







Purpose of National Lakes Assessment

- Report on the condition of U.S. lakes
 - Unbiased, based on randomly selected, representative subset of lakes
 - Reports on core indicators
 - Standardized or comparable methods
- Answers key questions:
 - Extent of lake waters supporting healthy ecosystems, recreation?
 - Extent of lake resource affected by key water quality problems/stressors?

National Lakes Assessment Indicators Habitat Quality **Biological Integrity** - Lakeshore Vegetation - Planktonic Index of Cover Taxa Loss Littoral Quality Diatom Index of Biotic – Human Shoreline Integrity Disturbance Trophic State Chemical stressors Recreational Use - Nutrients Occurrence of - pH microcystin Risk of cyanotoxin – DO exposure Salinity Enterococci Change over time - Sediment diatom cores

6

5















Working with "Neatniks" to Restore Our Lakeshores



Fred Rozumalski Landscape Architect/Ecologist Barr Engineering Company





















































































1. Direct Management

State parks and trails

e.g. Devils Lake State Park

State forests, fish / wildlife areas

e.g. Northern Highland State Forest

Stewardship Fund

\$86,000,000 annual budget

Lake protection grants

Acquisition, management plans











Waterway and Wetland Permits

- Dams
- Dredging
- Grading
- Piers
- Water Levels



- Shoreline erosion protection
- Designated Waters
 - different standards to protect sensitive waters and resources



County Lake Classification 1. Classify lakes by sensitivity to development 2. Lot size, setback, and other dimensional zoning standards for classes of lakes 3. Colorful, graphic, plain-language guides for shoreland property owners Lake Classification Seepage/Spring lakes Drainage Lakes Shallow Deen Shallow Deen A Property Owner's Guide For Protecting & Managing Shorelands in (A) High Sensitivity (B) Medium Sensitivity (C) Low Sensitivity Sensitivity Ranking **Bayfield Count**

3. Financial incentives

Lake Protection grants (WDNR) Acquisition, planning, restoration, education County Conservation grants (WDATCP) Plans, site preparation and planting Tax credits for property owners Burnett County shoreland stewards Contributions from local lake organizations and citizens

4. Tech Assistance & Education

UW-Extension

Basin educators

Lake and land use specialists

Wisconsin Association of Lakes County Staff

Land and water conservation Natural resource/economic development

Private service providers

Friends from other states















Shoreland Zoning -Revising a 40-year old rule

State rule with minimum standards for shoreland management

Implemented by counties through their local ordinances

Standards apply to "shoreland zone"

- -300-feet from a river or stream
- -1000-feet from a lake

Unincorporated areas only



The Approach

Kept the good

 Lot size, setback, structure limits

Fixed some things

- Vegetation, nonconforming structures
- Added some new



-Mitigation, Impervious Surface Limits₇₁

The Process

Listening Sessions Technical Advisory Committee Public Hearings Stakeholder involvement






Impervious Surfaces

Before

• No impervious surface standards



Impervious Surface
 Limits

Now

- Applies within 300feet of any waterway
- 15% of lot size,
 30% cap with
 Mitigation
- -Keep existing %IS

<section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><section-header><section-header>

Wisconsin's Goal...

To protect and enhance the habitat, water quality and natural scenic beauty of Wisconsin's shorelands





The Maine Story Carrots and Sticks





Shoreland Zoning: Protecting shorefronts since 1973



(most of the time)



P-Free Fertilizer

- Law passed in 2007 requiring sign to be posted, <u>not</u> a ban
- In 2 years most stores selling 90% P-free





In Order to Work Smarter Not Harder – used Social Marketing and Social Science

What is Social Marketing?

Applying commercial marketing principles to social issues to achieve a change in behavior for the good of the individual or society.





Step 1. Define driving forces, goals and objectives

Driving Force

Declining water quality due to urban/suburban landscaping

<u>Goal</u>

Lake-friendly landuse practices statewide

Objectives

5 workshops/year 50% of participants take action



Step 2. Identify and analyze target audience (and the targeted behaviors)

- Target audience lake shore residents
- Concerned, lacking knowledge on cause and effect. looking for easy fixes. retired
- McKenzie-Mohr's Behavior Change matrix

Describe area Iomeowner pu oubled from 1	rchases of law	· · ·	ts that contain	pesticides, fert	lizers or both
<u>Activity</u> (Specific behaviors that people could do)	Competing Behaviors What do people currently do Use focus groups or observation	Impact Quantify impact each has on water x % expected to adopt the behavior = cumulative impact	Barriers What will stand in our way of getting people to do what we would like them to do	Benefits From the new behavior or how to make competing behavior less desirable	Tool or Action Workshop, ac door hanger, media coverage, etc
Use pesticides /fertilizers only when needed, amounts only as required	~1/3 don't fertilize, 1/3 fertilizer 1-2 times/year and 1/3 fertilize 3-5 times/year	Impact?	Habit, more is better, and risk not recognized	Save for kids & pets, save consumers \$, reduce opportunity for accidents	Point of sale info, bag closure sticker 89



Step 3. Create the tool

Create method for evaluating properties

- 1. Driveways & parking
- 2. Structures & septic
- 3. Yard & paths
- 4. Shorefront

Gives scores and suggestions for improvements



91

Use 3rd party - Soil & Water Conservation Districts to evaluate











Market Research to Answer Impact and Context Questions

- Phone Survey of workshop participants
- Paper survey to lake associations
- Interview 3rd party evaluators and lake association contacts
- Mail survey to property owners who had evaluations

Results of Market Research: Workshop Phone Survey

- 61% who signed up showed up
- 72% learned something new
- 37% had a property evaluation in 2004 and more waiting for one
- 83% took action (planting, diversions,..)
- · But actions not directly tied to workshop







Step 7. Lessons Learned and Applied

New requirements for Project lakes

- Assoc. must apply to join
- Active association
- Local "Spark Plug"
- Offer incentives/support
- A minimum 3 year commitment to work toward specific target # of evals













Speaker Contact Information

Amina Pollard, U.S. EPA, Monitoring Branch 202-566-2360 Pollard.Amina@epa.gov

Fred Rozumalski, Barr Engineering Minneapolis, MN 612-718-8466 FRozumalski@barr.com

Liesa Lehmann, Waterway Protection Section Chief Bureau of Watershed Management Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources 608-264-8554 Liesa.LehmannKerler@wisconsin.gov

Barbara Welch, Outreach Coordinator, Land and Water Bureau Maine Department of Environmental Protection 207-287-7682 Barb.Welch@maine.gov



