

LAKE ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR LAKE BRANT IN HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY FLORIDA

Date Assessed: June 12, 2007

Assessed by: Sarah Koenig and David Eilers

Reviewed by: Jim Griffin, Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION

This assessment was conducted to update existing physical and ecological data for Lake Brant on the Hillsborough County Watershed Atlas (<http://www.hillsborough.wateratlas.usf.edu/>). The project is a collaborative effort between the University of South Florida's Center for Community Design and Research and Hillsborough County Stormwater Management Section. The project is funded by Hillsborough County and the Southwest Florida Water Management District's Northwest Hillsborough, Hillsborough River and Alafia River Basin Boards. The project has, as its primary goal, the rapid assessing of up to 150 lakes in Hillsborough County during a five year period. The product of these investigations will provide the County, lake property owners and the general public a better understanding of the general health of Hillsborough County lakes, in terms of shoreline development, water quality, lake morphology (bottom contour, volume, area, etc.) and the plant biomass and species diversity. These data are intended to assist the County and its citizens to better manage lakes and lake centered watersheds.



Figure 1. General photograph of Lake Brant taken on June 12, 2007.

The first section of the report provides the results of the overall morphological assessment of the lake. Primary data products include: a contour (bathymetric) map of the lake, area, volume and depth statistics, and the water level at the time of assessment. These data are useful for evaluating trends and for developing management actions such as plant management where depth and lake volume are needed.

The second section provides the results of the vegetation assessment conducted on the lake. These results can be used to better understand and manage vegetation in your lake. A list is provided with the different plant species found at various sites around the lake. Potentially invasive, exotic (non-native) species are identified in a plant list and the percent of exotics is presented in a summary table. Watershed values provide a means of reference.

The third section provides the results of the water quality sampling of the lake. Both field data and laboratory data are presented. The trophic state index (TSI)ⁱ is used to develop a general lake health statement, which is calculated for both the water column with vegetation and the water column if vegetation were removed. These data are derived from the water chemistry and vegetative submerged biomass assessments and are useful in understanding the results of certain lake vegetation management practices.


The intent of this assessment is to provide a starting point from which to track changes in your lake, and where previous comprehensive assessment data is available, to track changes in the lake's general health. These data can provide the information needed to determine changes and to monitor trends in physical condition and ecological health of the lake.

Section 1: Lake Morphology

Bathymetric Mapⁱⁱ. The bottom of the lake was mapped using a Lowrance LCX 26C HD Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS)ⁱⁱⁱ enabled Global Positioning System (GPS) with fathometer (bottom sounder) to determine the boat's position, and bottom depth in a single measurement. The result is an estimate of the lake's area, mean and maximum depths, and volume and the creation of a bottom contour map (Figure 2). Besides pointing out the deeper fishing holes in the lake, the morphologic data derived from this part of the assessment can be valuable to overall management of the lake vegetation as well as providing flood storage data for flood models. Table 1 provides the lake's morphologic parameters in various units.


Table 1. Lake Morphologic Data (Area, Depth, and Volume)

Parameter	Feet	Meters	Acres	Acre-ft	Gallons
Surface Area (sq)	2,640,957.26	245,352.9	60.63		
Mean Depth	5.61	1.71			
Maximum Depth	15.6	4.75			
Volume (cubic)	13,584,057.5	384,657.68		311.85	101,616,511.1
Gauge (above datum)	54.59				



Lake Brant

Section - Township - Range
14 & 23-27-18



Contour Lines
Expressed in
2-Foot Intervals



Lake Perimeter
Ground Level

EXPLANATION:

Survey Date: June 12, 2007
Lake water level was 54.59 ft
above sea level at time of assessment.
Contours are expressed in absolute depth
below this level.

LAKE MORPHOLOGY:

Perimeter 12,063 ft;
Area 60.6 Acres;
Mean Depth 5.61 ft;
Volume 311.85 Acre-ft, (101,616,511 gallons);
Deepest point 15.6 ft

DATA SOURCES:

2006 aerial photography provided by the
SWFWMD.
Lake perimeter digitized from SWFWMD
2006 aerial photographs.
All contours generated by the Florida Center
for Community Design and Research from
survey data provided by the Hillsborough
County Lake Management Program.

DISCLAIMER:

This map is for illustrative purposes only,
and should not be used for lake navigation.




Figure 2. Contour map for Lake Brant. The mapping technique used in 2007 employs a standard DGPS for horizontal position and a fathometer for depth.

Section 2: Lake Ecology (vegetation)

The lake's apparent vegetative cover and shoreline detail are evaluated using the latest lake aerial photograph as shown in Figure 3 and by use of WAAS enabled GPS. Submerged vegetation is determined from the analysis of bottom returns from the Lowrance 26c HD combined GPS/fathometer described earlier. As depicted in Figure 3, 10 vegetation assessment sites were chosen for intensive sampling based on the *Lake Assessment Protocol* (copy available on request) for a lake of this size. The site positions are set using GPS and then loaded into a GIS mapping program (ArcGIS) for display. Each site is sampled in the three primary vegetative zones (emergent, submerged and floating)^{iv}. The latest aerials high resolution aerial photos are used to provide shore details (docks, structures, vegetation zones) and to calculate the extent of surface vegetation coverage. The primary indices of submerged vegetation cover and biomass for the lake, percent area coverage (PAC) and percent volume infestation (PVI), are determined by transiting the lake by boat and employing a fathometer to collect "hard and soft return" data. These data are later analyzed for presence and absence of vegetation and to determine the height of vegetation if present. The PAC is determined from the presence and absence analysis of 100 sites in the lake and the PVI is determined by measuring the difference between hard returns (lake bottom) and soft returns (top of vegetation) for sites (within the 100 analyzed sites) where plants are determined present.

The data collected during the site vegetation sampling include vegetation type, exotic vegetation, predominant plant species and submerged vegetation biomass. The total number of species from all sites is used to approximate the total diversity of aquatic plants and the percent of invasive-exotic plants on the lake (Table 2). The Watershed value in Table 2 only includes lakes sampled during the lake assessment project begun in May of 2006. These data will change as additional lakes are sampled. Tables 3 through 7 detail the results from the 2007 aquatic plant assessment for your lake. These data are determined from the 10 sites used for intensive vegetation surveys. The tables are divided into Floating Leaf, Emergent and Submerged plants and contain the plant code, species, common name and presence (indicated by a 1) or absence (indicated by a blank space) of species and the calculated percent occurrence (number sites species is found/number of sites) and type of plant (Native, Non-Native, Invasive, Pest). In the "Type" category, the term invasive indicates the plant is commonly considered invasive in this region of Florida and the term "Pest" indicates that the plant has a greater than 55% occurrence in your lake and is also considered a problem plant for this region of Florida, or in a non-native invasive that is or has the potential to be a problem plant in your lake and has at least 40% occurrence. These two terms are somewhat subjective; however, they are provided to give lake property owners some guidance in the management of plants on their property. Please remember that to remove or control plants in a wetland (lake shoreline) in Hillsborough County the property owner must secure an [Application To Perform Miscellaneous Activities In Wetlands](http://www.epchc.org/forms_documents.htm) (http://www.epchc.org/forms_documents.htm) permit from the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough and for management of in-lake vegetation outside the wetland fringe (for lakes with an area greater than 10 acres), the property owner must secure a Florida Department of Environmental Protection permit (<http://www.dep.state.fl.us/lands/invaspec/>).

Table 2 Total diversity, percent exotics, and number of EPPC pest plants

Parameter	Lake	Watershed
Total Plant Diversity (# of Taxa)	61	106
% Non-Native Plants	14.75%	14.15%
Total Pest Plant Species	4	7




Figure 3. 2006 6-inch resolution aerial photograph showing vegetation assessment sites on Lake Brant. Major emergent and floating vegetation zones as well as structures such as docks are also observable in this aerial.

Table 3. List of Floating Leaf Zone Aquatic Plants Found

Code	Plant Species	Common Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	% Occurrence	Native (N), Non-Native (NN), Invasive (I), Pest (P)
NLM	Nuphar lutea var. advena	Spatterdock, Yellow Pondlily	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	90%	NP
HYE	Hydrocotyl umbellata	Manyflower Marshpennywort, Water Pennywort	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	80%	N



Figure 4. Nuphar lutea var. advena (Spatterdock), was the most common floating leaved vegetation found during the assessment of Lake Brant. Although native, Nuphar lutea advena can grow into dense mats covering the surface of the water resulting in its listing as a pest plant when found in high % occurrence.

Table 4 List of Emergent Zone Aquatic Plants Found

Code	Plant Species	Common Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	% Occurrence	Native, Non-Native (NN), Invasive (I), Pest (P)
LOP	Ludwigia spp.	Water Primroses, Primrosewillow	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100%	NP
PRS	Panicum repens	Torpedo Grass	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	90%	NNIP
TAS	Taxodium ascendens	Pond Cypress	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	90%	N
BOC	Boehmeria cylindrica	Bog Hemp, False Nettle	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	90%	N
MSS	Mikania scandens	Climbing Hempvine	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	90%	N
CYP	Cyperus spp.	Sedge	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	80%	N
CPS	Cyperus polystachyos	Flat Sedge	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	80%	N
BMI	Bacopa monnieri	Common Bacopa, Herb-Of-Grace	1	1				1	1	1	1	1	70%	N
PLU	Pluchea spp.	Marsh Fleabane, Camphorweed	1	1		1	1			1	1	1	70%	N
SLA	Sagittaria lancifolia	Bulltongue Arrowhead, Duck Potato	1	1		1	1	1	1			1	70%	N
SCS	Scirpus cubensis	Burhead Sedge, Cuban Scirpus	1	1	1	1		1	1		1		70%	N
CAA	Centella asiatica	Asian Pennywort, Coinwort, Spadeleaf	1	1				1	1	1		1	60%	N
COM	Commelina spp.	Dayflower	1	1		1	1			1		1	60%	N
EAA	Eclipta alba (prostrata)	False Daisy, Yerba De Tajo	1	1		1		1	1			1	60%	N
PNA	Phyla nodiflora	Frog-fruit, Carpetweed, Turkey Tangle Frogfruit	1	1				1	1	1		1	60%	N
WTA	Sphagneticola (Wedelia) trilobata	Creeping Oxeye	1	1			1		1	1		1	60%	NNIP
CYO	Cyperus odoratus	Fragrant Flatsedge		1		1	1	1		1		1	60%	N

Table 5. List of Emergent Zone Aquatic Plants Found

Code	Plant Species	Common Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	% Occurrence	Native, Non-Native (NN), Invasive (I), Pest (P)
COS	<i>Cephalanthus occidentalis</i>	Common Buttonbush	1		1	1	1				1	1	60%	N
DVA	<i>Diodia virginiana</i>	Buttonweed					1	1	1	1		1	50%	N
PCA	<i>Pontederia cordata</i>	Pickereel Weed	1			1		1			1	1	50%	N
BID	<i>Bidens</i> spp.	Bur Marigold	1	1			1					1	40%	N
BLS	<i>Blechnum serrulatum</i>	Swamp Fern	1			1				1	1		40%	N
PHN	<i>Panicum hemitomon</i>	Maidencane	1				1		1			1	40%	N
BMA	<i>Urochloa mutica</i>	Para Grass	1	1			1					1	40%	NNI
APS	<i>Alternanthera philoxeroides</i>	Alligator Weed	1		1	1					1		40%	NNI
AST	<i>Aster</i> spp.	Aster spp., Elliot's Aster	1	1				1				1	40%	N
SAL	<i>Salix</i> spp.	Willow	1		1				1			1	40%	N
POL	<i>Polygonum</i> spp.	Smartweed, Knotweed				1					1	1	30%	N
FSC	<i>Fuirena</i> spp.	Rush Fuirena	1				1					1	30%	N
JES	<i>Juncus effusus</i> var <i>solutus</i>	Soft Rush	1			1						1	30%	N
JUM	<i>Juncus marginatus</i>	Shore Rush, Grassleaf Rush				1		1				1	30%	N
TYP	<i>Typha</i> spp.	Cattails					1		1			1	30%	N
CCA	<i>Cinnamomum camphora</i>	Camphor-tree	1					1				1	30%	NNI
MEL	<i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i>	Punk Tree, Melaleuca			1				1		1		30%	NNI
CSS	<i>Cyperus surinamensis</i>	Flat Sedge		1			1		1				30%	N
GTM	<i>Galium tinctorium</i>	Marsh Bedstraw		1		1	1						30%	N
URL	<i>Urena lobata</i>	Caesar's Weed	1			1							20%	NNI
JMS	<i>Juncus megacephalus</i>	Bighead Rush						1				1	20%	N

Table 6. List of Emergent Zone Aquatic Plants Found

Code	Plant Species	Common Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	% Occurrence	Native, Non-Native (NN), Invasive (I), Pest (P)
LPA	Ludwigia peruviana	Peruvian Primrosewillow	1	1									20%	N
MVA	Magnolia virginiana	Sweetbay Magnolia								1		1	20%	N
WAX	Myrica cerifera	Wax Myrtle				1						1	20%	N
ACE	Acer rubrum var. trilobum	Southern Red Maple				1						1	20%	N
CHN	Cyperus haspan	Jointed Flat Sedge	1									1	20%	N
LAA	Ludwigia arcuata	Ludwigia					1		1				20%	N
HGS	Hibiscus grandiflorus	Swamp Hibiscus				1					1		20%	N
CAM	Crinum americanum	Swamp lily								1			10%	N
HRS	Habenaria repens	Waterspider False Reinorchid		1									10%	N
PVA	Peltandra virginica	Green Arrow Arum	1										10%	N
NSS	Nephrolepis spp.	Sword Fern					1						10%	N
RF	Osmunda regalis	Royal Fern	1										10%	N
OCA	Osmunda cinnamomea	Cinnamon Fern				1							10%	N
EBI	Eleocharis baldwinii	Baldwin's Spikerush, Roadgrass									1		10%	N
SSP	Scirpus validus	Soft-stem Bulrush							1				10%	N
GLS	Gordonia lasianthus	Loblolly Bay								1			10%	N
SAM	Sambucus canadensis	Elderberry	1										10%	N
ABM	Amaranthus blitum	Livid Amaranth		1									10%	N
CPR	Cyperus prolifer	Dwarf Papyrus										1	10%	NNI
PCM	Ptilimnium capillaceum	Mock Bishop's Weed		1									10%	N
SVA	Spermacoce verticillata	White Head Broom					1						10%	N



Figure 5. Creeping Oxeye, *Sphagneticola (Wedelia) trilobata*, is a common non-native invasive species in Florida.



Figure 6. Waterspider False Reinorchid, *Habenaria repens*, is a native wetland ground orchid found on Lake Brant.

Table 7. List of Submerged Zone Aquatic Plants Found

Code	Plant Species	Common Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	% Occurrence	Native, Non-Native (NN), Invasive (I), Pest (P)
NIT	Nitella spp.	Nitella								1		1	20%	NNI

Section 3: Lake Water Chemistry

A critical element in any lake assessment is the long-term water chemistry data set. The primary source of water quality trend data for Florida Lakes, is the Florida LAKEWATCH volunteer and the Florida LAKEWATCH water chemistry data. Hillsborough County is fortunate to have a large cadre of volunteers who have collected lake water samples for significant time period. These data are displayed and analyzed on the Water Atlas as shown in Figure 7 for Lake Brant. Additional data, when available, is also included on the Water Atlas; however, the LAKEWATCH data remains the primary source. By the trend data shown in the figure, the lake may be considered in fair to good healthy terms of the trophic state index. This lake is a clear water lake and as such it must maintain a TSI of below 40 to not be considered impaired by the State of Florida guidelines^v. The lake's long term water quality data indicates enough violations of these criteria to be classified by Florida DEP as impaired. The more recent trends indicate a possible downward trend; however, the overall TSI remains primarily above 40 and the lake should therefore be considered impaired for nutrient concentration.




Figure 7. Recent Trophic State Index (TSI) graph from Hillsborough Watershed Atlas. For the latest date go to:

(<http://www.hillsborough.wateratlas.usf.edu/lake/waterquality.asp?wbodyid=5630&wbodyatlas=lake>)

Note: The graph above includes benchmarks for using verbal descriptors of "good", "fair" and "poor". The verbal descriptors for these benchmarks are based on an early determination by stakeholders of the generally acceptable and understood terms for describing the state of lakes. The same benchmarks are used for nutrient graphs (Nitrogen and Phosphorus), chlorophyll graphs and trophic state index (TSI) graphs. The TSI is a calculated index of lake condition based on nutrient and chlorophyll (a) concentrations (please see "Learn more about Trophic State Index"). The benchmarks are established based on the TSI range that relates to a specific descriptor. The source for the TSI concentration relationships is the Florida Water Quality Assessment, 1996, 305(b) (Table 2-8).

As part of the lake assessment the physical water quality and chemical water chemistry of a lake are measured. These data only indicate a snap shot of the lakes water quality; however they are useful when compared to the trend data available from LAKEWATCH or other sources. Table 8 contains the summary water quality data and index values and adjusted values calculated from these data. The total phosphorus (TP), total nitrogen (TN) and chlorophyll (a) water chemistry sample data are the results of chemical analysis of samples taken during the assessment and analyzed by the Hillsborough County Environmental Protection Commission laboratory. These data (TSI=54) compare with the mean data from the LAKEWATCH data set for the lake (TSI=53). Table 9 contains the field data taken in the center of the lake using a multi-probe (YSI 6000) which has the ability to directly measure the temperature, pH, dissolve oxygen (DO), percent DO (calculated from DO, temperature, conductivity and turbidity). These data are listed for three levels in the lake and twice for the surface measurement. The duplicate surface measurement was taken as a quality assurance check on measured data.

Table 8. Water Quality Parameters (Laboratory)

<i>Summary Table for Water Quality</i>			
<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Comment</i>	
TP ug/L	35.00		
TN mg/L	0.93		
Chla ug/L	9.00		
Chla TSI	48.44		
TP TSI	60.11		
TN TSI	57.97		
Secchi Disk (SD)	4.50		
TSI	54.27	P limited	
PAC	5%		
PVI	1%		
Adj TP	0.02	P from Veg Added	
Adj TSI	54.28	With additional P	

Table 9. Water Quality Parameters (Field-YSI)

Sample Location	Time	Temp (°C)	Conductivity (mS/cm3)	Dissolved Oxygen (%)	DO (mg/L)	PH (SU)	ORP (ORP)	Turbidity (NTU)	Secchi Depth (ft)
Surface	13:13	31.89	0.217	104	7.61	7.84	91.8	1.5	
Mid	13:15	31.83	0.217	103.7	7.59	7.79	88.8	1.7	
Bottom	13:18	31.5	0.217	96.4	7.1	7.45	91.1	2.5	
Surface	13:21	31.9	0.217	107	7.82	7.82	76.5	1.5	
Mean Value		31.78	0.217	102.775	7.53	7.725	87.05	1.8	4.5

Table 8 also provides data derived from the vegetation assessment which is used to determine an adjusted TSI. This is accomplished by calculating the amount of phosphorus that could be released by existing submerged vegetation if this vegetation were treated with an herbicide or managed by the addition of Triploid Grass Carp (*Ctenopharyngodon idella*). While it would not be expected that all the vegetation would be turned into available phosphorus by these management methods, the data is useful when planning various management activities. Approximately 5 % of the lake has submerged vegetation present and this vegetation represents about 1 % of the available lake volume. The vegetation holds only a small fraction of the total nutrient available to the water column and would not affect the lake TSI.

To better understand many of the terms used in this report, we recommend that you visit the Hillsborough Watershed Atlas (<http://www.hillsborough.wateratlas.usf.edu>) and explore the “Learn More” areas which are found on the resource pages. Additional information can also be found using the Digital Library on the website.

Section 4: Conclusion

Lake Brant is a medium area (60 acre) lake that would be considered in the (eutrophic to high mesotrophic) category of lakes based on water chemistry. It has a lower than normal abundance of aquatic vegetation. About 5 % of the open water areas contain submerged vegetation. Since vegetation helps to maintain the nutrient balance in the lake as well as provide good fish habitat, consideration should be given to increasing the quantity Florida native submerged aquatic vegetation in the lake. The lake has many open water areas that support various types of recreation and has a good diversity of plant species. The primary pest plants in the lake include Nuphar, Ludwigia spp., Panicum repens, Sphagneticola (Wedelia) trilobata. For more information and recent updates please see the Hillsborough Watershed Atlas (water atlas) website at: <http://www.hillsborough.wateratlas.usf.edu>.


i "Trophic" means "relating to nutrition." The Trophic State Index (TSI) takes into account chlorophyll, nitrogen, and phosphorus, which are nutrients required by plant life. For more information please see *learn more at:*

<http://www.hillsborough.wateratlas.usf.edu/lake/default.asp?wbodyid=5630&wbodyatlas=lake>

ii A bathymetric map is a map that accurately depicts all of the various depths of a water body. An accurate bathymetric map is important for effective herbicide application and can be an important tool when deciding which form of management is most appropriate for a water body. Lake volumes, hydraulic retention time and carrying capacity are important parts of lake management that require the use of a bathymetric map.

iii WAAS is a form of differential GPS (DGPS) where data from 25 ground reference stations located in the United States receive GPS signals from GPS satellites in view and retransmit these data to a master control site and then to geostationary satellites. The geostationary satellites broadcast the information to all WAAS-capable GPS receivers. The receiver decodes the signal to provide real time correction of raw GPS satellite signals also received by the unit. WAAS enabled GPS is not as accurate as standard DGPS which employs close by ground stations for correction, however; it was shown to be a good substitute when used for this type of mapping application. Data comparisons were conducted with both types of DGPS employed simultaneously and the positional difference was determined to be well within the tolerance established for the project.

iv The tree primary aquatic vegetation zones are shown below:



v A lake is impaired if " (2) For lakes with a mean color less than or equal to 40 platinum cobalt units, the annual mean TSI for the lake exceeds 40, unless paleolimnological information indicates the lake was naturally greater than 40, or

For any lake, data indicate that annual mean TSIs have increased over the assessment period, as indicated by a positive slope in the means plotted versus time, or the annual mean TSI has increased by more than 10 units over historical values. When evaluating the slope of mean TSIs over time, the Department shall use a Mann's one-sided, upper-tail test for trend, as described in Nonparametric Statistical Methods by M. Hollander and D. Wolfe (1999 ed.), pages 376 and 724 (which are incorporated by reference), with a 95% confidence level."

Excerpt from Impaired Water Rule (IWR). Please see:

<http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/tmdl/docs/AmendedIWR.pdf>