3.2.3	# of miles and severity of gully and ravine erosion	Pfaff		x	Moderate	Based on preliminary data, the Daugs, Lucht, and Lower Redstone sub-basins are potentially the worst and will be focused on in yrs 1-5. The other sub-basins will be focused on in yrs 6-10	Identify potential BMPs including grassed waterways, streambank restoration and/or stabilization (see Iowa DNR document referenced in Section	Follow guidelines from NRCS Field Office Technical Guide https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/#/state/WI	Juneau County, Sauk County, Discovery Farms, PLRW	
			Daug	x		High					
			Lucht	x		High					
			Clark		x	Moderate					
			LaValle		x	Moderate					
*Lower Redstone	x		High								
e) Increase the number of total agricultural acres covered under nutrient management plans by 10%	5.1.2	# of acres under nutrient management plans	Pfaff	76	76	Low	10% in yrs 1-5 and an additional 10% in yrs 6-10.	Maintain existing (2021) acreage covered under NMP (287) and add at least 43 more in yrs 1-5, and 330 more in yrs 6-10.	Direct contact with agricultural producers	Juneau and Sauk County	
			Daug	14	14						
			Lucht	20	20						
			Clark	24	24						
			LaValle	75	75						
			Lower Redstone	121	121						
TOTAL	330	330									
f) Work with WI-DNR and County foresters to make sure appropriate BMPs are incorporated in MFL harvests	3.3.5	Knowledge of forestry operations in the watershed	All	x	x	Low	While this is a low priority, it is something that the LRPD can keep tabs on throughout the implementation of this project	Consult with WI-DNR foresters on the number of harvests going on each year	Personal contact via email	WI-DNR, LRPD	

Objective1B: Data gathering to support efforts to reduce the amount of sediment and phosphorus loading from the watershed											
a) Redo the Stream Power Index (SPI) from the WRB TMDL for each subbasin	3.3.2.3	Calculated/modeled values identifying those streams in the sub-basin with potential issues	All	x		High	This will be completed in the first year of plan implementation	The LRPD will work with the WI-DNR to address how to get the SPI survey completed	EVAAL - SPI protocol	WI-DNR	
b) Develop additional financial incentives to encourage implementation of BMPs	5.1.2.1	Successful incentive programs that support and complement existing programs	All	x	x	High	Discussion of appropriate incentive programs and payments will be discussed in Yr 1 of implementation and funding solicited	Existing incentive programs and how they are implemented will be evaluated and used to develop new incentive programs	Working with Juneau and Sauk County and others, appropriate incentive programs will be created and added to existing programs	LRPD, Juneau and Sauk Counties, PLRW, NRCS, and others	WI-DNR SW grants
c) Evaluate subbasins for gully/ravine erosion	3.3.4.2	# of miles and severity of gully and ravine erosion	Pfaff		x	Moderate	Daug, Lucht, and Lower Redstone sub-basins will be completed immediately following the SPI project likely in yrs 1 or 2; Pfaff, Clark, and LaValle will likely be completed in yrs 2 or 3	A process similar to what was done in 2007 with monitors actually traversing those streams identified with the most potential for erosion issues		Consultant, LRPD, Juneau County, Sauk County, PLRW	
			Daug	x		High					
			Lucht	x		High					
			Clark		x	Moderate					
			LaValle		x	Moderate					
*Lower Redstone	x		High								
d) Determine the number of active POWTS in the greater watershed of Lake Redstone	3.2.3	Map of active POWTS	All	x		Moderate	This will be done in the first 3 yrs of implementation	Count the number of likely active POWTS in the watershed	Using aerial or satellite imagery or by creating and distributing a paper survey	LRPD	

*Lower Redstone gully/ravine erosion is also considered part of riparian milestones

Appendix F
Riparian Area
Milestone Table

Recommendations	9-Key Plan Reference	Indicator Units	SubWatershed	Milestones		Priority	Timeline	Approach	Method	Implementation	Funding
				0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs						
Objective2A: Reduce the amount of sediment and phosphorus loading from the riparian area											
a) Reduce the number of moderate to high priority properties from the SHA	5.2.1.1	# of properties identified when the SHA assessment is redone in yr 6	Lower Redstone	x		High	In the first 3 yrs of implementation, with a redo of the SHA completed in yr 4. Then in the next 3 yrs of implementation	Workshops focusing on education, information, and implementation of projects	Education and shoreland improvement projects likely through the Healthy Lakes and Rivers Program	LRPD, local contractors and planners, Sauk and Juneau Counties, Town of LaValle	Surface water Healthy Lakes and Rivers grants and Sauk County grants
b) Repair existing sediment and stormwater control BMPs	5.2.1.2	A list of projects that gets shorter as projects are identified and completed	Lower Redstone	x	x	High	A weir on Martin-Meadowlark damaged in 2018 is currently out for bids for repair. New projects like dredging of sediment basins on Martin-Meadowlark and have been and will be identified	Once identified, the LRPD will contract with the appropriate resources to complete the projects	Remove identified projects from repair lists and address new projects as they are added to the list	LRPD, local contractors and planners, Sauk and Juneau Counties, Town of LaValle	Surface water restoration and plan implementation grants, LRPD funds
c) Provide initial and on-going maintenance for existing sediment and stormwater control BMPs	5.2.1.2	Sediment basins are dredged	Lower Redstone	x	x	High	Two sediment basins on Martin-Meadowlark and another on Swallow are candidates for dredging to allow them to hold more sediment	At least these three basins should be sampled for sediment depth and a plan devised to get them dredged	Planning and then implementation	LRPD, local contractors, Town of LaValle, property owners	Lake District Funds, possibly Sauk County funds
d) Reduce the number of miles with gully/ravine erosion	3.2.2.1	# of miles (or some other measurement) of the severity of gully, ravine, and wash erosion	Lower Redstone			High	Based on preliminary data, the Daus, Lucht, and Lower Redstone sub-basins are potentially the worst and will be focused on in yrs 1-5. The other sub-basins will be focused on in yrs 6-10	Identify potential BMPs including grassed waterways, streambank restoration and/or stabilization (see Iowa DNR document referenced in Section	Follow guidelines from NRCS Field Office Technical Guide https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/#/state/WI	Juneau County, Sauk County, Discovery Farms, PLRW	
e) Bring faulty septic systems and drain fields into compliance	3.2.3	# of projects	Lower Redstone	x	x	Low	Over the course of the 10 year project - as faulty or failing sites are identified	Education and information	County identification of failing systems and possible systems identified by a conductivity survey of the lake	LRPD, Sauk County, Property owners	
f) Reduce the number of beach club and other cooperatively owned parcels contributing to sediment and phosphorus loading	3.2.4	# of projects	Lower Redstone		x	Low	Beach club and other cooperatively owned lots will be evaluated and plans for implementation made when the number of private parcels with projects begins to decline annually	Education and information, group meetings, workshops	Education and shoreland improvement projects likely through the Healthy Lakes and Rivers Program	LRPD, local contractors and planners, Sauk and Juneau Counties, Town of LaValle	Healthy Lakes and Rivers grants, Sauk County grants

Objective2B: Data gathering to support efforts to reduce the amount of sediment and phosphorus loading from the riparian area											
a) Repeat the SHA for the entire lake	5.2.1.1	Completed survey report	Lower Redstone		x	High	In yr 4 of implementation, the SHA completed in 2018 will be redone.	A comparison of the 2018 and 2024 (yr 3) survey will be compared to identify changes in priority properties	The SHA will follow the same guidelines and parameters used in the 2018 survey (2020 WI-DNR SHA Protocols)	LRPD, Consultant	Surface water planning grants
b) Document the level of sediment entering the individual bays of Lake Redstone during storm events	3.2.2	Concentration of sediment	Lower Redstone	x		High	Within the first 3-yrs of implementation	Collect storm event water samples for sediment including total suspended, total dissolved, and total settled solids (TSS, TDS, and Settled)	water samples collected by LRPD volunteers, SLOH analysis, and the use of settling cones	LRPD, Consultant	
c) Evaluate streams, gullies and washes entering directly into Lake Redstone for stormwater runoff and erosion issues	3.2.2.1	# of miles (or some other measurement) and the severity of gully, ravine, and wash erosion	Lower Redstone	x		High	Each of the 28 bays will be evaluated during runoff events over the course of the first and second years of implementation	The Sediment Control Committee established by the LRPD will work with partners to establish a visual protocol to evaluate each potential site with issues	Visual, boots-on-the-ground survey with water sampling	LRPD, Sauk County, Consultant	
d) Develop a sediment model to aide in establishing goals for sediment reduction from gullies, ravines, and washes directly entering the bays of Lake Redstone	4.2.1	A working model for use	Lower Redstone	x		Moderate	Yr 1 - a plan to develop a sediment model will be devised. Yr 2 - the model will be developed. Yr 3 - the model will be completed and put into practice. By years 5-10 the model will be used to help set target goals for sediment reduction.	The LRPD and their consultant will work closely with Paul McGinley from UWSP to devise a plan for creating the model and how it is to be used.	Existing WinSLAMM and P-8 models will be modified in an attempt to create a sediment delivery model for each of the bays	Paul McGinley, UWSP; WI-DNR, Consultant, LRPD	
e) Update Septic System data in the riparian area of Lake Redstone	5.2.1.4	New data to add to existing water quality modeling	Lower Redstone	x		Moderate	by year 3 of implementation	a paper survey will be sent out to all property owners to collect time at the lake and other people factors to use in default septic system loading calculations	Post card survey to update past time at the lake and people data for use in default septic system loading calculations	LRPD, property owners	
f) Determine potential extent of septic system leaching into Lake Redstone	3.2.3	Results for a conductivity survey of the entire shoreland area	Lower Redstone	x		Moderate	by year 5 of implementation	A conductivity survey using a conductivity meter will be completed with sampling points adjacent to each property around the lake	Survey conducted by a consultant, data results compared around the lake. Places with elevated conductivity could be indicative of leaching from septic systems	LRPD, Consultant	

g) Evaluate the use of EutroPHIX to reduce phosphorus loading	5.2.1.2	Claims (by EutroPHIX) of greatly reduced phosphorus in the water	All, with a focus on Lower Redstone	x		High	In the first year or two of implementation, the LRPD will have further discussion with the Team at EutroPHIX	Complete gathering of more information leading to a decision by the LRPD to move forward with the EutroPHIX process	Discussions with the EutroPHIX team, WI-DNR, USGS and others about whether or not this process should be considered on Lake Redstone	LRPD, EutroPHIX team, WI-DNR, USGS, and other resource professionals	
h) Evaluate beach club and other community lots for erosion and other issues	3.2.4	Visual survey with documented evaluation results	Lower Redstone		x	Low	Initial focus in the riparian area are single owner parcels. Beach club lot evaluation will likely not occur until around Yr 5 of implementation	Identify locations and meet with beach club and other community lot owners	Review maps and complete boots-on-the-ground surveys	LRPD, Consultant, Community lot owners	

Appendix G
Lake Redstone Milestones
Table

Recommendations	9-Key Plan Reference	Indicator Units	Sub Watershed	Milestones		Priority	Timeline	Approach	Method	Implementation	Funding
				0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs						
Objective3A: Reduce the amount of sediment and phosphorus loading within Lake Redstone											
a) Aquatic Plant Management	3.1.4.3	Follow recommendations in a WI-DNR approved Aquatic Plant Management Plan	NA	x	x	High	A timeline related to management planning including plant survey work, permitting and actual implementation are laid out in the APM Plan	Physical removal, mechanical harvesting, application of aquatic herbicides, and biological controls	Following Integrated Pest Management guidelines from the WI-DNR	LRPD, WI-DNR, Property Owners	WI-DNR surface water grants - AIS Small or Large-scale Population Control grants, LRPD
b) Prevent the introduction and spread of AIS	3.1.4.4	No new infestations, records of efforts, future responses on social surveys distributed to the constituency	NA	x	x	High	Continual education and information related to how AIS can impact water quality and lake usability throughout implementation of this project	Participation in CBCW, AIS monitoring, education of property owners and lake users	Physical presence at boat landings, dissemination of materials at meetings and in newsletters and other publications, and on-the-water survey	LRPD, Town of LaValle,	CBCW grants and other AIS education grants from the WI-DNR
c) Hypolimnetic withdrawal from the dam	4.3.1	Time when bottom withdrawal is implemented each year	NA		x	Moderate	Yr 3 if recommendations are made in the completed study	If the hypolimnetic withdrawal study suggests it might be beneficial it will be implemented	Further study and implementation plan development	LRPD, Sauk County	
d) Carp removal	3.1.2.2	# of successful events and carp removed	NA	x	x	Low	At present, the LRPC sponsors carp shoots in late spring early summer in many years	Carp Shoots - bowfishing contests	Promotion of events	LRFC, local businesses, Sauk County	LRPD, LRFC, Community Support
e) Minimize bottom disturbances caused by boating in shallow water	3.1.1.6	documentation of efforts to education and inform boaters on the lake	NA	x	x	Low	Continual education and information throughout the implementation of this project	Distribute education and information, posting of no-wake zones, and the emergency high water restriction	Education and information	LRPD	
f) Application of alum or other phosphorus binding agents	5.3.1	Planning and implementation as determined necessary	NA		x	Low	Yr 5 or later if recommendations are made in the completed study	Go with what research and study results show/suggest	Working with partners to determine best way to move forward if necessary	LRPD, Consultant, UW-System, Applicator	Lake Management Plan implementation grants, lake protection grants
g) Selective dredging	5.3.2	Amount of sediment removed	NA		x	Low	Near the end of the 10 yr plan if at all. This will only be done as a last resort				

Objective3B: Data gathering to support efforts to reduce the amount of sediment and phosphorus loading within Lake Redstone											
a) Update the APM Plan	3.1.4.3	A new APM Plan approved by the LRPD and the WI-DNR ready for implementation by 2023	NA	x		High	Completion of this milestone is already in the works with grant funding applied for in 2021 for update in 2022.	Work with a consultant to do what is necessary to update the existing APM Plan	Following Integrated Pest Management guidelines from the WI-DNR	LRPD, Consultant, WI-DNR	WI-DNR SW Planning
b) Update existing lake response modeling	4.1.2	Updated results	NA	x		High	First or second year of implementation, dependent on the available data and resources	After collection of several years worth of automated sampler data at Clark and Lavalle the USGS will redo lake response modeling	USGS modeling of new data	LRPD, WI-DNR, USGS	Partner funding and WI-DNR SW planning
c) Complete an internal loading study	3.1.1.5, 4.1	Final report with recommendations	NA	x		High	Yr 1 - Study design and grant funding request. Yr 2 - Study completed.	Increased temp/DO profiles, bottom sampling for phosphorus, phosphorus in the sediment release study	Combine additional lake sampling data with phosphorus release from sediment in a laboratory setting	LRPD, Consultant, UW-System	WI-DNR SW Planning or Plan Implementation
d) Re-evaluate hypolimnetic withdrawal	4.3.1	Final report with recommendations	NA	x		High	Yr 1 - study design and grant funding request. Yr 2 study completed.	Work with WI-DNR, Sauk County, and other partners to develop a plan	The most likely method is to redo what was done previously	LRPD, WI-DNR, Consultant, Sauk County	WI-DNR SW Planning or Plan Implementation
e) Recalculate sediment and phosphorus loading to Lake Redstone from all sources based on new data	4.1	A new phosphorus budget is created	NA	x		High	In Yrs 1 and 2 new data will be collected and evaluated with a new or updated phosphorus budget for the lake created by the end of Yr 3	Results from improved data collection from the Clark and La Valle tributaries, gullies and washes, septic system data, and internal loading will be evaluated	Data analysis will lead to the development of a new phosphorus budget for the lake	LRPD, USGS, WI-DNR, Consultant	WI-DNR SW Planning or Plan Implementation
f) Survey sediment in bays, compare before and after implementation of Plan	4.2	Comaprison of Yr 2 sediment deposition in bays to Yr 10 sediment in bays	NA	x	x	Moderate	Yr 1 - study design and grant funding. Yr 2 Complete the first study. Yr 10 complete the second study	This action could be tied in with creating a sediment delivery model as discussed in the riparian table	Repeat the survey done by Ayres in 2018 in Yr 2, and again in Yr 10.	LRPD, WI-DNR, Property Owners, contractors	WI-DNR SW Planning or Plan Implementation
g) Survey sediment in main body of the lake	4.2	A final assessment of how much sediment is in the lake	NA	x		Moderate	In the first five years of implementation additional conversation will be had as to how and when to do this type of survey	This action could be tied in with creating a sediment delivery model as discussed in the riparian table	perhaps core sampling at multiple locations in the main basin of the lake	LRPD, USGS, Sauk and Juneau Counties, UW System, private contractors/consultants	WI-DNR SW Planning or Plan Implementation

Appendix H
Monitoring Milestones Table

Recommendations	9-Key Plan	Indicator Units	SubWatershed	Milestones		Priority	Timeline	Approach	Method	Implementation	Funding
				0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs						
Watershed and Riparian Area Monitoring											
a) Land Use Changes and Implementation of BMPs	9.1.1	# of acres under different BMPs	Pfaff	215	215	High	1) National Land Cover Database (NLCD) - 2021, 2026, and 2031. 2) Satellite and transect surveys - Annually	1) National Land Cover Database 2)Satellite Imagery 3)Transect Surveys	1) Familiarity with the database. 2) Work in cooperation with the WI-DNR to interpret satellite imagery. 3) Establish a transect survey plan and have LRPD volunteers or PLRW partners complete it under the tutelage of Sauk County	LRPD, PLRW, Sauk County, Juneau County	
			Daug	34	34						
			Lucht	49	49						
			Clark	55	55						
			LaValle	182	182						
Lower Redstone	244	244									
b) East (Lavalle) and West (Clark) Branches of Big Creek	9.1.2.1	Sediment concentrations, phosphorus concentrations, flow, and discharge	Clark	x	x	High	Between 2021-2023; and again between 2029-2031; longer if funds are available	Automated samplers set up by the USGS and supported by LRPD volunteers and Juneau and Sauk County staff	Automated samplers can collect water samples and flow and discharge continuously regardless of flood stage	USGS, LRPD, Juneau and Sauk Counties	
			LaValle	x	x						
			Outlet	x	x						
c) Daugs, Lucht, Pfaff	9.1.2.1	Sediment concentrations, phosphorus concentrations, flow, and discharge	Daug	x	x	Moderate	3-yrs of continuous monitoring from 2023-2025; and again from 2028-2031	Baseline tributary sampling following WisCALM protocol	Volunteer water sampling following WisCALM protocol with the possible installation of pressure transducers, staff gauges	LRPD, Sauk County, Juneau County	
			Lucht	x	x						
			Pfaff	x	x						
			LaValle (at Nemitz)	x	x						
d) Gully and wash sampling	9.1.2.2	Sediment concentrations, phosphorus concentrations, flow, and discharge	Lower Redstone	x		High	This will be completed in the first year of plan implementation	The LRPD will work with the WDNR to address how to get the SPI survey completed	Volunteer water sampling following WisCALM protocol with the possible installation of pressure transducers, staff gauges	LRPD, Sauk County, Juneau County	
e) Install up to three stream erosion monitoring sites in each sub-basin	9.1.2.3	Documented installation sites, and data analysis	All	x	x	Moderate	Installation of stream erosion monitoring sites will be completed after the gully/ravine evaluation but before implementation of BMPs	Following available guidelines, up to three sites per basin will be installed after the evaluation	Kearney, Fonte, Garcia, & Smukler, 2018; Rathbun, 2009	Consultant, LRPD, Sauk and Juneau Counties	

Lake Redstone Monitoring											
a) CLMN Expanded water quality monitoring	9.2.2	CLMN monitoring results	Deep Hole and Middle sites	x	x	High	May through Spetember in every year of implementation	The LRPD will collect water quality data following CLMN expanded monitoring protocol, and add TP and Chla water sampling in September	CLMN expande monitoring protocol, plus additional monitoring to meet WisCALM guidelines	LRPD	WDNR and UW-Extension Lakes
b) Long Term Trend water quality monitoring	9.2.2	Long Term Trend monitoring results	Deep Hole Site	x	x	High	LTT monitoring in every year of implementation	In cooperation with the WI-DNR, the LRPD will collect water quality data in the Deep Hole following LTT monitoring protocol	LTT guidelines for Secchi, TP, Chla, dissolved oxygen, temperature, conductivity, pH, alkalinity, color, nitrate/nitrites, and total Kjeldahl nitrogen every year, and calcium and magnesium every five years	LRPD WDNR	WDNR
c) Secchi, dissolved oxygen and temperature profiles	9.2.1	Data results	Deep Hole and Middle sites	x	x	High	Every 2-3 weeks from ice out to ince in (follow remote sensing satellite schedule)	Monitoring completed by LRPD volunteers	CLMN and remote sensing satellite	LRPD	
d) Water column sampling for TP and maybe othophosphates	9.2.2	Data results	Deep Hole and Middle sites	x		High	At least in the first two to three year of implementation. After that, the data can be used in concert with internal loading study results to get a better understanding of the role of internal loading on the lake	Monitoring completed by LRPD volunteers	Following a monitoring plan developed before implementation	LRPD	Surface water planning or implementation grants
e) Aquatic plant monitoring	9.2.3	Survey maps and comparisons	Whole lake	x	x	High	Whole lake, point-intercept survey work in 2022, 2027, and again in 2032 if active management is occurring; Possible annual pre and post-treatment PI survey work; and annual late season mapping	The LRPD in cooperation with an aquatic plant survey/management specialist will complete these surveys as determined in an updated Aquatic Plant Management Plan	Following WDNR guidelines for aquatic plant survey work	LRPD, Consultant	Surface water planning grants
f) AIS monitoring	9.2.3	Survey maps, documentation of new AIS	Whole lake	x	x	High	Annually	LRPD volunteers and Consultant surveys and documentation	Following CLMN AIS Monitoring Guidelines	LRPD, Consultant	Surface water education grant funds

Appendix I

Overview of Plan Actions, Interim Milestones, Cost Estimates, and Responsible Entities

Appendix I - Overview of Plan Actions, Interim Milestones, Cost Estimates, and Responsible Entities

Plan Action	Milestones			Cost*	Implementation
	Years 1-3 (2022-24)	Years 4-6 (2025-27)	Years 7-10 (2028-2031)		
1 Surface Water Monitoring					
a USGS – Maintain 3 sites (East, West, and Outlet (2022-23; 2029-2031) \$41,700/yr sampling (2022, 2023, 2029, 2030, 2031) + \$15,900 to Establish 3 sites (2029)	X	TBD	X	\$229,400	LCD, LRPD, USGS, DNR
b LRPD – Maintain 4 sites (Daug's, Lucht, Nemitz, Pfaff) \$490.00/site/yr sampling TP and TSS (2029-31) + \$300/site establishment and maintenance (2029)			X	\$7,080	LRPD, DNR, LCD
c LRPD - Maintain 7 sites (Chickadee North, Chickadee South, Eagle, Fox Court, Heron, Martin-Meadowlark, Swallow) \$343/site/yr sampling TP and TSS (2023-24, 2030-31) + \$300/site establishment and maintenance (2023 and 2030)	X		X	\$13,804	LCD, LRPD
d Discovery Farms Edge of Field – Maintain 2 sites \$4,000/yr sampling + \$500/yr site maintenance	X	TBD	TBD	\$13,500	LCD, UW-DF, LRPD
2 Lake Monitoring					
a Deep Hole (LTT and CLMN site) + TP (Apr, Sept-Oct), ChIA (Sept-Oct), \$142/yr sampling (2022-31)	X	X	X	\$1,420	LRPD, DNR
b Middle Site TP (Apr-Oct), ChIA (Jun-Oct), \$342/yr sampling (2022-31)	X	X	X	\$3,420	LRPD, DNR
c Water Column - Middle and Deep Hole, TP-Ortho-Fe (10 depths, Jun-Oct), \$4,600/yr sampling (2023-24)	X			\$9,200	DNR, LRPD
3 Reduce Sediment and P loading - Watershed					
a Convert 40% of existing cropland acres (3,896 acres) to grazing/pasture \$55-65/acre	390 acres (10%)	390 acres (10%)	778 acres (20%)	\$93,480	LCD, LRPD, PLRW
b Cropland BMPs – conservation tillage, cover crops – 75% of remaining acres (3896-1558=2338x.75=1754 acres) An additional 10% of remaining acres (2338x.1=234acres) Cons Tillage \$17/acre(NRCS); Cover Crop \$65/acre (Producer Led); \$55/Acre (NRCS)	701 acres (30%)	701 acres (30%)	352 acres (15%) 234 acres (10%)	\$134,575 \$17,954	LCD, LRPD, PLRW, NRCS, DNR
c Increase agricultural acres covered under nutrient management plans to 10% of all agricultural acres (an additional 390 acres over 10 years) \$40/acre (LWRD-SEG)	100 acres	145 acres	145 acres	\$15,600	LCD, PLRW, LRPD, NRCS
d Convert 10% remaining cropland acres (3896-1558=2338x.1=234 acres) to Prairie - \$4,000/acre			234 acres	\$936,000	LCD, LRPD, PLRW, RP
e Feedlot BMPs – 5 operations Waste Storage - \$150,000/unit; Fencing, roof runoff, critical area planting, walls, etc.)- 70% Cost share	2 units	3 units	TBD	\$750,000	LCD, DNR, NRCS, LRPD, PLRW
f Reduce verified gully/ravine erosion areas (see 6B) in the watershed outside of the riparian zone via source and/or erosion control BMPs. \$10-20,000/site; 1 site/yr Grassed Waterways – 2/units/year; 200-250 ft length; ~\$5/foot or 70% Grade Stabilization Structure – \$12,000/unit or 70%	2 sites 4 units 2 units	3 sites 6 units 4 units	4 sites 6 units TBD	\$135,000 \$20,000 \$72,000	DNR LCD, LRPD, NRCS, PLRW
g Contour Farming – 25% acres that do not already use the practice \$7/acre	135 acres	135 acres		\$1,890	LCD, LRPD, PLRW
h Help repair faulty POWTS so they comply with current regulations	See 6e	See 6e	See 6e	See 6e	LRPD, LCD, DSPS, DNR, PLO, RP
i Identify landowners and work with them and DNR to adopt appropriate forestry and mining BMPs in the watershed 1 site/3yr cycle; \$1,000/site	1 site	1 site	1 site	\$3,000	LRPD, DNR, LCD, PLO, RP

4 Reduce Sediment and P loading - Riparian Area						
a	Shoreland Improvement Workshops 1/yr, \$250/workshop	2 workshops	3 workshops	3 workshops	\$2,000	DNR, LRPD, LCD, RP, PLO
	Contact Landowners and Implement BMPs on 20% of high priority shoreline parcels (214 parcels x .2 = 43 parcels). Use Lakeshore Assistance Program for larger projects (>\$1500) (25%=11projects); and Healthy Lakes Initiative Program for projects up to \$1500 (75%=32projects)	18 sites	25 sites	TBD	\$59,500	
b	Address shoreland issues on all of the high (4) and moderate (9) risk beach club and other cooperatively owned parcels identified in the SHA Use Lakeshore Assistance Program for larger projects (>\$1500) (25%=3 projects); and Healthy Lakes Initiative Program for projects up to \$1500 (75%=10 projects)	3 sites	5 sites	5 sites	\$17,500	LRPD, LCD, DNR, PLO, RP
c	Help repair faulty POWTS so they comply with current regulations	See 7c	See7c	See 7c	See 7c	LRPD, LCD, DSPS, DNR, PLO, RP
d	Evaluate and repair existing runoff and sediment control structures \$32,000/project; 10 projects total.	2 projects	4 projects	4 projects	\$320,000	LRPD, LCD, DNR, RP, ToLV
e	Reduce verified gully/ravine erosion areas within the riparian zone (See 7b) via source and/or erosion control BMPs. \$10-20,000/site; 1 site/yr	2 sites	3 sites	4 sites	\$135,000	LRPD, LCD, DNR, NRCS, ToLV
5 Reduce Sediment and P loading - Lake Redstone						
a	Aquatic Plant Management - Planning (\$1000), Surveys (\$5500), Permits (\$700), and Treatments –Diver Aided Suction Harvest, herbicides, etc. (\$9000) \$16,200/yr every other year	2 yrs	1 yr	2 yrs	\$81,000	LRPD, DNR, LCD, RP
b	Carp Removal	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	LRPD
c	Application of alum (see 8c)			TBD	TBD	LRPD, DNR, UW, LCD
d	Hypolimnetic withdrawal (see 8d)			TBD	TBD	LRPD, DNR, UW, LCD
e	Adapt/adopt new boating ordinances (see 8e)	X			TBD	LRPD, ToLV
6 Gathering Additional Data - Watershed						
a	Streambank Erosion and Lateral Recession Rate Monitoring Identify 2 representative sites in two sub-basins and monitor annually - \$500 site/year	X	X	X	\$18,000	DNR, LRPD, LCD, PLO, PLRW
b	Complete Stream Power Index (SPI) + gully/ravine inventory outside of the Lake Redstone Subbasin (riparian zone)	X			\$8,000	LRPD, LCD, DNR, PLO, PLRW
c	Monitor Land Use Changes via Satellite Imagery and Cropland Data Layer \$500/year	3 checks	3 checks	4 checks	\$5,000	LRPD, DNR, LCD, RP
d	Cropland roadside transect surveys within entire watershed \$2500/year	X	X	X	\$25,000	LCD, LRPD, DNR, PLRW
e	Complete inventory of active POWTS outside of the Lake Redstone Subbasin (riparian zone) and reduce faulty or failing POWTS in the watershed Prioritize POWTS for repair/maintenance, contact landowners, and connect them with programs to help deal with faulty or failing septic systems. Support repair and replacement of faulty or failing septic systems. \$10-20,000/site	X			\$5,000	LRPD, LCD, DNR, DSPS, PLO. RP
	Send septic system info and maintenance brochures to property owners around the lake about septic maintenance and water quality impacts. At least once in each time period.	2 sites	3 sites	4 sites	\$90,000	
		X	X	X	See 11a	LRPD, LCD

7 Gathering Additional Data - Riparian						
a	Repeat Shoreline Habitat Assessment in five years – compare to 2018 analysis, \$7,000		X		\$7,000	LRPD, DNR, RP
b	Complete Stream Power Index (SPI) and gully/ravine inventory within the Lake Redstone Subbasin (riparian zone)	X			\$2,000	LRP, LCD, DNR, PLO
c	Complete inventory of active POWTS within the Lake Redstone Subbasin (riparian zone) and reduce faulty or failing POWTS in the watershed Prioritize POWTS for repair/maintenance, contact landowners, and connect them with programs to help deal with faulty or failing septic systems. Support repair and replacement of faulty or failing septic systems. \$10-20,000/site	X			\$5,000	LRPD, LCD, DNR, DSPS, PLO, RP
	Send septic system info and maintenance brochures to property owners around the lake about septic maintenance and water quality impacts. At least once in each time period.	2 sites	3 sites	4 sites	\$90,000	
		X	X	X	See 11a	LRPD, LCD
d	Evaluate all streams, gullies and washes entering directly into the bays of Lake Redstone for stormwater runoff and erosion issues. Prioritize for further documentation and implementation of BMPs	2022-23 Inventory			TBD	LCD, LRPD, PLO, RP
e	Document the level of sediment and nutrients entering into an estimated 14 individual bays (not included the bays covered in 1c) from streams, gullies, and washes during storm events to determine TP and TSS contributions from upgradient gullies and washes (14 sites x 3 storm events x 2 yrs x \$49.00 (TP&TSS costs))	7 bays	7 bays		\$4,116	LRPD, LCD, UW, PLO, PLRW
f	Develop a sediment model to predict future sediment loading to the lake		X		TBD	LRPD, DNR, UW
8 Gathering Additional Data – Lake Redstone						
a	Update the Aquatic Plant Management Plan		2027		\$10,000	LRPD, DNR, RP
b	Update existing lake response modeling 1x every 3 years - \$500	X	X	X	\$1,500	LRPD, DNR, RP, USGS, UW
c	Develop scope and complete an internal phosphorus loading study	Scope	Study Start	Study finish	TBD	LRPD, DNR, USGS, UW
d	Reevaluate hypolimnetic withdrawal from the lake		Study Start	Study finish	TBD	LRPD, LCD, DNR, USGS
e	Review of boating ordinances	X			TBD	LRPD, TofLV
f	Recalculate sediment and phosphorus loading to Lake Redstone from all sources based on new watershed data and practices adopted	X	X	X	See 10c. Plan Implement Tracking	LRPD, DNR, LCD, USGS, RP
g	Survey sediment in the main basin of Lake Redstone to quantify deposition*		TBD	TBD	TBD	LRPD, UW, RP
9 Staff and Technical Assistance						
a	1 new County LCD position- \$55,000/year Salary Plus Fringe Benefits	X	X	X	\$550,000	LCD
b	Hire private contractor to assist with plan implementation \$40,000 /year	2 years	2 years	2 years	\$240,000	PLRW, PLRW, LRPD
10 Plan Implementation Tracking						
a	Conservation Practices - \$2000/year	X	X	X	\$20,000	LCD, LRPD, DNR, PLRW, NRCS
b	Education Efforts - \$4000/year	X	X	X	\$40,000	LRPD, LCD, PLRW
c	Modeling Pollutant Sources or Reductions – \$1,500/year STEPL modeling, In-lake Modeling, DATCP Producer Led Reports, Sediment Modeling	2 years	3 years	4 years	\$15,000	LCD, DNR, LRPD, RP
d	NR 151 Implementation Compliance - \$5,000/year; 2 farms/year	X	X	X	\$50,000	LCD, DNR, NRCS, PLRW

11 Education and Outreach						
a	Provide education and informational materials to public via brochures, demonstrations, displays, notices, and other publications. - \$1000/yr	X	X	X	\$10,000	LCD, LRPD, PLRW
b	Summer/fall field events: cover crop/soil health field days, small acreage landowner workshops, pasture walks, nutrient management farmer education classes – 1 event/year at \$3000/yr	3 events	3 events	4 events	\$30,000	LCD, LRPD, PLRW, DNR
c	Conference in cooperation with other localities currently working on developing or implementing 9-Key Element Plans, 1 conference in each 3yr timeframe \$3500/conf	1 conf.	1 conf.	1 conf.	\$10,500	LCD, LRPD, PLRW, DNR, RP, UW
d	Tours on non-agricultural conservation practices like stream bank, shoreline, rain gardens gardens, etc. - \$1000/yr	2 tours	2 tours	3 tours	\$7,000	LCD, LRPD, PLO, RP
e	Producers of Lake Redstone Watershed Group DATCP grant helps farmers reach out to other farmers to join the group; offer incentives to implement best management practices, including cover crops, community manure sharing, establishing nutrient management plans, and sponsoring community events, field days, and training. \$25,000/yr grant award	2 years grant award	2 years grant award	2 years grant award	\$150,000	DNR, LCD, PLRW, RP, LRPD
f	LRPD Board and Stakeholders Meetings – Review 9 element plan implementation actions and adapt plan milestones, as necessary– 2 x/yr	6 mtgs	6 mtgs	8 mtgs	TBD	All Stakeholders
g	LRPD meetings with the Constituency (Annual Meetings) 1x/yr	1 mtg	1 mtg	1 mtg	TBD	LRPD
TOTAL COST*				\$	\$4,465,439	
<p>X = plan action will be completed during this 3-year interim period * = cost estimate may change as new or additional cost information (e.g., contractor bids, operating budgets, grant resources) is determined during the 10-year plan implementation schedule. TBD = To Be Determined</p>		<p>BMP = Best Management Practices CLMN = Citizen Lake Monitoring Network DATCP = Dept. of Agriculture, Trade & Consumer Protection DNR = Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources DSPS = Dept. of Safety & Professional Services LCD = Juneau or Sauk County Land Conservation Dept. LRPD = Lake Redstone Protection District LTT = Long Term Trend NRCS = Natural Resource Conservation Service PLO = Private Land Owners PLRW = Producers of Lake Redstone Watershed POWTS = Private Onsite Wastewater Treatment System RP = Research Professional TofLV = Town of LaValle TP = Total Phosphorus, TSS = Total Suspended Solids, ChIA = Chlorophyll-a, Fe = Iron, Ortho = Orthophosphates USGS = United States Geological Survey UW = University of Wisconsin UW-DF = Discovery Farms</p>				



Producer-Led Watershed
Protection Grant Program

Appendix J

2019 CONSERVATION BENEFITS REPORT

Producers of Lake Redstone



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Group Summary.....	1
Soil and Water Quality Modeling.....	2
Model Inputs.....	3
Results: Grain Operations.....	5
Grain Rotations Explained.....	6
Modeled Effects of Grain Rotations on Soil Erosion.....	7
Modeled Effects of Grain Rotations on Phosphorus Loss.....	8
Results: Dairy Operations.....	9
Dairy Rotations Explained.....	10
Modeled Effects of Dairy Rotations on Soil Erosion.....	11
Modeled Effects of Dairy Rotations on Phosphorus Loss.....	13
Soil Conditioning Index.....	14
Soil Conditioning Index Comparison: Dairy and Grain.....	15
Producers of Lake Redstone Conservation Dashboard.....	16
Potential Sediment and Nutrient Reductions.....	17
Potential Reductions: Grain Rotations.....	18
Potential Reductions: Dairy Rotations.....	19
Producers of Lake Redstone Future Work.....	20

The Producers of Lake Redstone are

focused on improving water quality and soil health in the watershed, with particular interest in:

- Developing viable ways to interseed cover crops,
- Developing a community manure application/ sharing system, and
- Using cover crops to meet late-season nutrient needs of crops.



SOIL & WATER QUALITY MODELING

Farmer-led groups are demonstrating and promoting conservation practices and rotations that can help reduce soil erosion and improve soil quality.


Reducing the amount of soil lost from farm fields and improving the ability of soils to function is connected to water quality. The degree of benefits that we see from each of these farmer-led groups' conservation projects is dependent upon the unique climate conditions, soil types, and farming practices used in the particular watersheds where they farm.

- Using SnapPlus nutrient management planning software, potential soil quality benefits were estimated for solely cropland practices implement by the Dodge County Farmers HSHW.
- These practices include primarily cover crops and reduced tillage.
- Crop rotations with varying levels of conservation integration were modeled to estimate the potential phosphorus and sediment reductions, and soil organic matter building potential that can occur from adopting different practices.
- Rotations were selected that **best reflect the practices used by farmers in this watershed area,**
- These estimations do not consider other conservation practices that may be present in a field such as a grassed waterway, water and sediment control basin, or buffers.




ESTIMATING SOIL & WATER QUALITY BENEFITS | Model Inputs




Dominant soil types of watershed + corresponding organic matter percentages (NRCS Web Soil Survey)



County average yields



Average plant and harvest dates of crops for Wisconsin (NASS)



The lower quartile, median and upper quartile soil test P levels for the appropriate county as provided by DATCP soil laboratory results summaries.

Farm operation type representative of watershed and conservation crop rotation scenarios




GENERALLY SPEAKING...

- + Greater **risk of soil erosion on fields** under corn-soybean and corn-silage systems relying on chisel plowing
- + Adding winter wheat back into corn-soybean systems may decrease **phosphorus loss from fields**
- + Higher Soil Conditioning Index (**soil building potential**, in simple terms) as conservation practices are integrated into grain and dairy systems
- + Hay/grass systems experience **lowest soil erosion and phosphorus loss** on farm fields

Let's break it down →

Modeling Results: GRAIN OPERATIONS



CROP ROTATIONS: Grain

The majority of farm operations in this watershed project area are either dairy or cash grain operations. For each operation type, crop rotations for three different levels of conservation were identified for the purpose of modeling soil and water conservation benefits:

Conventional Rotation

- Corn grain- Soybeans
- Fall chisel plowing
- No cover crops

Intermediate- Vertical Tillage (VT)


- Corn grain (2 years)- Soybeans
- Fall vertical tillage;
- No cover crop

Conservation Rotation- Winter wheat + cover crops

- Corn grain- winter wheat
- Multi-species cover crop after wheat
- Corn planted green into cover crop



Less variability in soil erosion across fields with different slopes when using conservation practices



1.3
t/ac/yr

Difference in soil loss from the dominant C-slope soils in this watershed compared to B-slope soils when farmers include winter wheat and plant cover crops

COMPARED TO

7
t/ac/yr

Difference in soil loss on C-slope soils compared to A-slope soils with fall chisel plowing in a corn-soybean rotation without cover crops.

Soil Loss in this publication refers to the amount of soil lost from a field in t/ac/year over a set rotation as calculated by RUSLE2¹. This value takes into account factors including field slope, soil type, climate, and ground cover.

1 'B slope' refers to the soil types in this watershed with slope of 2-6%

2 'C slope' refers to the soil types in this watershed with slope of 6-12%


Higher phosphorus loss from fields in corn-soybean, chisel plow systems

5.3
lb/ac/yr

At a soil test level of 48 ppm P using a Vertical Till implement instead of a chisel plow to prep soil for planting can reduce phosphorus loss by 5.3 lb/ac/yr.

4.7
lb/ac/yr

At the High P level, transitioning from Vertical Till to planting green into living covers can decrease phosphorus loss from fields by another 4.7 lb/ac/yr.



—●— 17 ppm Soil P ¹ —●— 28 ppm Soil P ² —●— 48 ppm Soil P ³

The Wisconsin Phosphorus Index (PI) estimates the average annual runoff P from a farm field based on: manure application rate and timing, P fertilizer additions, soil test P, crop rotation and field operations.

1 Lower quartile of the Juneau County soil test P soil data summary

2 Median of the Juneau County soil test P soil data summary

3 Upper quartile of the Juneau County soil test P soil data summary



Modeling Results:
DAIRY
OPERATIONS



CROP ROTATIONS: Dairy

Dairy Rotation - Conventional

Corn silage (3 years) - Alfalfa Hay (3 years)

Spring disk

8,000 gallons/acre spring manure application,
Incorporated; No cover crop

Dairy Rotation - No-till

Corn silage (3 years) - Alfalfa Hay (3 years)

No-till

8,000 gallons/acre spring manure surface
application

Dairy Rotation - No-till + cover crops

Corn silage (3 years) - Alfalfa Hay (3 years)

Spring disk

8,000 gallons/acre spring manure surface
application, Rye cover crop after corn silage

Dairy Rotation - Hay


Straight alfalfa/grass crops

Tillage only in seeding years



7.5
t/ac/yr

Soil erosion can be reduced by 7.5 t/ac/yr on certain soils in this watershed area with the use of cover crops after corn silage and introducing no-till into dairy systems



—●— B Slope

—●— C Slope


Higher risk of **phosphorus loss from fields** in dairy rotations when disking in the spring and incorporating manure using tillage

On dairy operations, manure is an important part of the system. Some fields may receive more frequent or higher volume manure applications than others on a regular basis, leading to a variability in soil test P levels across the farm.

Conservation practices can not only lower risk of P losses from the field, but also reduce the *variability* in phosphorus losses across fields with different soil phosphorus concentrations.



Decreasing tillage in dairy systems can lower phosphorus loss from fields.



—●— 17 ppm Soil P —●— 28 ppm Soil P —●— 48 ppm Soil P

8.9
lb/ac/yr


At a soil test level of 48 ppm P, **no-till planting corn crops** instead of using conventional tillage can reduce phosphorus loss by 8.9 lb/ac/yr on average on soils in this watershed.

1.1
lb/ac/yr



Sometimes additional disturbance from either tillage or the drill when **planting a cover crop after corn crops** may increase P losses from the field, however not always; on average on these soils, by 1.1 lb/ac/yr.



A higher Soil Conditioning Index means farming practices are encouraging **the building of soil organic matter**



The SCI predicts whether field soil is **gaining or losing carbon**. Values indicate direction of soil carbon building based off management practices like tillage. It does not reflect the actual quantity of carbon stored in the soil and a **value near zero doesn't necessarily indicate good management** if soil carbon levels have already degraded and they are being maintained at a low level.



- + Reducing tillage,
 - + Increasing surface residues left on the field
 - + Integrating cover crops into a rotation
- will often raise the SCI**

PRODUCERS OF LAKE REDSTONE

Conservation Dashboard

3,211
acres

Covered by participating farms in
2019

240
acres

Of **cover crops planted** across **6 farms** through the group's cost-share incentive program.

118 acres

Receiving **soil testing** to help inform soil nutrient needs.



PRODUCERS OF LAKE REDSTONE CONSERVATION PROGRESS

Potential
Sediment +
Nutrient
Reductions

Conservation efforts can reduce sediment and phosphorus from reaching waterways.

Here we apply the reductions we've modeled for the different scenarios on 3,000 acres of cropland to get an idea of potential impacts to water quality.

Currently the group membership covers 3,211 acres. Many producer-led watershed groups seek to expand their farmer participation in their group, while promoting these practices in their communities.



3,000 acres of cropland managed under a **grain system** could experience the following reductions* when switching from a **corn-bean system with chisel plowing** to:

**Vertical
Tillage**



14,322
Tons
Sediment

15,539
Pounds of
P

**No-till
and
cover
crops**



25,115
Tons
Sediment

27,692
Pounds of
P



*Estimates based on numbers averaged across rotation years, all dominant soil types in watershed, slope classes and soil test P values. Actual reductions will vary based on practice particulars and placement on landscape

PRODUCERS OF LAKE
REDSTONE
CONSERVATION PROGRESS

Potential Sediment +
Nutrient Reductions

3,000 acres of cropland managed under a **dairy system** could experience the following reductions* when switching from **silage and alfalfa rotations with spring disking and manure incorporation** to:

**No-till +
cover crops**



19,631
Tons
Sediment

25,000
Pounds of
P

**Perennial
forage system**



26,130
Tons
Sediment

35,076
Pounds of
P



*Estimates based on numbers averaged across rotation years, all dominant soil types in watershed, slope classes and soil test P values. Actual reductions will vary based on practice particulars and placement on landscape

Looking ahead, the Producers of Lake Redstone are looking to expand their activities and outreach through partnerships with UW Discovery Farms and neighboring Producer-Led groups.

They will continue to develop their manure sharing program and learn more about how to make cover crops a viable practice in their systems.

If you have questions regarding this report, contact Dana Christel, Conservation Specialist:

Dana.Christel@Wisconsin.Gov
(608) 640- 7270

