LAND MANAGEMENT ACTION SCHEDULES

Table III.F. - Land Management Action Schedule for First Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
Bombay SF (FR 2)	A-25	7.0	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-33	13.9	70	70	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-34	5.5	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-42	69.2	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-14	17.1	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
Bombay SF (FR 4)	None							
Brasher SF (SL 1)	B-12.1	34.1	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-17	57.2	60	60	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-27	8.4	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-14.1	5.0	41	70	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-38.1	17.6	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-38.2	9.5	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-33	48.2	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	D-34	9.8	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-35.1	11.2	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-35.2	3.1	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-37	16.0	41	41	79	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.F. - Land Management Action Schedule for First Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	E-1	2.7	99	99	99	WL	WL	HM
	E-35.1	2.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	E-35.2	3.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	E-37	31.3	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
Brasher SF (SL 5)	B-18	36.7	60	60	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-25.1	60.8	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-25.2	21.6	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-25.3	25.8	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-25.4	12.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-28	6.9	54	54	71	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	B-29	3.3	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-30	3.5	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	B-32	10.8	10	10	10	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-33	1.2	99	99	99	WL	WL	HM
	B-37.1	3.4	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-38	3.7	21	21	21	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	B-39	6.3	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	B-40	4.0	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	B-43	13.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-1	19.0	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.F. - Land Management Action Schedule for First Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	C-2	9.4	48	48	32	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	C-3.1	34.2	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-3.2	11.1	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-5.1	15.6	46	46	71	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-6	6.3	11	11	11	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-10	7.7	46	46	71	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-21.1	7.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-21.2	1.4	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	C-22	25.9	11	11	11	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-23.1	27.6	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-23.2	7.2	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-23.3	14.6	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-25.1	25.3	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	C-28	2.1	98	98	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	E-2.1	12.3	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	E-2.2	4.5	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	E-2.3	2.9	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	E-3	3.2	47	47	47	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	E-4.1	3.5	25	25	25	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	E-4.2	2.0	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	E-5.1	10.6	47	47	47	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.F. - Land Management Action Schedule for First Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	E-5.2	4.1	47	47	47	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	F-17	1.7	99	99	99	WL	WL	HM
Brasher SF (SL 6)	A-11	2.1	99	99	99	WL	WL	HM
	A-12	20.0	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-13	9.0	11	11	11	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	A-14	12.6	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	A-15	6.0	11	11	11	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-10	2.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-12	9.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-13	1.8	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-22.1	10.8	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-22.2	1.9	21	21	21	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	B-47	9.6	21	21	21	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	B-56.1	22.1	12	12	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-56.2	6.8	12	12	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-74	9.5	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-77.1	8.0	63	63	63	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-78	4.6	42	42	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-80	3.0	42	42	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-88	13.3	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.F. - Land Management Action Schedule for First Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	B-95	7.5	46	46	71	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-99	18.0	60	60	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-1.1	11.3	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-1.2	8.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-3.1	6.1	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-3.2	2.1	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-6	7.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-9.1	33.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-9.2	2.1	21	21	21	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-10.1	16.9	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	D-10.2	2.5	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-22.1	19.3	60	60	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-22.3	5.9	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-22.4	3.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-36.2	24.9	12	12	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-36.3	3.6	25	25	25	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-37	4.3	21	21	21	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-38.1	42.8	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-38.2	3.5	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-38.4	1.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-39	5.5	46	46	71	T-EA	T-EA	TH

Table III.F. - Land Management Action Schedule for First Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	D-40	14.8	12	12	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-43	14.9	25	25	25	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-46	3.5	47	47	47	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-47	14.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-48	48.5	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
Brasher SF (SL 7)	C-3	11.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-7.1	34.8	25	25	25	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-14.2	5.4	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-26	15.4	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-27	23.0	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-29	12.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-25	2.2	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-26.2	14.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-27	5.1	10	10	10	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-28	10.0	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-30	0.9	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	D-31	51.8	64	64	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-32	3.6	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	D-33	8.7	46	46	71	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-35	8.0	48	48	48	T-EA	T-EA	TH

Table III.F. - Land Management Action Schedule for First Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	D-36	1.9	49	49	49	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-38	2.7	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	D-39	60.5	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-41	34.5	61	61	61	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-50	23.9	11	11	11	T-UE	T-UE	TH
Brasher SF (SL 10)	D-11	15.8	68	68	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-12	5.0	12	12	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	D-15	8.2	70	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-25.1	8.8	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-44	2.4	68	68	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-48	7.3	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-51	22.9	32	32	32	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	E-13	10.1	70	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	E-14.1	9.5	70	70	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
Brasher SF (SL 17)	A-18.1	42.0	12	12	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-18.2	7.4	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-29.1	18.0	60	60	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-29.2	2.5	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-32	2.2	12	12	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-14.2	4.8	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.F. - Land Management Action Schedule for First Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	D-3	14.4	60	60	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
Buckton SF (SL 31)	A-1	14.8	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-2	5.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-3	21.1	12	12	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-5.1	38.9	11	11	11	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	A-5.2	5.2	11	11	11	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	A-6	2.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-7	2.4	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-8	5.3	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-10	9.1	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-15	6.1	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-17	2.8	21	21	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	A-18	22.4	11	11	11	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	A-23	3.7	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-24	2.4	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	A-25	1.8	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	A-26	4.0	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-9	14.6	41	41	41	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-10	0.9	99	99	99	WL	WL	HM
	B-14.1	14.2	10	10	10	T-UE	T-UE	TH

Table III.F. - Land Management Action Schedule for First Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	C-16.1	8.9	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	C-16.2	23.8	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
Fort Jackson SF (SL 22)	None							
Grantville SF (SL 15)	None							
Knapp Station SF (SL 11)	A-8	9.2	46	46	71	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-9	14.6	10	10	10	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-10	9.8	63	63	63	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-13	7.1	71	71	71	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-14	3.8	10	10	10	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-15.1	7.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-15.2	2.4	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-16	32.4	60	60	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-17	3.6	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-18	4.9	46	46	71	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-19	9.4	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-20	8.7	42	42	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-21	6.2	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-25	8.8	70	70	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-1	6.8	12	12	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.F. - Land Management Action Schedule for First Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	D-3	3.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
Lost Nation SF (SL 9)	A-20.2	11.3	40	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	C-18	4.1	45	45	71	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-19	3.0	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-20	10.6	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-44	11.3	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-45	6.0	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-51	3.6	10	10	10	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-52	5.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-53	12.7	47	47	47	T-EA	T-UE	TH
Raymondville SF (SL 33)	None							
Sodom SF (SL 25)	None							
Southville SF (SL 23)	None							
Total Yrs 0-5		2,243.7						

Table III.G. - Land Management Action Schedule for Second Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
Bombay SF (FR 2)	None							
Bombay SF (FR 4)	None							
Brasher SF (SL 1)	B-25	5.2	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-26	11.4	21	21	21	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-6.1	11.0	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-7	4.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-9	3.4	40	97	10	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	C-18	6.0	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-19	2.0	41	41	21	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-21	2.8	21	21	21	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-22	71.3	60	60	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-23.1	9.1	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-29	16.3	60	60	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-1	7.9	21	21	21	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	D-4	3.5	41	41	70	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	D-24	15.8	40	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
Brasher SF (SL 5)	A-10.2	5.1	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-10.3	4.3	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.G. - Land Management Action Schedule for Second Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	A-11	4.6	70	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	A-12	13.4	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	A-21	31.3	10	10	10	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-12.1	16.2	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-12.2	4.3	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	C-14.5	45.3	31	31	31	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-18	7.3	21	21	21	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-19	26.0	60	60	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-1.1	72.8	12	12	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	D-1.2	16.9	12	12	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	D-1.3	10.1	12	12	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	D-14.1	23.9	60	60	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-14.2	4.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-15	1.2	42	42	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-18.1	8.3	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	D-19	5.5	40	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	D-20	0.6	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	D-21	2.2	41	41	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	F-2	4.1	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	F-6	9.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	F-7	5.6	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.G. - Land Management Action Schedule for Second Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	F-9	8.6	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RG
	F-10	5.7	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	F-11	23.4	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	F-13	7.4	47	47	47	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	F-14	4.8	32	32	32	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	G-1.1	21.0	12	12	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	G-1.2	10.3	21	21	21	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	G-1.3	9.9	12	12	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	G-2	15.0	12	12	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	G-3	1.6	12	12	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	G-5	5.0	12	12	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	G-6	4.3	32	32	32	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	G-7.1	7.3	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	G-7.2	3.2	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	G-8	23.2	60	60	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	G-9	11.9	64	64	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	G-12.1	8.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	G-13.2	2.8	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
Brasher SF (SL 6)	B-3.1	11.0	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-3.2	34.4	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.G. - Land Management Action Schedule for Second Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	B-4.1	22.0	12	12	12	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-4.2	15.7	25	25	25	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-9	6.2	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-27.1	20.7	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	B-27.2	35.0	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	B-29.1	10.7	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-29.2	16.5	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-29.3	5.1	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-29.4	7.9	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-30	2.8	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-31	4.4	53	53	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-32	7.9	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-50	13.2	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-54	12.7	60	60	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-65.3	16.8	63	63	63	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-69.2	14.8	49	49	49	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-71	7.5	10	10	10	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-100	24.4	60	60	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-7	5.3	46	46	71	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-8	46.5	60	60	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-9.1	15.2	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.G. - Land Management Action Schedule for Second Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	C-10	8.1	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-20	5.8	68	68	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-25	21.0	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-26	26.4	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	C-27	35.9	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-29.1	13.8	63	63	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-29.2	3.3	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-33.1	2.7	12	12	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-33.2	4.6	70	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-34	2.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-35	8.6	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	C-36	5.8	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-37	7.8	46	46	71	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-38	5.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-39.1	10.2	40	40	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-39.2	3.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-53	18.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-21.1	26.5	14	14	10	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	D-21.3	6.1	14	14	10	T-EA	T-UE	TH
Brasher SF (SL 7)	None							

Table III.G. - Land Management Action Schedule for Second Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
Brasher SF (SL 10)	C-1	18.4	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-6	6.5	61	61	71	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-7	15.3	70	70	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-9	18.7	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-10	7.5	71	71	71	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-11.1	3.6	10	10	10	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-11.2	9.2	10	10	10	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-15	6.7	70	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-23	2.0	70	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-31	18.5	60	60	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-32	18.2	60	60	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-34	5.8	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-39	12.7	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-41.2	12.0	70	70	70	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-58	39.8	70	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-60	2.0	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	E-2	5.0	68	68	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	E-24.1	36.3	25	25	25	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	E-40	5.7	70	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
Brasher SF (SL 17)	A-14.2	3.5	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH

Table III.G. - Land Management Action Schedule for Second Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	B-24.1	4.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-24.2	2.7	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-26	5.9	12	12	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
Buckton SF (SL 31)	C-1.2	12.9	10	10	10	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-5	16.3	10	10	10	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-6	3.0	45	45	71	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-7	1.0	46	46	71	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-9	7.5	10	10	10	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-12	6.2	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-13.1	52.6	19	19	19	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-13.2	10.5	11	11	11	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-19	15.2	11	11	11	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-21	2.1	21	21	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-22	3.3	12	12	12	T-UE	T-UE	TH
Fort Jackson SF (SL 22)	A-23.1	12.8	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	A-23.2	10.0	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	A-23.3	3.7	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	A-24	6.0	11	11	11	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	A-26	25.6	10	10	10	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	A-49	48.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH

Table III.G. - Land Management Action Schedule for Second Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	B-2	6.6	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-4	36.9	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-5	7.6	14	14	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-9	6.1	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-10	6.9	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	B-15	12.7	42	42	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-18	11.5	21	21	12	T-EA	T-UE	TH
Grantville SF (SL 15)	B-2	2.5	99	99	99	WL	WL	HM
Knapp Station SF (SL 11)	C-8	44.6	14	14	11	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-16	4.8	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	C-18	21.6	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	C-19	19.1	47	47	47	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-20	6.9	11	11	11	T-UE	T-UE	TH
	C-22	16.1	40	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	C-23	3.6	14	14	10	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	C-24	10.4	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
Lost Nation SF (SL 9)	A-11	5.4	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	A-15.1	20.1	32	32	32	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	A-15.2	6.2	32	32	32	T-EA	T-EA	TH

Table III.G. - Land Management Action Schedule for Second Five-Year Period **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type			Management Category		Treatment Type
			Current	Post Treatment	Future	Current	Future	
	A-19	9.3	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
	A-20.1	19.6	40	70	T-EA	T-EA	T-EA	TH
	B-35.1	52.6	41	41	70	T-EA	T-UE	TH
	B-45.1	17.1	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
Raymondville SF (SL 33)	None							
Sodom SF (SL 25)	None							
Southville SF (SL 23)	B-4	38.6	42	70	70	T-EA	T-EA	RL
Total Yrs 6-10		2,127.5						

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
Bombay SF (FR 2)	A-1	9.9	41	70	T-UE
	A-3	13.3	41	70	T-UE
	A-8	22.3	21	21	T-UE
	A-20	13.9	26	70	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	A-21	13.1	21	21	T-UE
	A-27	3.0	25	25	T-EA
	A-32	19.0	10	10	T-EA
	A-37	6.1	12	12	T-EA
	A-40	33.8	10	10	T-EA
	A-41	10.1	32	32	T-EA
	A-47	20.0	25	25	T-EA
	A-48	5.2	10	10	T-EA
	B-6	109.0	32	32	T-EA
	B-11	3.2	40	40	T-EA
	C-3	106.3	10	10	T-EA
	C-4	4.3	12	12	T-UE
	C-5	10.6	40	70	T-EA
	C-6	15.7	21	21	T-UE
	C-17	9.7	40	70	T-EA
	C-19	11.0	42	42	T-EA
Bombay SF (FR 4)	None				
Brasher SF (SL 1)	A-1	11.5	41	70	T-EA
	A-3	3.8	41	70	T-UE
	A-4	12.6	60	70	T-UE
	A-6.1	10.9	41	70	T-UE
	A-12	3.3	40	70	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	A-14	13.6	60	70	T-UE
	A-15	14.4	40	70	T-EA
	A-23	6.2	20	20	T-UE
	A-25.1	11.7	41	70	T-UE
	A-25.2	2.8	41	70	T-UE
	A-26.1	8.5	41	70	T-UE
	A-26.2	10.3	41	70	T-UE
	A-27	8.6	21	21	T-EA
	A-29	2.1	12	12	T-UE
	A-36	51.0	63	63	T-UE
	A-40.1	88.9	41	70	T-UE
	A-41	1.7	32	32	T-EA
	B-1	7.5	10	10	T-EA
	B-3.1	12.7	40	70	T-EA
	B-3.4	6.9	40	70	T-EA
	B-4.1	12.0	41	70	T-UE
	B-4.2	3.5	41	70	T-UE
	B-8	2.8	99	99	WL
	B-10	2.7	40	40	T-EA
	B-11	17.7	41	70	T-UE
	B-14	6.3	40	40	T-EA
	B-16	4.6	32	32	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	B-19	2.3	10	10	T-EA
	C-10	56.2	12	12	T-UE
	C-15	33.2	12	12	T-UE
	C-16	7.1	25	25	T-EA
	C-17	11.8	32	32	T-EA
	C-20	44.0	12	12	T-UE
	C-26	24.3	41	41	T-UE
	C-30	7.6	41	70	T-UE
	C-31	56.0	41	70	T-UE
	C-33	10.1	41	41	T-UE
	C-35	13.8	40	40	T-EA
	C-36	8.9	41	70	T-UE
	C-40	0.8	32	32	T-EA
	D-10	6.5	10	10	T-EA
	D-11.1	7.7	10	10	T-EA
	D-11.2	2.9	11	11	T-UE
	D-12	20.2	10	10	T-EA
	D-15	26.6	10	10	T-EA
	D-16.1	15.2	10	10	T-EA
	D-16.2	3.4	10	10	T-EA
	D-18	52.7	12	12	T-UE
	D-29	3.2	41	41	T-UE

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	D-36	1.4	97	10	T-EA
	E-2	23.8	41	70	T-UE
	E-5.1	4.2	10	10	T-EA
	E-5.2	5.0	10	10	T-EA
	E-6	7.6	32	32	T-EA
	E-7	6.7	46	46	T-UE
	E-8	5.0	10	10	T-EA
	E-9	22.3	11	11	T-UE
	E-10	36.6	11	11	T-UE
	E-12.1	85.5	10	10	T-EA
	E-34.3	1.9	32	32	T-EA
	E-36	27.2	25	25	T-EA
Brasher SF (SL 5)	A-1.1	39.9	97	10	T-EA
	A-1.2	38.7	60	60	T-UE
	A-1.3	1.9	40	70	T-EA
	A-2	6.2	30	30	T-UE
	A-5	4.7	46	46	T-UE
	A-6	11.0	40	70	T-EA
	A-9	5.0	98	70	T-EA
	A-10.1	30.7	41	70	T-UE
	A-14	39.4	63	63	T-UE
	A-15	8.5	68	68	T-UE

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	A-16	8.6	45	45	T-UE
	A-17.1	71.9	10	10	T-EA
	A-18.1	5.0	49	49	T-EA
	A-18.2	3.4	49	49	T-EA
	B-4.1	96.7	11	11	T-UE
	B-6	40.0	10	10	T-EA
	B-13	56.3	11	11	T-UE
	C-7.2	16.3	11	11	T-UE
	C-15.1	46.4	60	60	T-EA
	C-15.2	1.9	40	70	T-EA
	C-15.3	1.7	40	70	T-EA
	C-20.1	28.3	12	12	T-UE
	C-20.2	6.4	32	32	T-EA
	C-26	7.3	12	12	T-UE
	D-6.1	24.5	41	70	T-UE
	D-6.2	9.1	41	70	T-UE
	D-10	4.6	10	10	T-EA
	F-3	10.4	42	70	T-EA
	F-12	4.3	25	25	T-EA
	F-18	16.4	49	49	T-EA
	F-21	4.1	46	46	T-UE
	G-15	6.4	41	70	T-UE

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	G-18	16.3	60	70	T-EA
	G-25	33.3	40	70	T-EA
Brasher SF (SL 6)	A-3	64.4	10	10	T-EA
	A-5	3.0	42	70	T-EA
	A-6	9.0	41	41	T-UE
	A-7	11.8	12	12	T-UE
	A-8	32.4	42	70	T-EA
	A-9	4.3	41	41	T-EA
	A-16	141.1	11	11	T-UE
	B-7	4.9	32	32	T-EA
	B-16.1	1.9	41	70	T-UE
	B-16.2	2.7	40	70	T-EA
	B-21.1	7.3	14	14	T-UE
	B-26.1	23.1	97	31	T-EA
	B-26.2	2.7	97	31	T-EA
	B-33	9.0	40	70	T-EA
	B-34	3.3	40	70	T-EA
	B-37	5.5	42	70	T-EA
	B-44	4.1	12	12	T-UE
	B-45.1	22.4	60	70	T-UE
	B-45.2	7.5	40	70	T-EA
	B-61	13.3	60	70	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	B-62	26.4	60	70	T-EA
	B-65.2	34.0	63	63	T-UE
	B-70	69.0	41	70	T-UE
	B-81.1	11.9	41	70	T-UE
	B-81.2	8.5	41	70	T-UE
	B-83	17.8	63	63	T-UE
	B-84	11.4	42	70	T-EA
	B-85	2.6	53	70	T-EA
	B-86	2.5	40	70	T-EA
	B-92	21.4	41	70	T-UE
	B-94	13.5	41	70	T-UE
	B-96.1	15.8	40	70	T-EA
	B-96.2	3.8	10	10	T-EA
	B-98	41.1	40	70	T-EA
	C-5.1	19.6	60	70	T-EA
	C-13.1	50.2	60	70	T-EA
	C-13.2	7.5	40	70	T-EA
	C-51	16.7	41	70	T-UE
	C-52	40.9	60	70	T-EA
	D-1	16.5	41	70	T-UE
	D-5	29.7	41	70	T-UE
	D-19	23.1	10	10	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	E-1.1	4.6	41	70	T-UE
	E-1.2	7.3	41	70	T-UE
	E-1.3	4.6	41	70	T-UE
Brasher SF (SL 7)	B-4	20.2	46	71	T-UE
	B-7.1	12.9	46	71	T-UE
	B-7.2	5.7	46	71	T-UE
	B-9.1	10.7	46	71	T-UE
	B-9.2	4.9	46	71	T-UE
	B-11	1.5	99	99	WL
	C-7.2	9.4	10	10	T-EA
	C-8.1	22.9	10	10	T-EA
	C-9	5.0	10	10	T-EA
	C-10	24.0	41	70	T-UE
	C-13	5.8	48	48	T-EA
	C-15	30.9	41	70	T-UE
	C-18	4.5	49	49	T-EA
	C-21	25.5	41	70	T-UE
	C-22	16.1	40	70	T-EA
	C-23	13.1	63	63	T-UE
	C-24.3	6.2	25	25	T-EA
	C-28	16.8	25	25	T-EA
	C-35	26.2	61	61	T-UE

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	D-23	6.5	46	71	T-UE
	D-29	81.2	63	63	T-UE
	D-46	10.9	60	70	T-EA
	D-57	7.6	49	49	T-EA
Brasher SF (SL 10)	A-1	84.5	68	70	T-EA
	A-2	4.9	32	32	T-EA
	A-13	22.3	60	70	T-EA
	A-15	4.3	32	32	T-EA
	A-16	23.0	68	70	T-EA
	A-17	4.4	71	71	T-EA
	A-18	3.1	68	70	T-EA
	A-21	5.2	60	70	T-EA
	A-23	4.4	68	70	T-EA
	A-24	13.4	68	70	T-EA
	A-25	18.3	70	70	T-UE
	A-32.1	16.8	41	70	T-UE
	A-36	18.8	32	32	T-EA
	B-1	16.6	60	70	T-EA
	B-4.2	4.2	15	15	T-EA
	B-7	10.2	68	70	T-EA
	B-8	16.6	63	63	T-UE
	B-9	8.8	42	70	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	B-14	13.0	40	70	T-EA
	B-15	14.8	12	12	T-UE
	B-17.1	37.9	41	70	T-UE
	B-17.2	5.1	41	70	T-UE
	B-17.3	8.3	41	70	T-UE
	B-18.1	10.2	70	70	T-UE
	B-18.2	2.9	70	70	T-UE
	B-24	15.3	41	70	T-UE
	B-28	12.7	11	11	T-UE
	B-30.1	41.9	12	12	T-UE
	B-30.2	6.3	40	70	T-EA
	B-30.3	24.3	12	12	T-UE
	B-30.4	5.3	98	98	WL
	C-8.1	21.1	32	32	T-EA
	C-22	6.7	10	10	T-EA
	C-26.1	55.0	40	70	T-EA
	C-28	6.0	40	70	T-EA
	C-29	9.1	97	31	WL
	C-30	7.4	70	70	T-EA
	C-33.2	6.1	32	32	T-EA
	C-37	9.3	40	70	T-EA
	C-38	8.1	70	70	T-UE

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	C-41.1	6.3	60	70	T-EA
	C-47.1	6.5	40	70	T-EA
	C-47.2	4.8	40	70	T-EA
	C-49.1	2.1	68	70	T-UE
	C-49.2	2.1	70	70	T-UE
	C-51	4.2	40	70	T-EA
	C-53	7.9	41	70	T-UE
	C-57	9.8	32	32	T-EA
	D-2.1	23.6	41	70	T-UE
	D-3	24.6	70	70	T-UE
	D-4	2.9	97	70	WL
	D-5.2	2.4	63	71	T-UE
	D-10	2.7	68	68	T-UE
	D-18	10.8	70	70	T-UE
	D-19	22.6	70	70	T-EA
	D-20.1	9.3	12	12	T-UE
	D-32	11.2	60	70	T-UE
	D-34	4.3	12	12	T-UE
	D-36	36.6	12	12	T-UE
	D-43	4.4	70	70	T-EA
	E-5	4.7	41	70	T-UE
	E-6	6.1	41	70	T-UE

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	E-7	6.9	60	70	T-UE
	E-8	7.6	32	32	T-EA
	E-19	6.0	41	70	T-UE
	E-20	10.6	41	70	T-UE
	E-21.1	23.0	32	32	T-EA
	E-21.2	8.8	12	12	T-UE
	E-22	9.6	32	32	T-EA
	E-23.1	13.7	70	70	T-EA
	E-23.2	8.2	31	31	WL
	E-23.3	5.5	12	12	T-UE
	E-23.4	3.2	70	70	T-EA
	E-31.1	54.2	10	10	T-EA
	E-31.2	18.7	31	31	WL
	E-36	8.2	10	10	T-UE
Brasher SF (SL 17)	A-1.1	5.2	70	70	T-EA
	A-1.2	3.2	40	70	T-EA
	A-6.1	6.5	25	25	T-EA
	A-6.2	1.7	40	70	T-EA
	A-7	4.4	15	15	T-EA
	A-8	6.0	41	70	T-UE
	A-9	34.7	12	12	T-UE
	A-10.1	14.3	12	12	T-UE

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	A-10.2	2.8	12	12	T-UE
	A-11	18.4	70	70	T-EA
	A-14.1	7.6	41	70	T-UE
	A-20	4.8	12	12	T-UE
	A-21.1	5.7	41	70	T-UE
	A-21.2	3.8	41	70	T-UE
	A-23	3.0	21	12	T-UE
	A-24	3.1	21	12	T-UE
	A-26	3.4	40	70	T-EA
	A-27	4.9	21	21	T-UE
	A-37	6.6	41	70	T-UE
	B-13	25.0	60	70	T-EA
	B-14.1	19.4	60	70	T-EA
	B-19.1	6.7	12	12	T-UE
	B-23	4.4	41	70	T-UE
	B-25	29.7	13	13	WL
	B-27	3.6	12	12	T-UE
	B-28.2	5.3	25	25	T-EA
	B-32.1	4.2	10	10	T-EA
	B-33.1	24.9	12	12	T-UE
	B-33.2	19.5	10	10	T-EA
	B-34	10.9	40	70	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	B-36	12.5	41	70	T-UE
Buckton SF (SL 31)	A-9	3.0	41	70	T-UE
	A-11	1.3	99	99	WL
	A-14	0.9	40	70	T-EA
	A-16	1.9	41	70	T-UE
	A-19	1.0	40	70	T-EA
	B-2	24.2	11	11	T-UE
	D-6	16.2	10	10	T-EA
	D-8	10.3	40	70	T-EA
	D-13	12.0	40	70	T-EA
	D-16	1.9	32	32	T-EA
	D-17	12.6	10	10	T-UE
Fort Jackson SF (SL 22)	A-2.1	10.9	14	11	T-UE
	A-2.3	2.7	32	32	T-EA
	A-3	7.0	32	32	T-EA
	A-17.2	6.6	11	11	T-UE
	A-18	4.0	40	70	T-EA
	A-19	15.6	11	11	T-UE
	A-22	3.2	10	10	T-EA
	A-33	11.0	11	11	T-UE
	A-37.1	23.4	40	70	T-EA
	A-37.2	1.3	40	70	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	A-44.1	7.7	68	70	T-UE
	A-46	12.0	98	70	WL
	A-47	25.2	98	70	WL
	A-48	86.9	98	70	WL
	A-50	2.7	97	31	WL
	A-52	27.1	40	70	T-EA
	A-54	27.9	40	70	T-EA
	B-8	24.4	10	10	T-EA
	B-14	45.3	11	11	T-UE
Grantville SF (SL 15)	A-3	20.1	12	12	T-UE
	A-5	3.1	10	10	T-EA
	A-7	9.4	70	70	T-EA
	A-8	15.7	70	70	T-EA
	A-15	14.9	41	70	T-UE
	A-17.1	13.0	12	12	T-UE
	A-17.2	7.1	12	12	T-UE
	A-18	10.0	98	70	WL
	A-20.1	4.7	63	63	T-UE
	A-25	7.5	63	63	T-UE
	A-28	11.2	70	70	T-EA
	B-1	26.2	70	70	T-EA
	B-3	18.6	15	15	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
Knapp Station SF (SL 11)	A-3	14.9	40	70	T-EA
	B-1	4.1	42	70	T-EA
	B-2.1	5.2	40	70	T-EA
	B-2.2	3.2	40	70	T-EA
	B-5	11.5	46	71	T-UE
	B-6	64.6	41	41	T-UE
	B-10	11.8	15	15	T-EA
	C-9.1	14.7	15	15	T-EA
	C-15	11.6	10	10	T-UE
Lost Nation SF (SL 9)	A-1.2	6.5	41	70	T-UE
	A-10	43.8	41	70	T-UE
	A-13	24.6	11	11	T-UE
	A-18	96.7	25	25	T-EA
	A-26	10.5	21	21	T-UE
	A-29	5.0	41	41	T-UE
	A-31	12.5	41	41	T-UE
	A-32	13.8	41	41	T-UE
	A-36	30.6	41	70	T-UE
	A-40	26.4	12	12	T-UE
	B-8	9.8	10	10	T-EA
	B-10	23.7	60	70	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	B-21	13.8	41	70	T-UE
	B-26.1	3.0	40	70	T-EA
	B-26.2	2.6	40	70	T-EA
	B-29.1	5.5	10	10	T-EA
	B-30	9.4	98	70	WL
	B-31	26.8	41	70	T-UE
	B-32	8.3	98	70	WL
	B-33	19.6	41	70	T-UE
	B-35.2	4.1	41	70	T-UE
	B-37	2.5	41	70	T-UE
	B-40	64.2	41	70	T-UE
	B-50	43.4	40	70	T-EA
	C-1.1	12.0	41	70	T-UE
	C-1.2	11.8	41	70	T-UE
	C-1.3	6.3	41	70	T-UE
	C-1.4	7.1	41	70	T-UE
	C-2.1	4.4	46	71	T-UE
	C-15	15.7	12	12	T-UE
	C-17	16.9	25	25	T-EA
	C-21.1	19.5	12	12	T-UE
	C-23	7.0	10	10	T-UE
	C-24	5.9	40	70	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	C-30	2.9	32	32	T-EA
	C-38	13.1	10	10	T-EA
	C-39	15.6	41	70	T-UE
	C-54	9.2	45	71	T-UE
Raymondville SF (SL 33)	A-17.1	10.9	10	10	T-EA
	A-17.2	27.6	10	10	T-EA
	A-19	6.9	42	70	T-EA
	A-23	3.8	42	70	T-EA
	A-24	20.5	32	32	T-EA
	A-27	17.2	25	25	T-EA
	A-28	30.0	40	70	T-EA
	A-29	3.8	70	70	T-EA
	A-30	48.8	10	10	T-UE
	A-39	9.5	40	70	T-EA
	A-40	10.6	46	71	T-UE
	A-41	3.8	32	32	T-EA
Sodom SF (SL 25)	A-17	12.9	70	70	T-UE
	B-1.1	79.9	32	32	T-UE
	B-1.4	4.3	60	70	T-UE
	B-3	2.9	10	10	T-EA
	B-4	12.0	40	70	T-EA

***Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years* (by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	B-5.1	13.7	10	10	T-EA
	B-8	8.6	32	32	T-EA
	B-11	29.5	42	70	T-EA
	B-12	9.6	46	71	T-UE
	B-16	8.2	32	32	T-UE
	B-20	5.2	40	70	T-EA
	C-4	39.8	32	32	T-EA
	C-5	5.9	32	32	T-EA
	C-12	15.4	12	12	T-UE
	C-13.1	16.9	32	32	T-EA
	C-14	40.7	12	12	T-UE
Southville SF (SL 23)	A-5.1	18.3	70	10	T-EA
	A-5.2	8.1	42	70	T-EA
	A-6.1	50.1	10	10	T-EA
	A-6.2	26.9	15	15	T-EA
	A-8	11.5	10	10	T-EA
	A-10	11.2	70	11	T-UE
	A-11	30.3	11	11	T-UE
	A-13	12.9	10	10	T-EA
	A-14	2.7	10	10	T-EA
	A-17	4.0	42	70	T-EA
	A-18	6.9	42	70	T-EA

Table III.H. - Stands without Scheduled Management within 10 Years **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type		Future Management
			Current	Future	
	A-20	38.2	42	70	T-EA
	B-3	9.5	11	11	T-UE
	B-5	44.9	11	11	T-UE
	B-6	3.6	11	11	T-UE

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
Bombay SF (FR 2)	A-2	5.9	46
	A-4	8.8	99
	A-5	2.2	15
	A-6	17.5	25
	A-7	5.7	46
	A-9	2.3	25
	A-10	1.4	10
	A-11	5.0	99
	A-12	9.9	15
	A-13	3.0	49
	A-14	17.0	99
	A-15	10.6	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	A-16	2.6	25
	A-17	17.0	97
	A-18	7.4	99
	A-19	5.4	32
	A-22	8.4	71
	A-23	10.6	25
	A-24	18.2	32
	A-26	20.9	71
	A-28	6.0	32
	A-29	6.7	25
	A-30	23.5	32
	A-31	8.1	25
	A-35	6.7	24
	A-36	15.0	15
	A-38	20.9	32
	A-39	20.8	25
	A-43	2.9	46
	A-44	17.7	13
	A-45	9.4	32
	A-46	35.9	25
	A-49	14.2	99
	A-711	12.5	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-1	7.6	32
	B-2	4.0	32
	B-3	13.5	97
	B-4	12.0	99
	B-5	111.5	32
	B-7	53.3	23
	B-8	80.9	32
	B-9	47.2	15
	B-10	68.9	32
	B-711	6.6	99
	C-1	85.0	32
	C-2	15.3	99
	C-7	8.6	40
	C-8	18.0	99
	C-9	18.2	99
	C-10	14.5	15
	C-11	38.8	32
	C-12	171.7	32
	C-13	16.1	21
	C-15	17.0	99
	C-16	154.8	14
	C-18	75.1	32

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-711	12.3	99
Bombay SF (FR 4)	A-1	7.2	25
	A-2	8.0	25
	A-3	14.3	41
	A-4	7.7	49
	A-5	19.3	25
	A-6	14.0	99
	A-7	7.0	15
	A-8	12.6	14
	A-9	9.3	12
	A-10	172.8	99
	A-11	8.3	99
	A-12	10.6	99
	A-13	17.5	15
	A-14	26.8	41
	A-15	57.3	99
	A-16	122.1	70
	A-17	111.4	32
	A-18	23.0	15
	A-19	49.8	99
	A-20	36.3	41
	A-21	26.6	41

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	A-711	1.4	99
Brasher SF (SL 1)	A-2	4.2	41
	A-5	27.6	99
	A-6.2	20.7	12
	A-6.3	2.7	41
	A-6.4	4.4	99
	A-6.5	2.6	41
	A-7	6.2	41
	A-8	9.6	12
	A-9	2.8	97
	A-10	10.7	63
	A-11	3.6	97
	A-13	2.2	12
	A-16.1	6.2	99
	A-16.2	7.4	99
	A-17	3.8	32
	A-18	45.5	99
	A-21	5.5	97
	A-24	3.3	97
	A-26.3	1.6	97
	A-28	1.6	99
	A-30	5.3	12

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	A-31.1	32.9	41
	A-31.2	2.8	12
	A-32	3.4	21
	A-33	3.3	99
	A-34	14.1	41
	A-35	0.8	99
	A-37	3.9	99
	A-38	0.8	99
	A-39	4.1	99
	A-40.2	10.7	12
	A-40.3	4.0	15
	A-42	4.5	12
	A-43	73.6	99
	A-711	3.9	99
	B-2	1.0	32
	B-3.2	13.3	97
	B-3.3	9.8	97
	B-5	4.9	99
	B-6.1	51.0	15
	B-6.2	8.5	99
	B-7	18.5	46
	B-9	8.2	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-12.2	6.1	41
	B-13	2.5	99
	B-15	15.3	11
	B-18	3.6	44
	B-20.1	19.2	32
	B-20.2	3.2	15
	B-21	83.7	99
	B-22	7.4	60
	B-23	59.4	15
	B-24.1	106.1	14
	B-24.2	144.8	12
	B-28	19.5	99
	B-29	2.1	40
	B-30	2.0	30
	B-31	13.7	32
	B-32	7.9	21
	B-33	20.7	21
	B-711	10.0	99
	B-920	3.0	99
	C-1	10.9	11
	C-2	3.2	32
	C-3.1	4.0	21

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-3.2	5.7	21
	C-4	123.8	99
	C-5	12.9	12
	C-6.2	1.4	32
	C-8.1	23.1	12
	C-8.2	15.9	97
	C-11	1.6	12
	C-12	5.6	12
	C-13	5.4	41
	C-14.2	1.7	41
	C-23.2	3.0	41
	C-24	4.4	41
	C-25	9.2	99
	C-27	3.2	41
	C-28	11.0	99
	C-32.1	14.7	15
	C-32.2	8.1	32
	C-34	9.5	32
	C-37	20.4	99
	C-38.3	2.3	41
	C-39	3.1	41
	C-41	9.2	12

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-42	10.9	10
	C-43	24.9	12
	C-711	7.7	99
	D-2	83.2	32
	D-3	3.6	41
	D-5	5.3	99
	D-8.1	116.6	99
	D-8.2	6.1	99
	D-8.3	9.0	99
	D-8.4	20.7	99
	D-9	17.0	12
	D-13.1	27.8	32
	D-13.2	5.7	11
	D-14.0	11.0	54
	D-17	3.4	54
	D-19	6.9	99
	D-20	14.6	99
	D-21	21.9	99
	D-22	6.4	32
	D-23	61.3	99
	D-25	8.7	99
	D-26	11.0	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	D-27	6.8	26
	D-28	1.7	42
	D-29	3.2	41
	D-30.1	49.8	25
	D-30.2	10.3	99
	D-31	1.2	21
	D-32	6.4	12
	D-38	68.3	99
	D-711	13.5	99
	E-3	3.5	25
	E-4	14.5	32
	E-11	9.4	32
	E-12.2	11.8	10
	E-13	6.6	15
	E-15	32.0	25
	E-17.1	47.1	46
	E-17.2	26.6	15
	E-18	60.3	15
	E-19	2.5	40
	E-20	16.7	13
	E-21	20.8	49
	E-22	11.7	10

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	E-23	35.2	41
	E-24	9.6	40
	E-25.1	9.5	15
	E-25.2	5.0	15
	E-26	23.8	32
	E-29	10.3	13
	E-30.1	33.8	15
	E-30.2	24.6	97
	E-30.3	1.2	32
	E-34.1	24.7	15
	E-34.2	3.8	32
	E-38	4.7	97
	E-40	57.2	25
	E-41	2.6	10
	E-42.1	65.9	32
	E-42.2	48.4	25
	E-42.3	8.2	32
	E-42.4	16.6	32
	E-42.5	48.1	25
	E-43	20.0	99
	E-44.1	3.7	41
	E-44.2	1.2	41

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	E-45	26.4	99
	E-48	9.2	32
	E-49	69.8	13
	E-50	136.7	99
	E-51	193.9	99
	E-52	2.1	40
	E-53	8.7	99
	E-711	7.4	99
Brasher SF (SL 5)	A-3	24.7	99
	A-4	8.8	99
	A-7	50.7	13
	A-8	26.0	97
	A-13	27.4	99
	A-17.2	1.5	97
	A-19	8.5	99
	A-20.1	19.9	70
	A-20.2	1.9	99
	A-711	4.5	99
	B-1.1	89.6	99
	B-1.2	5.3	99
	B-2	7.8	12
	B-3	3.8	12

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-4.2	56.6	11
	B-5	1.9	10
	B-7	1.1	45
	B-9	6.3	11
	B-11	5.6	11
	B-12.1	8.5	32
	B-12.2	10.6	32
	B-14	12.5	99
	B-15	3.1	46
	B-16	8.9	15
	B-17	32.0	14
	B-19	1.3	54
	B-22	3.9	97
	B-24.1	14.0	12
	B-24.2	6.2	15
	B-26	14.4	13
	B-27	2.8	11
	B-31	3.8	32
	B-34	1.9	32
	B-35.1	8.3	99
	B-35.2	6.0	32
	B-36.1	15.2	63

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-36.2	5.2	46
	B-37.2	2.6	40
	B-41	2.7	32
	B-42	5.8	99
	B-44	49.9	99
	B-45	55.9	99
	B-46.1	10.2	15
	B-46.2	1.7	12
	B-47	11.9	99
	B-711	13.6	99
	C-4.1	3.1	32
	C-4.2	2.9	25
	C-4.3	2.2	99
	C-4.4	9.4	41
	C-5.2	2.6	98
	C-7.1	20.3	32
	C-8	39.5	99
	C-9	30.2	97
	C-11.1	15.2	31
	C-11.2	3.0	99
	C-11.3	3.4	97
	C-13	52.5	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-14.1	1.0	10
	C-14.2	11.8	97
	C-14.3	33.0	11
	C-14.4	13.8	32
	C-16	5.5	97
	C-17	6.1	12
	C-24	8.5	99
	C-25.2	4.8	42
	C-27	30.4	11
	C-711	8.9	99
	C-720	2.5	99
	C-910	9.4	99
	D-1.4	5.3	12
	D-1.5	3.3	99
	D-2	2.1	10
	D-3	3.7	25
	D-4.1	16.3	12
	D-4.2	2.7	99
	D-5	3.9	46
	D-6.3	1.2	41
	D-7	32.1	99
	D-8	1.6	25

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	D-9.1	5.6	45
	D-9.2	5.3	45
	D-11	3.2	32
	D-12	7.1	15
	D-13	23.5	11
	D-16	5.1	25
	D-17	2.4	97
	D-18.2	1.3	42
	D-711	4.7	99
	E-1	25.1	12
	E-6	2.6	25
	E-7	3.5	15
	E-8	4.5	32
	E-9.1	13.9	12
	E-9.2	9.9	12
	E-10.1	15.0	99
	E-10.2	2.0	99
	E-11	1.7	12
	E-12	3.0	25
	E-711	0.2	99
	F-1	13.1	12
	F-4	1.1	46

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	F-5	11.7	99
	F-8.1	13.7	15
	F-8.2	2.3	99
	F-8.3	6.1	32
	F-8.4	3.8	15
	F-8.5	3.6	25
	F-15	6.7	25
	F-16	2.3	49
	F-19	10.8	15
	F-20.1	6.1	99
	F-20.2	2.4	97
	F-22.1	32.7	25
	F-22.2	1.0	99
	F-23	12.9	49
	F-24	6.1	99
	F-26	7.0	99
	F-29	2.4	40
	F-32	69.4	25
	F-33	4.4	40
	F-34	3.8	15
	F-35	21.5	25
	F-36	1.5	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	F-37	121.1	99
	F-711	6.9	99
	F-920	4.7	99
	G-4	11.0	99
	G-10	16.6	12
	G-11	2.2	10
	G-12.2	8.5	41
	G-13.1	13.1	60
	G-14	3.3	15
	G-16	5.6	32
	G-17	2.8	25
	G-20	0.5	41
	G-24	35.7	25
	G-26	66.8	99
	G-27	17.5	41
	G-920	2.7	99
Brasher SF (SL 6)	A-1	4.7	11
	A-10	12.7	32
	A-711	4.4	99
	A-722	0.4	99
	B-1	4.2	25
	B-2	14.8	12

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-4.3	3.7	25
	B-5	12.0	12
	B-6	4.5	41
	B-8	43.7	15
	B-11.1	17.2	41
	B-11.2	8.7	41
	B-14	1.2	41
	B-15	19.4	32
	B-17	56.2	15
	B-18	10.3	14
	B-19	33.2	15
	B-20	5.5	41
	B-21.2	3.6	12
	B-23	7.1	21
	B-24	5.2	12
	B-25	1.1	41
	B-28	3.3	14
	B-35	28.8	32
	B-40	159.1	12
	B-43.1	16.2	13
	B-43.2	41.2	97
	B-43.3	8.6	32

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-46	22.0	46
	B-48	3.1	40
	B-49	11.0	12
	B-51	3.2	41
	B-53	177.3	12
	B-55	7.0	40
	B-57	2.6	99
	B-60	12.7	46
	B-63	4.0	97
	B-65.1	53.9	12
	B-66	4.2	46
	B-67.1	3.1	41
	B-67.2	5.6	21
	B-68	1.8	46
	B-69.1	2.1	41
	B-72	2.4	97
	B-75	1.8	25
	B-76	5.4	99
	B-77.2	2.8	25
	B-79	31.5	99
	B-82	5.4	12
	B-87	4.9	54

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-89.1	6.2	25
	B-89.2	2.6	32
	B-93	2.6	99
	B-97	9.7	32
	B-101	761.4	99
	B-711	35.7	99
	C-2	13.7	25
	C-4	42.6	99
	C-5.2	7.0	41
	C-6	70.4	99
	C-9.2	4.8	40
	C-15	34.6	97
	C-16	4.9	21
	C-19	1.9	40
	C-21.1	370.1	14
	C-21.2	5.2	10
	C-22	96.6	15
	C-23	2.8	40
	C-24	39.5	99
	C-28	10.7	12
	C-30	4.8	40
	C-40	2.8	32

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-41	1.4	40
	C-42	23.7	15
	C-43	13.4	12
	C-44	8.1	46
	C-45	35.7	25
	C-48	2.5	42
	C-49.1	15.5	99
	C-49.2	2.3	99
	C-50	23.8	10
	C-54	25.6	41
	C-711	13.8	99
	D-2	30.1	12
	D-3	27.6	12
	D-4	23.9	99
	D-7	9.4	99
	D-8	0.8	99
	D-11	5.1	99
	D-12	14.4	42
	D-14	45.3	12
	D-16	4.0	41
	D-17	9.3	46
	D-20.1	102.1	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	D-20.2	63.9	99
	D-20.3	9.5	99
	D-21.2	17.2	14
	D-22.2	5.1	15
	D-23	6.9	99
	D-24	2.1	46
	D-25	200.8	15
	D-26.1	30.9	15
	D-26.2	16.5	97
	D-28	19.6	12
	D-29	8.3	97
	D-30	26.6	99
	D-31.1	15.8	41
	D-31.2	3.7	25
	D-32	4.3	99
	D-33.1	18.1	25
	D-33.2	9.5	25
	D-34	3.1	25
	D-35	10.8	99
	D-36.1	20.2	15
	D-36.4	10.9	25
	D-38.3	4.2	40

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	D-41	3.9	10
	D-42	1.5	47
	D-44	7.8	42
	D-45.1	62.7	11
	D-45.2	2.8	25
	D-49	54.5	97
	D-50	6.4	97
	D-51	56.7	15
	D-711	3.5	99
	E-2	5.9	12
	E-3	2.4	99
	E-4.1	7.2	97
	E-4.2	4.8	99
	E-711	0.7	99
Brasher SF (SL 7)	B-1	9.3	11
	B-2	0.8	99
	B-5	8.0	99
	B-6	6.5	14
	B-9.3	1.5	46
	B-10	11.3	49
	B-12	2.2	41
	B-13.1	21.7	13

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-13.2	19.6	25
	B-13.3	32.9	25
	C-1	1.8	99
	C-2	5.5	32
	C-4	10.5	99
	C-5	2.7	99
	C-6	1.2	99
	C-7.3	3.6	15
	C-8.2	5.1	40
	C-14.1	15.3	64
	C-16	20.3	15
	C-19.1	48.0	99
	C-19.2	3.0	99
	C-20	1.0	32
	C-24.1	50.6	49
	C-24.2	2.3	32
	C-25	13.4	46
	C-30	105.8	99
	C-33.1	5.3	41
	C-33.2	5.6	41
	C-33.3	4.9	41
	C-34	39.2	13

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-36	57.9	12
	C-711	7.0	99
	D-8	3.7	60
	D-9	9.2	14
	D-10	4.1	99
	D-11	47.0	99
	D-12	15.2	14
	D-13	8.6	97
	D-14	7.8	40
	D-15.1	9.6	97
	D-15.2	12.8	99
	D-16.1	2.7	40
	D-16.2	6.3	46
	D-17.1	69.3	46
	D-17.2	12.6	46
	D-19	6.8	41
	D-20	21.4	32
	D-21	3.8	41
	D-22.1	16.3	99
	D-22.2	2.1	99
	D-22.3	2.2	97
	D-24.1	1.2	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	D-24.2	6.1	97
	D-26.1	24.2	46
	D-37	3.8	21
	D-40	30.9	25
	D-42	2.9	99
	D-44	9.2	32
	D-45	5.6	32
	D-47	3.6	99
	D-48	7.8	32
	D-49	23.4	11
	D-51	22.2	99
	D-52	38.1	15
	D-53	7.1	40
	D-54	23.1	15
	D-55.1	6.1	40
	D-55.2	2.5	40
	D-56.1	53.0	99
	D-56.2	1.6	99
	D-711	60.5	99
Brasher SF (SL 10)	A-3.1	6.3	32
	A-3.2	7.3	97
	A-4	26.6	97

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	A-5	9.0	71
	A-6	12.0	24
	A-7.1	23.2	32
	A-7.2	44.5	32
	A-8	3.0	12
	A-11	2.8	42
	A-12	17.0	99
	A-14	13.3	99
	A-22.1	11.0	99
	A-22.2	5.9	97
	A-26	2.0	32
	A-27	14.8	97
	A-28	5.1	25
	A-29	8.8	99
	A-32.2	3.1	41
	A-33	13.6	25
	A-34	2.6	15
	A-37	3.6	61
	A-38	5.6	97
	A-39	12.7	99
	A-711	2.4	99
	B-2	50.4	15

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-3	2.2	99
	B-4.1	56.3	15
	B-5	2.2	63
	B-6	32.1	99
	B-10.1	55.2	99
	B-10.2	11.7	99
	B-11	23.9	15
	B-16.1	14.1	15
	B-16.2	5.8	14
	B-16.3	47.5	15
	B-16.4	18.6	15
	B-16.5	8.3	97
	B-16.6	8.1	15
	B-19	22.7	99
	B-20	4.6	10
	B-21	13.8	99
	B-22	30.1	99
	B-25	16.6	99
	B-26	11.1	99
	B-27	9.8	32
	B-29	7.1	15
	B-30.5	7.0	10

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-32	42.0	15
	B-711	4.7	99
	C-2	2.6	31
	C-4	28.1	15
	C-8.2	7.4	32
	C-13	2.0	70
	C-14	16.6	32
	C-16	12.0	71
	C-17	15.6	99
	C-18	15.5	15
	C-20	7.4	32
	C-21	8.2	25
	C-24	7.2	14
	C-25.1	33.9	15
	C-25.2	112.7	15
	C-25.3	10.7	99
	C-25.4	3.9	97
	C-26.2	3.7	40
	C-27	28.4	15
	C-33.1	26.0	99
	C-36	7.3	40
	C-40	8.6	97

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-42	5.6	99
	C-43	6.0	70
	C-44.1	6.4	42
	C-44.2	2.0	42
	C-45	8.8	97
	C-46	10.8	15
	C-47.3	2.4	40
	C-48	2.1	42
	C-50	29.7	99
	C-52	6.6	15
	C-54	3.7	15
	C-56	17.2	99
	C-59	12.2	97
	C-711	9.7	99
	D-2.2	15.0	70
	D-5.1	97.0	70
	D-5.3	11.9	71
	D-6.1	39.1	97
	D-6.2	7.5	32
	D-7	2.1	42
	D-8	5.4	68
	D-9	28.3	15

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	D-13	8.1	15
	D-20.2	7.5	26
	D-21	36.8	99
	D-24	15.6	32
	D-25.2	2.5	40
	D-30	3.8	32
	D-31	2.0	12
	D-33	4.9	99
	D-35	4.1	97
	D-37	18.2	99
	D-38	31.5	15
	D-41	2.7	46
	D-42	3.4	15
	D-45	2.0	97
	D-46	13.8	70
	D-47	14.5	71
	D-52	75.1	99
	D-53	14.0	99
	D-54	14.9	99
	D-55	6.2	68
	D-56	2.4	32
	D-711	9.5	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	D-722	0.5	99
	D-920	20.8	99
	E-1	13.3	99
	E-9	2.4	97
	E-10	7.2	70
	E-12	5.7	99
	E-14.2	7.8	32
	E-17	10.3	15
	E-18	8.8	32
	E-21.3	8.5	15
	E-24.2	2.0	32
	E-24.3	2.6	32
	E-25	9.9	32
	E-27	4.7	97
	E-28	11.8	30
	E-29	3.5	32
	E-32.1	5.9	99
	E-32.2	3.1	99
	E-33	8.3	32
	E-39	10.0	15
	E-41	63.6	99
	E-42	5.2	70

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	E-43	64.1	97
	E-44	27.1	99
	E-45	21.8	99
	E-711	4.1	99
Brasher SF (SL 17)	A-2.1	13.7	13
	A-2.2	8.1	13
	A-3	18.9	12
	A-4	1.9	21
	A-5	1.9	12
	A-12	9.8	11
	A-13.1	5.9	12
	A-13.2	2.8	32
	A-16	3.4	15
	A-17	2.1	21
	A-30.1	1.0	14
	A-30.2	2.8	14
	A-31	6.3	41
	A-36	73.5	99
	A-38	1.9	32
	A-39	4.5	21
	A-711	5.9	99
	B-1	55.4	14

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-2	51.8	25
	B-14.3	0.6	99
	B-15	5.7	25
	B-18	10.8	11
	B-19.2	9.4	11
	B-20	9.3	12
	B-24.3	2.0	41
	B-28.1	10.2	11
	B-29	3.4	32
	B-30.1	4.3	32
	B-30.2	2.6	97
	B-31.1	7.2	21
	B-31.2	7.2	41
	B-32.2	1.6	12
	B-35	2.3	32
	B-711	7.1	99
	D-4	30.2	10
	D-5	16.4	21
	D-7	13.5	97
	D-8.1	16.8	60
	D-8.2	2.9	41
	D-9	20.0	14

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	D-10	2.1	99
	D-11	18.7	99
	D-12	13.8	97
Buckton SF (SL 31)	A-4.1	4.1	25
	A-4.2	3.6	99
	A-12	5.0	14
	A-13	16.4	11
	A-20	7.0	99
	A-21	17.2	11
	A-22	4.6	11
	A-711	4.3	99
	B-1	31.9	99
	B-3	3.4	41
	B-4	8.0	11
	B-5	4.7	97
	B-6	2.3	97
	B-7	24.9	99
	B-8	3.5	12
	B-11	34.0	11
	B-12	14.9	15
	B-13	13.9	99
	B-711	3.0	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-1.1	84.9	10
	C-2	19.3	10
	C-3.1	9.2	15
	C-3.2	10.5	15
	C-4	25.2	11
	C-8	2.7	99
	C-10	16.8	99
	C-11	3.7	99
	C-15.1	13.6	25
	C-15.2	9.9	99
	C-17	21.3	11
	C-18	3.4	99
	C-20	1.1	15
	C-23	10.0	99
	C-711	2.6	99
	D-1	3.0	25
	D-3	3.6	70
	D-4	2.4	25
	D-7	1.4	40
	D-9	12.1	14
	D-10	8.0	97
	D-12	11.5	32

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	D-15	14.4	32
	D-19	13.0	40
	D-20	4.8	10
	D-21	8.7	11
	D-22	40.6	11
	D-23	7.4	99
	D-24	61.7	99
	D-711	3.0	99
Fort Jackson SF (SL 22)	A-1	21.8	99
	A-2.2	2.8	40
	A-7	5.2	40
	A-13	17.1	99
	A-15	3.0	99
	A-16	5.9	11
	A-17.1	4.0	11
	A-20	5.7	20
	A-25	6.5	11
	A-28	2.8	99
	A-32	14.1	10
	A-34	9.5	99
	A-35	17.6	11
	A-36	8.5	10

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	A-38.1	6.5	11
	A-38.2	3.3	11
	A-38.3	2.8	11
	A-39	12.8	32
	A-41	1.1	42
	A-42.1	11.5	15
	A-42.2	10.9	15
	A-42.3	2.0	15
	A-44.2	2.4	68
	A-45	4.7	99
	A-51	22.7	10
	A-53	25.6	99
	A-711	11.9	99
	B-1.1	14.6	11
	B-1.2	3.4	11
	B-3	4.6	97
	B-6	15.2	46
	B-7	4.3	15
	B-11	30.1	15
	B-12.1	22.6	14
	B-12.2	22.5	14
	B-12.3	5.3	14

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-13.0	1.0	99
	B-16	4.1	42
	B-17	3.4	42
Grantville SF (SL 15)	A-1	2.2	99
	A-2.1	10.4	15
	A-2.2	2.0	99
	A-4	4.7	30
	A-6.1	22.5	32
	A-6.2	8.4	15
	A-6.3	2.1	99
	A-9	7.2	99
	A-10	12.5	32
	A-11	4.6	12
	A-13	9.5	32
	A-14	5.2	71
	A-19	6.9	70
	A-20.2	5.0	63
	A-21.1	11.6	32
	A-21.2	3.3	15
	A-22	12.6	15
	A-23.1	53.0	15
	A-23.2	9.7	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	A-23.3	6.4	15
	A-24	2.0	99
	A-26	15.0	99
	A-27	9.4	70
	A-29	6.6	99
	A-30	32.1	99
	A-31	14.5	11
	A-711	2.0	99
	B-4	5.5	32
	B-5	11.7	63
	B-6	14.0	99
	B-10	13.9	10
	B-11.1	83.0	15
	B-11.2	15.9	32
	B-11.3	3.5	15
	B-11.4	2.5	15
	B-12	8.1	99
	B-13	16.1	15
	B-14	5.4	32
	B-15	9.5	14
	B-16	5.9	15
	B-17	4.8	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-19	44.4	32
	B-20	80.6	99
	B-710	4.5	99
Knapp Station SF (SL 11)	A-1	2.2	25
	A-2	4.3	25
	A-11.1	19.5	99
	A-11.2	15.3	97
	A-12.1	1.5	63
	A-12.2	1.5	10
	A-22	28.1	99
	A-23	4.7	97
	A-24	5.4	99
	B-3.1	2.7	14
	B-3.2	2.1	14
	B-4	9.7	99
	B-7.1	2.2	46
	B-7.2	0.9	97
	B-8	10.7	46
	B-9	2.4	14
	B-11	10.2	46
	B-711	8.0	99
	C-2.1	7.4	41

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-2.2	1.8	41
	C-3	6.9	40
	C-4	1.6	10
	C-6	5.5	10
	C-7	12.8	32
	C-9.2	4.4	99
	C-10	9.3	11
	C-11.1	14.1	41
	C-11.2	5.1	13
	C-12	1.4	25
	C-13	1.2	99
	C-14	12.7	32
	C-17	3.2	15
	C-21	18.8	14
	C-25	23.3	99
	C-26	140.1	99
	C-27	1.3	40
	C-28	1.8	97
	C-29	0.5	99
	C-711	4.9	99
	D-6	5.2	70
	D-7.1	11.4	41

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	D-7.2	3.2	41
	D-9	7.0	25
	D-11	32.2	99
	D-12	19.5	25
	D-13	4.3	22
	D-14.1	2.7	11
	D-14.2	2.5	11
	D-15	11.8	12
	D-16	7.3	40
	D-17	4.8	10
	D-18.1	5.5	97
	D-18.2	2.1	97
	D-18.3	1.7	20
	D-19	2.3	44
	D-20.1	3.6	25
	D-20.2	2.4	99
	D-21	5.2	10
	D-22	52.5	99
	D-711	1.2	99
Lost Nation SF (SL 9)	A-1.1	29.1	41
	A-2	6.8	11
	A-3	11.6	11

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	A-4	17.4	99
	A-5	5.7	21
	A-6	5.3	99
	A-9	20.9	99
	A-12	1.4	99
	A-14	24.7	13
	A-16	6.7	32
	A-17	27.5	15
	A-21	32.0	15
	A-22	17.5	99
	A-24	1.1	97
	A-33.1	5.7	97
	A-33.2	4.5	97
	A-34	9.8	41
	A-35.1	28.0	12
	A-35.2	5.0	25
	A-37	13.0	29
	A-38	4.1	10
	A-39.1	22.3	25
	A-39.2	4.3	25
	A-41	3.3	99
	A-711	9.1	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-1	24.3	99
	B-2.1	3.8	42
	B-2.2	4.4	42
	B-3.1	2.8	97
	B-3.2	1.9	97
	B-9	11.2	15
	B-11	1.8	42
	B-12.1	16.3	25
	B-12.2	3.3	32
	B-13	22.6	32
	B-14	5.7	42
	B-15	1.4	99
	B-16	3.9	25
	B-17	14.4	99
	B-18	14.8	97
	B-19.1	8.4	32
	B-19.2	3.3	14
	B-20	8.6	99
	B-29.2	6.3	10
	B-34.1	22.5	99
	B-34.2	2.1	99
	B-38	9.0	14

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-41	1.1	14
	B-43	3.1	42
	B-44.1	8.4	14
	B-44.2	3.2	14
	B-45.2	3.4	42
	B-46	9.4	11
	B-47	3.4	99
	B-48	7.9	97
	B-49	2.8	97
	B-51	173.4	99
	B-52	15.6	15
	B-711	2.2	99
	C-1.5	1.9	41
	C-2.2	4.0	46
	C-3	4.8	15
	C-5	7.7	15
	C-6	3.1	97
	C-7	3.5	21
	C-8	7.2	21
	C-9	7.5	99
	C-10	3.9	25
	C-13	2.3	21

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-14	4.0	25
	C-21.2	5.4	21
	C-22	2.7	25
	C-25	3.7	40
	C-26.1	45.2	25
	C-26.2	2.8	25
	C-27	3.0	25
	C-28	2.9	14
	C-29.1	8.3	25
	C-29.2	3.0	25
	C-31	1.5	20
	C-33	1.9	25
	C-34	1.6	25
	C-36	4.1	32
	C-40	26.2	15
	C-41	3.5	40
	C-42	10.6	99
	C-43	10.3	15
	C-47	3.5	15
	C-48	11.5	32
	C-49	4.4	25
	C-55	52.3	99

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	C-711	13.7	99
Raymondville SF (SL 33)	A-1	7.0	70
	A-2	12.8	70
	A-3	28.5	32
	A-4	7.6	63
	A-5.1	16.4	99
	A-5.2	13.3	15
	A-5.3	6.8	99
	A-5.4	40.1	15
	A-5.5	23.5	15
	A-5.6	2.3	99
	A-7	16.1	99
	A-8	36.2	32
	A-10	2.2	15
	A-12	10.7	11
	A-13	5.3	12
	A-15	7.0	15
	A-18	2.7	22
	A-20.1	46.5	99
	A-20.2	3.0	99
	A-21	14.3	15
	A-22	3.5	12

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	A-25	8.0	15
	A-26	13.5	32
	A-32	15.3	15
	A-34	67.7	99
	A-35	9.5	15
	A-36	8.0	71
	A-38	2.3	32
	A-42	3.0	32
	A-43	5.1	14
	A-711	4.8	99
	A-722	4.4	99
Sodom SF (SL 25)	A-1	6.7	32
	A-2.1	23.7	32
	A-2.2	27.6	32
	A-3	27.2	97
	A-4	4.8	15
	A-5.1	82.1	99
	A-5.2	42.1	99
	A-5.3	51.7	99
	A-6	30.9	15
	A-7	11.5	10
	A-8	22.6	10

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	A-9	6.6	99
	A-10	125.0	32
	A-11	14.7	15
	A-12	10.7	10
	A-13.1	23.6	32
	A-13.2	13.7	15
	A-14.1	95.4	32
	A-14.2	21.6	32
	A-14.3	11.1	32
	A-14.4	7.8	15
	A-15	26.7	99
	A-16	4.4	32
	A-18	27.3	99
	B-1.2	6.6	15
	B-1.3	3.2	97
	B-2	5.3	24
	B-5.2	9.8	15
	B-9.1	7.2	99
	B-9.2	2.6	99
	B-13	36.6	71
	B-14	2.6	99
	B-15	8.5	12

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**

State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	B-17.1	16.9	15
	B-17.2	7.9	15
	B-18	18.4	99
	B-19	49.7	32
	B-21	4.5	99
	B-711	4.6	99
	C-2.1	16.1	14
	C-2.2	6.5	14
	C-3	23.8	99
	C-6	15.0	24
	C-7	8.3	14
	C-8	2.3	71
	C-13.2	33.8	32
	C-16	3.6	32
	C-18	5.2	15
	C-19	10.9	99
	C-20	17.4	99
	C-21	12.9	99
	C-711	0.5	99
	C-722	59.0	99
Southville SF (SL 23)	A-3.1	21.1	10
	A-3.2	14.0	10

Table III.I.- Natural Areas **(by State Forest)**			
State Forests	Stand	Acres	Forest Type
	A-4	11.4	25
	A-12	2.4	15
	A-15	15.0	10
	A-16	9.7	32
	A-19	13.0	11
	A-22	29.1	11
	A-24	18.6	11
	A-25	26.1	99
	A-26	7.4	15
	A-27	12.7	99
	A-28	18.4	32
	A-711	4.9	99
	B-9	11.1	15
	B-10	16.3	15
	B-711	2.3	99
	Total Acres	19,390.3	

GLOSSARY

GLOSSARY

ALLOWABLE CUT The amount of wood fiber that may be harvested annually or periodically from a specified area over a stated period in accordance with the objectives of management.

BASAL AREA The cross sectional area of a tree at breast height, measured in square feet. For a stand: the total basal area per unit of area, usually expressed as square feet per acre.

CAVITY TREES Trees containing an excavation sufficiently large for nesting, dens or shelter; tree may be alive or dead.

CLEARCUT A Method of regenerating an even-aged stand in which a new age class develops in a fully exposed microclimate after removal, in a single cutting, of all trees in the previous stand. Regeneration is from natural seeding, planted seedlings, and/or advance regeneration. Harvesting may be done in groups, patches or strips.

CLIMAX FOREST The culminating stage in forest succession, where the vegetation has reached a highly stable condition. It is self-perpetuating. A climax forest will persist until a catastrophic disturbance occurs.

COARSE WOODY DEBRIS Large decaying tree trunks and stumps on the forest floor.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Significant historical or archaeological assets on sites as a result of past human activity which are distinguishable from natural resources.

CUTTING INTERVAL The number of years between harvest-regeneration cuts in a stand using the uneven-aged system.

ECOSYSTEM All the interacting populations of plants, animals and microorganisms occupying an area, plus their physical environment.

EVEN-AGED A class of forest or stand composed of trees of about the same age. The maximum age difference admissible is generally 10-20 years.

FOREST DEVELOPMENT STAGES The various stages of forest stand growth and development ranging from seedling/sapling to mature trees.

GREEN TREE RETENTION Retention of living trees on cutover areas for goals other than regeneration. These residual trees create higher levels of stand diversity, moderate the microclimate of the of the site and provide continuity of habitat for plant and animal species between uncut forests areas. Differs from a shelterwood because these residual trees are not cut after regeneration is established, but during the next rotation.

INTERIOR SPECIES Species, vegetative and animal, whose habitat dependence requires significant tracts of unbroken forest types, often sensitive to fragmentation and to varying degrees of disturbance.

LARGE POLES Trees 9-11" diameter at breast height.

LARGE SAWTIMBER Trees 18"+ diameter at breast height.

MEDIUM SAWTIMBER Trees 15-17" diameter at breast height.

MULTIPLE USE A strategy of deliberate land management for two or more purposes which utilizes, without impairment, the capabilities of the land to meet different demands simultaneously.

NATURAL AREA Areas without scheduled management. Many of these stands will eventually attain late successional conditions. These areas are generally not managed for the production of wood products.

OLD GROWTH FOREST No universally accepted definition exists, however, old growth stands would have these characteristics: Large trees, Dead snags, Downed logs, Broken or multiple layered canopy, Community would be in an advanced or "climax" successional stage.

PROTECTION FOREST Forest lands excluded from active wood product management and some recreational practices to protect sensitive sites. These sites most often include steep slopes, wet woodlands, and riparian zones along stream corridors.

REGENERATION/REPRODUCTION The act of replacing old trees, either naturally or artificially. Also refers to the new growth that develops.

RELEASE The act of removing an overstory of trees to release an understory of established seedlings or saplings.

ROTATION The period of years required to establish and grow timber crops to a specified maturity, rotation being the predetermined time frame between successive harvest/regeneration cuts in a given stand under even-aged management.

SALVAGE CUTTING The harvest of dead, dying, damaged, or deteriorating trees primarily to put the wood to use before it loses its economic value.

SEEDLING/SAPLING Trees less than 6" diameter at breast height.

SEED TREE CUT The removal of the mature timber in one cutting, except for a small number of trees left singly, or in small groups, as a source of seed for natural regeneration.

SELECTION SYSTEM An uneven aged system which removes the mature and immature trees either singly or in groups at intervals. Regeneration is established almost continuously.

SHELTERWOOD SYSTEM An even-aged system which removes the mature stand in a series of cuts. Regeneration of the new stand occurs under the cover of a partial forest canopy.

SMALL POLES Trees 6-8" diameter at breast height.

SMALL SAWTIMBER Trees 12-14" diameter at breast height.

SNAGS Dead trees with or without cavities: functions as perches, foraging sites and/or a source of cavities for denning, roosting and/or nesting.

STAND Any area of forest vegetation with site conditions, past history and current species composition and age sufficiently uniform to distinguish it from adjacent areas. (Chambers)

STATE FOREST - STATE REFORESTATION AREA Lands owned by the State of New York, administered by the Department of Environmental Conservation and authorized by Environmental Conservation Law to be devoted to the establishment and maintenance of forests for watershed protection, the production of timber and other forest products, and for recreation and kindred purposes.

SUSTAINED YIELD The achievement and maintenance in perpetuity of a reasonable regular periodic output of the various renewable resources without impairment of the land's productivity.

TIMBER STAND IMPROVEMENT (TSI) Pre-commercial silvicultural treatments, typically thinnings intended to regulate stand density and species composition while improving wood product quality and fostering individual tree health and vigor

UNEVEN-AGED A class of forest or stand composed of intermingled trees or groups of trees that differ markedly in age.

WATER QUALITY CLASSES A system of classification in ECL Article 17 which presents a ranked listing of the State’s surface waters by the letters AA, A, B, C or D according to certain quality standards and specifications. AA is the highest quality rank and has the greatest suitability for human usage.

WETLAND CLASSES A system of classification set forth in ECL Article 24, section 664.5 which ranks wetlands I through IV based upon wetland functions and benefits, I being the highest rank. (DEC publication WM-P11, b/80).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, R.S. "Of Bog Ore and Brasher Iron Works." *The Quarterly*. St. Lawrence County Historical Association. Vol. 27 No. 2. April 1982. Pp. 21-22.

Angus, Christopher. *The Extraordinary Adirondack Journey of Clarence Petty: Wilderness Guide, Pilot, and Conservationist.* Syracuse University Press: Syracuse, NY. 2002. 265 pp.

Asaro, Christopher. *The Biology and Impact of Pine False Webworm, Acantholyda erythrocephala (L.) (Hymenoptera: Pamphiliidae), in Northern New York.* Master's Thesis. SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry. Syracuse, NY. 1996. 94 pp.

Benedict, Les, and O'Ceillaigh, Setanta. *St. Regis Mohawk Tribe – A Partnership for Hardwood Wetlands Habitat Restoration and Management*. USFWS TWG 2007 – Project Report. 2009. 73 pp. +

Benedict, Les, and David, Richard. *Handbook for Black Ash - Preservation Reforestation / Regeneration.* Mohawk Council of Akwesasne – Department of the Environment. 2004. 79 pp.

Civilian Conservation Corps Records. 1934-1941. There are several boxes of miscellaneous records and correspondence from the CCC era located at the Potsdam DEC Office. There are also extensive maps of the tree planting done during this era.

Crocoll, Scott. *Raptor Management on State Forests.* New York State Department of Environmental Conservation: Albany, NY. Unpublished report. 2013. 49 pp.

Dodds, Kevin J., Cooke, Robert R., Dubois, Garret, Wagner, Jason, Voss, Rodger, and Ganter, Travis. *Silvicultural Treatments to Reduce Pine Susceptibility to Sirex noctilio Attack on Fort Drum Military Base, New York.* Progress Report. 2008. 13 pp.

Durant, Samuel W., and Pierce, Henry B. *History of St. Lawrence Co., New York, with illustrations and biographical sketches of some of its prominent men and pioneers, 1749-1878.* Reprinted by the St. Lawrence County Historical Association. Heart of the Lakes Publishing. Interlaken, NY. 1982. 521 pp.

Eldblom, Nancy C., and Johnson, Anne M. *Plants of St. Lawrence County, NY: An Annotated Checklist of Vascular Flora.* Bloated Toe Publishing. Peru, NY. 2010. 263 pp.

Gullion, Gordon W. *Managing Northern Forests for Wildlife.* The Ruffed Grouse Society. Publication No. 13,442, Miscellaneous Journal Series, Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station: St. Paul, MN. 1984. 71 pp.

Huebner, Cynthia D., Olson, Cassandra, and Smith, Heather C. *Invasive Plants Field and Reference Guide: An Ecological Perspective of Plant Invaders of Forests and Woodlands.* USDA Forest Service. Morgantown, WV. 2005. Publication NA-TP-05-04.

Johnson, Warren T., and Lyon, Howard H. *Insects that Feed on Trees and Shrubs: An Illustrated Practical Guide.* Cornell University Press. Ithaca, NY. 1976. 464 pp.

Larue, Robert J. *St. Lawrence County Almanac . Volume 1.* Peerless Press. Syracuse, NY. 1996.

Larue, Robert J. *St. Lawrence County Almanac . Volume 2.* Peerless Press. Syracuse, NY. 1997.

Larue, Robert J. *St. Lawrence County Almanac . Volume 3.* Peerless Press. Syracuse, NY. 1999.

Larue, Robert J. *St. Lawrence County Almanac . Volume 4.* Peerless Press. Syracuse, NY. 2000.

New York Natural Heritage Program. *State Lands Assessment Project: Biodiversity Inventory of Regions 5 & 6 State Forests & Forest Preserve.* Albany, NY. 2008. 2,898 pp.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. *New York State Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality: BMP Field Guide.* NYS DEC: Albany, NY. 2011. 81 pp.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. *New York State Strategic Plan for State Forest Management.* NYS DEC: Albany, NY. 2010. 356 pp.
Available online at: http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/64567.html

Omohundro, John. "The Brasher Falls CCC Camp." *The Quarterly.* St. Lawrence County Historical Association. Vol. 40 No. 3. August 2015. Pp. 4-10.

Podskoch, Martin. *Adirondack Civilian Conservation Corps Camps: History, Memories & Legacy of the CCC.* Podskoch Press. East Hampton, CT. 2011. 347 pp.

Rogers, Bert J. "Conservation and 4-H." *The Quarterly.* St. Lawrence County Historical Association. Vol. 10 No. 1. January 1965. Pp. 3-4, 17.

Sepik, Greg F., Owen, Ray B. Jr., and Coulter, Malcom W. *A Landowner's Guide to Woodcock Management in the Northeast.* Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Maine Agricultural Experiment Station – University of Maine. Miscellaneous Report 253. 1996 (reprint). 23 pp.

Sinclair, Wayne A., and Lyon, Howard, H. *Diseases of Trees and Shrubs.* Cornell University Press. Ithaca, NY. 2005. 660 pp.

Starr, Bill. *The Fire Towers of the New York State Bureau of Forest Fire Control*. 2003. Unpublished. 18 pp.

State of New York Conservation Commission. *List of Lands in the Forest Preserve – March 20, 1920. Appendix to the 1919 Annual Report.* J.B. Lyon Company: Albany, NY. 1920. 320 pp. Pp. 197-206.

Stickney, Carlton. "History of the Town of Stockholm." *The Quarterly*. St. Lawrence County Historical Association. Vol LI, No. 6. 2006. Pp. 3-20.

Switalski, T. Adam, and Jones, Allison. "Off-road vehicle best management practices for forestlands: A review of scientific literature and guidance for managers." *Journal of Conservation Planning*. Vol 8 (2012). Pp. 12-24.

Van Driesche, Roy; Blossey, Bernd; Hoddle, Mark; Lyon, Suzanne, and Reardon, Richard eds. *Biological Control of Invasive Plants in the Eastern United States.* USDA Forest Service. 2002. Publication FHTET-2002-04. 413 pp.

Van Valkenburgh, Norman J. "Forest Preserve: The Detached Parcels." *Adirondac.* Vol L. No. 9 (1986). Pp. 10-13.

"Walter Pratt, State Ranger, Died at 51." *The Ogdensburg Journal* (Ogdensburg, NY), Wed 28 Nov 1956. Retrieved from the Northern New York Historical Newspapers database, available at http://news.nnyln.net/ . Downloaded 2012.

"Forest Land to be Dedicated to Walter Pratt." *The Courier Freeman* (Potsdam, NY), Thurs. 18 Jul 1957. Retrieved from the Northern New York Historical Newspapers database, available at http://news.nnyln.net/ . Downloaded 2012.

"In Memoriam – Walter F. Pratt." *The New York State Conservationist.* October-November 1957. Vol. 12 No. 2. Page 37. Received from the NYS DEC Library: Albany, NY. 26 Feb 2015.

APPENDICES & FIGURES

APPENDIX A - SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO THE ST. LAWRENCE FLATLANDS UMP

The following is a summary of the public comments that were received during the creation of the St. Lawrence Flatlands Unit Management Plan. Public scoping meetings were held June 20, 2012 at the Brasher Falls High School and June 23, 2012 at the Madrid-Waddington High School. A public draft meeting was held December 1, 2014 at the Brasher Falls High School. Comments were received at the public meetings, as well as through letters, phone calls, emails, and face to face meetings with contributors. **Comments** are in bold text, with *DEC responses* in italics.

Facilities Comments

1. There is no cost analysis of the proposed projects in the UMP. What are the cost estimates for road and trail brushing, grading, trail hardening, etc?

Detailed cost estimates for proposed actions will be created before implementation. Projects will be completed over many years, which will make timely cost estimates more accurate than those produced several years in advance.

2. The Pascal Haul Road and Old Keenan Roads near Shady City are in poor condition and soil is eroding and flowing into Lawrence Brook. The problem started several years ago when a culvert was removed and needs to be fixed.

The Pascal Haul Road is proposed for extensive rehabilitation and improvement to PFAR standards. The Old Keenan Road is a Town of Brasher Road and cannot be maintained by the DEC unless it is qualified abandoned by the town. The DEC supports improved maintenance of roads and trails, regardless of jurisdiction.

Forestry Comments

1. We support managing state forests in ways that reduce climate change. Forests can reduce climate change by sequestering carbon in trees. Some state forest areas should be managed for the creation of old growth timber that sequesters large amounts of carbon. State forests should not be used to produce firewood or other products which release carbon to the atmosphere.

Many of the actions proposed in this plan will increase carbon sequestration. Over 12,000 acres of forest are proposed for inclusion in the Natural Areas category, which means that they will receive minimal forest management now or in the future. The acreage of late successional forests will gradually increase as stands continue to age. The Department disagrees about the production of firewood from state

forests. Firewood is an important heating source for local residents, and will continue to be sold on a limited basis as time and staffing allows. Firewood thinnings also promote the improved growth of residual stands, which results in improved sawtimber quality in the future.

2. We strongly support maintaining uncut corridors along streams and rivers.

The plan proposes uncut corridors on state land along river corridors. These areas may still be suitable for non-motorized recreational trails and facilities.

3. We strongly support the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) when performing timber harvests and other forest management, as BMPs prevent soil erosion, rutting, spreading invasive species, and sedimentation into nearby bodies of water.

BMP implementation is standard practice on state forest timber sales, as well as construction and maintenance projects.

4. We would like to express our support of gradually transitioning even-aged white pine stands to uneven-aged stands through sustainable harvests intended to improve forest health while maintain native conifer and hardwood stands. In addition, we also support and encourage creating and maintaining areas of early successional shrubland and late successional shrubland and late successional forest habitat, as proposed in the UMP.

These proposed actions will take place over many years, and will provide a gradual transition to a more diverse forest with stands of varied ages and tree species. Additional details concerning the creation of early successional habitat has been included in the "Wildlife-related Recreation: Hunting" section of the plan.

5. We support using sustainable forestry for timber harvests, especially when it can have multiple benefits, such as supporting the local economy through timber sales while improving forest health and wildlife habitat through ecological forest management. When possible, harvest should take place outside of the breeding bird season (May-July), to minimize disturbance and destruction of nests and young.

The Department strongly considers wildlife needs when proposing and implementing timber harvests. Some sales must be harvested under frozen conditions to minimize site disturbance or due to nearby habitat for RTE species. However, some sales are located deep in the forest on seasonal unplowed roads, which necessitates that they be harvested in the summer due to accessibility issues.

6. Protection of endangered species habitat should be a higher priority than maximizing timber harvest. Preservation of habitat should be a high priority and the UMP should be flexible to respond to these concerns.

Approximately 62% (19,390 acres) of this unit has been classified as Natural Areas, which will receive minimal active management and will be allowed to develop in a natural state. Other sensitive habitats outside of Natural Areas will be protected when management occurs nearby.

7. Is there a way the public can be given notice before timber harvesting takes place, possibly on the state forest webpage?

All timber sales over $500 in value are required to go through a competitive bid process, and are advertised on the DEC public website at: http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/71130.html. Informational signs with contact information are also posted on active timber sales.

Recreation Comments

All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs)

1. People miss having the roads and trails open to ATVs and would like some type of ATV trail system in Brasher State Forest. The County Forest parcel on the Bush Road should be linked by an ATV trail system. The Burns Road and Burns Trail should be re-opened to ATVs. The Tri-Town ATV Riders previously maintained ATV trails and provided materials, labor and equipment, and are willing to help maintain trails again if they can have legal ATV trails on state forests.

The UMP includes a proposal to open over eight miles of roads and trails to public ATV use.

2. ATVs were previously concentrated in the Brasher area, but the opening of a county wide multi use trail would reduce the concentration of ATV use in Brasher State Forest. A multiple use trail system will bring more business to all of the towns in St. Lawrence County.

The UMP includes a proposal to connect the property to the St. Lawrence County Multi-use Trail System.

3. How were ATV concerns addressed in the *Strategic Plan for State Forest Management* and what was the process for its adoption? Where is the ATV policy currently? Why were ATV trails shut down with little explanation given?

The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management reviewed law and regulations governing ATV use on state lands, potential impacts of ATV use, and case histories of past ATV usage on State Forests located across the state. It was offered for public review and comment and was adopted in 2010. The ATV policy is still in a draft status. ATV trails in Brasher State Forest were closed due to continued problems with maintenance, and the lack of nearby trail connections which would justify their continued use.

4. ATV use should be allowed to provide access for hunting, fishing, trapping, and wildlife viewing. Establish a trail system committee to help make any decisions regarding opening state lands to motorized use. We need to protect the interests of private landowners and the environment. Trail users need to be accountable. Environmental issues of opening new areas to ATV use need to be adequately addressed. If new areas are opened to ATV use, we should also provide adequate parking areas and facilities.

The UMP proposes to increase motorized access to the unit for people with disabilities via designated trails, in order to make hunting, fishing and other recreational pursuits more accessible. These proposals take into account the need to protect neighboring private lands and the environment.

5. I live next to a state forest and have experienced problems with illegal ATV use on the state forest, as well as very loud and disruptive users. Law enforcement is often not available to help control these problems as they happen. There should be lower speed limits set for motorized users, perhaps 30 mph on roads and 15 mph on trails. There should be phone numbers posted so that violators can be reported to law enforcement officers.

Law enforcement is necessary to enforce trail regulations and ticket violators. Patrols will periodically tour these properties to ensure that all applicable laws are being followed.

6. I am opposed to ATV use in this unit. They cause environmental damage and are noisy. I feel that ATV use would be dangerous due to small children operating ATVs as well as intoxicated drivers.

The UMP includes mitigation measures to avoid and minimize potential adverse impacts such as those cited above.

7. ATV use may cause transport and dispersal of invasive species. This may cause Common Reed to invade sensitive wetland areas, including black ash stands. ATVs may spread invasive species due to mud on the tires. How will invasive species be monitored and curtailed? To prevent the spread of non-native invasive plants due to increased ATV use, the adoption of "clean tire" program may be useful, with checkpoints at trail entrances and/or parking areas.

Regular inspections of the trail system will be made to monitor for invasive species and remove them before they become permanent. Staging areas will be monitored for invasive species so that they are transported onto the trail system.

8. True ATVs can transport invasive species, but no more so than hikers and bicyclists. Again this section of the plan appears to intentionally paint ATVs in a negative light.

Invasive species transport along motor vehicle trails and roads has been shown to be a widespread and frequently encountered problem. Efforts must be made to minimize the damage done by transport of invasive species.

9. Many medicinal plant species important to Mohawk culture are found in wetland areas, which may be damaged by ATV use.

The Department agrees that wetland areas are susceptible to damages from ATV use. Wetlands near recreational trails will be monitored for invasive species and other potential problems.

10. The plan to connect state forest roads to public highways as part of an ATV route does not meet the standards of section 2405 of Vehicle and Traffic law. Opening roads to ATV use does not constitute

a trail system under section 2405 of Vehicle and Traffic law. The proposed multi-use trail is basically an ATV trail. Few other groups use the trail once it is opened to ATVs.

Section 2405 of the Vehicle and Traffic Law does allow for short sections of roads to be open to ATV use in order to connect other legal ATV riding areas. It is the intent of the UMP to comply with this and all legal provisions that apply to the use of ATVs.

11. For ATV riding to become a more accepted and sustainable form of recreation, numerous State policy and budgetary changes will need to be made, including but not limited to: (1) legislative amendments to prohibit recreational riding on our state's most sensitive lands, including, but not limited to, the Forest Preserve in the Adirondack Park; (2) amendments to Vehicle and Traffic Law section 2405 to clarify its intent and incentivize trail construction of private trail networks; (3) Increasing the registration fee of ATVs, with all funds dedicated to well-planned trail construction, enforcement staffing and resources, and rider education; and (4) Legislation that incentivizes "bad actors" to not repeat their offenses when caught by enforcement.

Legislation is outside the scope of the UMP.

12. ATVs should be limited to main (dirt) logging roads. ATVs should not be used on paved roads due to safety concerns. Manufacturers specifically recommend not using ATVs on paved surfaces.

The UMP does not propose to allow ATVs on any paved roads.

13. A letter dated 12/08/14 was received from the St. Lawrence County (SLC) Legislature supporting responsible motorized recreation (including ATV use) on parcels in the St. Lawrence Flatlands Unit Management Plan. A resolution dated 12/15/2014 was received from the SLC legislature finance committee which would open certain county forests in the town of Brasher and Stockholm to ATV use. A resolution dated 01/02/15 was received from the SLC legislature finance committee which would open certain county highways in the Towns of Brasher, Lawrence, and Stockholm to ATV use. A resolution dated 01/02/15 was received from the St. Lawrence County Legislature "in Support of Reinstating of the ATV Trail System in the Brasher State Forest and to Include Community Connector Trail through Buckton and Ft. Jackson State Forests to Connect to St. Lawrence County Multi-Use Trail System." A letter dated 01/13/15 was received from the Town of Brasher in support of connector trails through Brasher, Buckton, and Ft. Jackson State Forests, as well as four loop trails proposed in Brasher State Forest which would be open to ATV riding.

The cited resolutions and letters were considered when developing the UMP proposal to allow ATVs on certain roads and trails within the unit.

14. Consider not only where ATVs can go, but perhaps when, so as to reduce overlap with snowmobiles, skiers, and to limit damage to wet ground.

The list of potential mitigation measures includes seasonal restrictions as well as restrictions on the hours of use.

15. In spite of the ban in recent years, ATVs have regularly driven through the Ft. Jackson parcel, for example, according to area residents. When the ATV corridor is provided in the Brasher Forest parcel, more effort will be needed to prevent unauthorized access to other parcels. Will the riding clubs assist in that effort?

Riding clubs will be encouraged to help monitor the trail system and inform riders of the regulations. Enforcement of regulations, however, must be implemented by law enforcement officers.

16. ATVs for many years were allowed to use the state lands included in the Flatlands UMP for both recreational riding and during involvement in Department endorsed programs such as hunting, fishing, and trapping. Local residents, individuals with camps and visitors utilized ATVs to get to hunting, fishing, and trapping locations and to transport deer and game. The Department's decision to restrict/ban use of ATVs on Public Forest Access Roads and Haul Roads has unnecessarily hindered this mode of sporting access and makes access difficult for the less fit, elderly and those with handicapping conditions.

ATV use on state forests must comply with guidelines found in the Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (approved 2010), as well as relevant Environmental Conservation and Vehicle & Traffic Law. Connector trails may be allowed across state forests if specific conditions are met.

17. (Regarding information on page 58 of the Draft Plan that ATVs may be disruptive to birds, hunters, and non-motorized recreational users). Although ATV noise may be disruptive to some mammal species as well as nesting and breeding birds, we also know that based on field observations animals and birds quickly adjust to such noise and in many instances use roads traveled by automobiles, ATVs and snowmobiles as travel corridors. ATVs may be disruptive to hunters that is true, but no more so than an automobile or airplane. This section of the plan appears to intentionally paint ATVs in a negative light and we question the scientific basis for these statements.

There is extensive scientific evidence that ATVs can be disruptive to nearby birds, wildlife, and non-motorized recreationists.

18. (Regarding limiting ATV trail usage to times of dry ground). The Department's setting specific dates for ATV use is not convenient for people to use ATVs during the big game and trapping seasons.

The first requirement of any trail system is that it be able to sustain usage without degradation and damage. Motor Vehicle usage must be limited to times of dry or frozen ground. This will not allow ATV access throughout all hunting, fishing and trapping seasons. Users are, however, able to access areas by foot on a year round basis.

19. (Regarding trespass onto private land). We do not close the roads to everyone who speeds on the highway. An approach that punishes the collective whole at the expense of a few will only serve to further alienate lawful and contributing users from the Department. (Regarding illegal trails). This section of the UMP seems as it if is written to appease the environmentalists.

In order to have a sustainable and environmentally sound trail system, users must be limited to trails that can sustain usage without environmental damage. This requires limiting motorized usage to roads and trails that have hardened trail surfaces, adequate drainage, and stabilized wetland crossings.

20. (Regarding trail maintenance). The Department will never have sufficient staff to monitor all publically owned lands. Engaging user groups in a positive way to accomplish these goals appears to be the only alternative. The local ATV clubs have done extensive work in the past to rehabilitate problem areas, such as the Burns Trail. Will there be a dedicated funding source to monitor ATV use in the areas covered by this UMP? What guarantee is there that prior problems will not reappear?

The Department will work with willing partners and outside groups such as ATV clubs, local towns, and St. Lawrence Co. to help maintain the trail system through the issuance of Temporary Revocable Permits (TRP's), Volunteer Stewardship Agreements (VSA's), or Cooperative Agreements (CA's). A regular funding source is proposed which will fund labor and materials for the maintenance of the Multi-use Trail System. It is expected that some negative impacts will re-occur after the trail system re-opens, but through monitoring and mitigation they will be kept to a low level of impact.

21. In order to minimize disturbance to large, intact forested habitats, we support re-opening trails to ATV use only on pre-existing trails that have been previously open to ATV use, and only allowing ATV use if the DEC has the capacity to provide proper enforcement of speed limits and no off-trail driving.

The UMP proposes ATV use only on existing roads and trails.

Other Motorized Recreation

1. (snowmobiles) - Truck trails are posted for 25 MPH speed limit but typical snowmobile trails have a 55 MPH speed limit. Truck trail speed limits should be increased for snowmobiles. People feel harassed by law enforcement.

The speed limit on DEC maintained PFARs and Haul Roads is 25 MPH for all users.

2. DEC needs to work with all user groups (NYS Horse Council, ATVs, Snowmobiles, bikes) for multi-use trails. It is an unfair assumption that when one user group gains access to a trail system that other usage goes down.

At the statewide level, the Department meets on a regular basis with the NYS Trails Council, which includes representative of all the major trail user groups. In addition, the Department meets with the NYS Conservation Council, which represents the interests of hunters, anglers and trappers. On the local level, the Department encourages input from all interested parties, and has regularly attended meetings of the St. Lawrence County Recreational Trails Advisory Board.

Non-Motorized Recreation

1. I support creation of cross country skiing trails on Knapp Station State Forest along the Cook Road. I support the development of parking areas and recreational trails on Sodom State Forest. We strongly

support the creation of hike/bike trails along scenic river corridors. We support the creation of new trails. The state must provide more support for staff to conduct trail maintenance.

New trails are proposed in Brasher, Buckton and Fort Jackson State Forests.

2. I recommend a primitive campsite along the Raquette River on Grantville State Forest, which would provide access for users of the Raquette River Blueway Corridor.

The Department is not opposed to developing a campsite at this location, but feels that it would receive minimal use. Recreationists are currently free to camp anywhere on the state forest as long as it is at least 150 feet from roads, trails, and water bodies.

3. Informational kiosks and web pages will help direct visitors to trails by specifying length, terrain, and likely sights (river shore, red pine plantation, waterhole, wetland, etc.) We support the restoration (and interpretation) of the water hole by the Buckley Haul Road. At the same time, we recommend one or more dedicated foot trails to interesting destinations, such as river shoreline, wetland, or CCC waterhole. If such trails for non-motorized visitors were narrow with curves, they would be less attractive to motors, thus quieter, safer for walkers, less disturbing to wildlife, and less eroded.

The plan proposes development of 3 new informational kiosks in the unit, as well as restoration of the restoration of at least one water hole. Other interpretive trails will be considered as funds and staffing allows.

4. We support the proposed access trail to the St. Regis River's east bank in Ft. Jackson State Forest. The Barrett Road is largely impassible and needs to be fixed up to reach the proposed parking area. The state should work with the town to improve the road. We support the proposed access trail to the St. Regis River's east bank in Buckton State Forest.

The Barrett Road is proposed to be upgraded in cooperation with the Town of Stockholm.

5. For the 3 proposed canoe launches / fishing access along the Deer River in Brasher State Forest, the resulting trip up or downstream includes class I rapids, and so it is not for beginners. Signage should warn paddlers of class I rapids. The proposed river access points / canoe launches along the Deer River in Brasher State Forest should be relocated to provide better access to flat water sections of the river.

Signs will be posted warning paddlers of potential hazards along difficult stretches of river. Ideally, river access points will provide good road accessibility and access to flat water whenever feasible.

6. Multi-use trails for motorized recreation should be allowed in certain areas but there should also be trails dedicated to non-motorized recreation, especially on smaller isolated parcels such as Buckton and Southville State Forests. The St. Regis River Corridor should also be developed for fishing and paddling, as well as mountain biking and hiking. There should be more non-motorized uses such as cross country skiing and hiking on medium sized state parcels, such as Grantville and Raymondville

State Forests. We enjoy skiing at Brasher, Buckton, and Southville State Forests and would like to see some areas restricted from motor vehicle access.

The UMP proposes to allow limited motorized use on State Forests in the unit. Access to the St. Regis River corridor is proposed to be improved.

7. Horse trails are poorly marked and difficult to follow. Maps are not adequate and people get lost.

The Department is undertaking efforts to rehabilitate and improve the most popular trails to promote continued use.

Wildlife Comments

1. I support active forest management to promote habitat for wildlife including ruffed grouse and American woodcock, song birds, White tailed deer, and other species. I support even-aged forest management to provide habitat for ruffed grouse, American woodcock, snowshoe hare, cottontail rabbits, white tailed deer, songbirds, and other wildlife. (Regarding Habitat Improvement). An insufficient amount of attention has been paid to this very important aspect of state land management.

One of the goals of this plan is to provide increased early successional habitat on the unit which will benefit many wildlife species. Additional information has been included in the "Wildlife-related Recreation – Hunting" section which outlines suggested management practices to create habitat for both game and non-game species.

2. We strongly support "managing deer impacts" in the St. Lawrence Flatlands through the implementation of ecological assessments of white-tailed deer impacts on forest regeneration and health. Management objectives should reflect those assessments, with deer densities maintained at levels that allow native tree and shrub regeneration.

Deer management is largely within the domain of the DEC's Bureau of Wildlife, which regulate hunting seasons and issue special permits to increase deer harvests in over-populated areas. Areas experiencing heavy deer browse may benefit from the issuance of Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP) permits which allow additional deer harvesting in over-populated wildlife management units.

3. How will the blue heron rookeries be protected?

The heron rookeries, as well as other habitat important to RTE species, will be periodically monitored to ensure their continued health and integrity. Timber management and the creation of new roads or trails in the vicinity will be limited to minimize potential disturbances.

4. There is little information in the plan concerning birds and birding. Brasher State Forest contains many RTE bird species and provides critical bird habitat. It could become a major birding tourist area if it were better publicized.

The Departments agrees that the State Forests in this unit contain critical bird habitat. Table I.F. (At-Risk Species) lists over 20 Rare, Threatened, or Endangered bird species that may be found on unit. We would support promotion of this area as a birding site, with the birding community providing input on what new trails / observations points / etc. that they would like to see developed.

5. There should be a special goose season. Youth hunts would encourage more participation.

Wildlife regulations are beyond the scope of this plan.

6. Beavers are a problem and the UMP should have a policy for dealing with them.

Beavers are regularly trapped along the major waterways and wetlands in this unit. They are most problematic when they dam road culverts or otherwise flood roads and trails.

7. Leave dead end roads open for sportsmen access.

Roads are left open when they provide regular, good quality access. Many short dead end roads have been gated or barricaded due to problems with garbage dumping, illegal camping, or because they have become "party" spots.

Miscellaneous Comments

1. What time period does this UMP cover? When was the *Strategic Plan for State Forest Management* adopted? Are there management plans in place for the smaller (detached forest preserve) parcels? Are they too small for specific management plans? There should be outreach to the local town boards for their input.

This Unit Management Plan covers a ten year period from its time of adoption. The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management underwent a public review process and was adopted in 2010. The detached forest preserve parcels are too small and isolated to justify individual management plans. They have been included here due to their proximity to other state lands in this unit. Town boards and other local governments have been asked for their input, and their comments have been considered and incorporated into the plan.

2. More effort should be made to control invasive species. Invasive problems will likely become worse in the future. We strongly support improving forest health in this region by controlling invasive species and encourage DEC's ongoing participation in the St. Lawrence – Eastern Lake Ontario PRISM (Partnerships for Regional Invasive Species Management).

Invasive species are one of the most important threats to natural ecosystems. Invasive species will continue to be monitored, and management will be implemented when possible.

3. We support identifying and minimizing disturbances to the many old features on these parcels.

Treatment areas are searched for historical features before timber harvesting or construction occurs. Special effort is made to minimize their disturbance and preserve them for the future.

4. Mineral extraction should be prohibited on all state properties in this unit.

There are currently no active mines or wells on state properties in this unit.

5. Users of the forest should be reminded of the high value of wetlands found in this unit.

Wetlands have received extensive protection in this plan. Interpretive signs and trails will highlight their importance where appropriate.

6. We support the acquisition of additional parcels that are adjacent to lands included in this UMP, to be protected from development or fragmentation.

Purchase of additional land will be considered when it enhances existing state properties.

7. We support the designation High Conservation Forests, including the strong ties these forests have to Mohawk culture. Also supports the continued stewardship and management of the black ash resource to provide basket trees for Native American culture.

Continued protection and stewardship of the black ash resource will be encouraged throughout this unit.

APPENDIX B - STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW (SEQR)

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

This Plan and the activities it recommends will be in compliance with State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR), 6NYCRR Part 617. The State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) requires the consideration of environmental factors early in the planning stages of any proposed action(s) that are undertaken, funded or approved by a local, regional or state agency. The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (SPSFM) serves as the Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS), regarding management activity on State Forests. To address potential impacts, the SPSFM establishes SEQR analysis thresholds for each category of management activity.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT

This Unit Management Plan (UMP) does not propose pesticide applications of more than 40 acres, any clearcuts of 40 acres or larger, or prescribed burns in excess of 100 acres. Therefore the actions in the plan do not exceed the thresholds set forth in the Strategic Plan/Generic Environmental Impact Statement for State Forest Management**.**

This Unit Management Plan also does not include any of the following:

1. Forest management activities occurring on acreage occupied by protected species ranked S1, S2, G1, G2 or G3

2. Pesticide applications adjacent to plants ranked S1, S2, G1, G2 or G3

3. Aerial pesticide spraying by airplane or helicopter

4. Any development of facilities with potable water supplies, septic system supported restrooms, camping areas with more than 10 sites or development in excess of other limits established in this plan.

5. Well drilling plans

6. Well pad densities of greater than one well pad in 320 acres or which does not comply with the limitations identified through a tract assessment

7. Carbon injection and storage or waste water disposal

Therefore the actions proposed in this UMP, except the proposal described below to open multi-use recreational trails to ATVs in four State Forests, will be carried out in conformance with the conditions and thresholds established for such actions in the Strategic Plan/Generic Environmental Impact Statement, and do not require any separate site specific environmental review (see 6 NYCRR 617.10[d]).

One management action, the proposal to open multi-use recreational trails to ATVs through Brasher, Bombay, Buckton, and Ft. Jackson State Forests, was found to be beyond the scope of the SPSFM, and therefore required further environmental review under SEQR. To address this issue, a Supplemental

Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Multi-Use Recreational Trail System was prepared, and follows as part of Appendix B.

Any action taken by the Department on this unit that is not addressed in this Unit Management Plan and is not addressed in the Strategic Plan/Generic Environmental Impact Statement may need a separate site specific environmental review.

Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

for the Proposed Multi-Use Recreational Trail System

Located in the St. Lawrence Flatlands

Unit Management Planning Area

June 24, 2015

FSEIS Prepared by:

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

Division of Lands and Forests

Attn: Aaron Graves

6739 US Highway 11

Potsdam, NY 13676

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 200

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT 200

2.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND 200
2.2 HISTORY OF ATV USE IN THIS UNIT 201
2.3 PROJECT SUMMARY 202

3.0 POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION 202

3.1 SOIL COMPACTION AND EROSION 202
3.2 NOISE 205
3.3 INVASIVE SPECIES 206
3.4 ILLEGAL TRAILS AND TRESPASS ONTO PRIVATE LAND 207
3.5 CONFLICTS WITH OTHER USERS 209
3.6 WILDLIFE 209
3.7 AIR QUALITY 218
3.8 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS 218
3.9 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES 218
3.10 GROWTH INDUCING ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION 218
3.11 IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION ON THE USE AND CONSERVATION OF ENERGY 219

4.0 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS 219

4.1 PROPOSED CONNECTOR TRAIL THROUGH BRASHER STATE FOREST 220
4.2 PROPOSED LOOP TRAILS THROUGH BRASHER AND BOMBAY STATE FORESTS 225
4.3 PROPOSED CONNECTOR TRAIL THROUGH BUCKTON AND FT. JACKSON STATE FORESTS 231

5.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT 234

BIBLIOGRAPHY 239

1.0 Introduction

This Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) is being prepared pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) to analyze the relevant areas of environmental concern resulting from the construction of a proposed Multi-Use Recreational Trail on State-owned lands in the St. Lawrence Flatlands Unit Management Planning Area, which includes Brasher, Bombay, Buckton, and Ft. Jackson State Forests. These forests are located in the towns of Brasher and Stockholm in St. Lawrence County, and the towns of Bombay and Moira in Franklin County. The trail system would be open to a variety of non-motorized and motorized recreation, including All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs). Current DEC policy, as outlined in the Strategic Plan for State Forest Management (Strategic Plan), provides that public use of ATVs will be allowed on State Forests only to provide access to recreational programs under the Department's Motorized Access Program for People with Disabilities (MAPPWD), and to allow limited ATV use for connector routes, on a case by case basis. The Strategic Plan provides that designation of ATV connector trails on State Forests will only occur after "full SEQRA review" of the designation. Department staff have determined that the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, therefore, this FSEIS will examine all reasonable alternatives to determine which action will avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable.

The FSEIS will describe the St. Lawrence Flatlands proposed Multi-Use Recreational Trail proposals, identify potential impacts, suggest mitigation measures, and describe other reasonable alternatives that were considered during this analysis.

This Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared in accordance with the State Environmental Quality Review Act (Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law and 6 NYCRR Part 617).

2.0 Description of the Proposed Project

2.1 Project Background

There is a large network of multiple use trails located in Brasher State Forest. These trails originated as a mixture of former public roads, roads created by the state during the Civilian Conservation Corps era, and woods roads created for timber harvesting or fire suppression. During the 1970s and 1980s, many of these roads and trails were opened for snowmobile use and cross country skiing, and were maintained in conjunction with the local snowmobile clubs. During the 1980s and 1990s, many trails were opened for horse riding, as well as ATV use. Due to maintenance concerns, ATV usage was gradually curtailed and is no longer permitted on trails or roads on State-owned lands in this unit.

Trails in the St. Lawrence Flatlands unit receive steady usage year round, by people enjoying motorized and non-motorized recreation, as well as hunters and campers. The large trail system in Brasher State Forest is generally in poor condition, due to statewide resource constraints for trail maintenance and improvement. An effort is being made to improve the condition of the most popular trails, by improving signage, brushing and widening overgrown trails, providing trailhead parking, and providing maps and web pages to promote the trail system.

In addition to the State maintained multiple use trails in this unit, the Town of Stockholm also owns a multiple use trail along the former Rutland Railroad right-of-way which passes through Knapp Station State Forest. There are also several trails available on St. Lawrence County #18, which is located adjacent to Brasher State Forest.

2.2 History of ATV use in this Unit

The following is a summary of the Brasher State Forest ATV trail system, reprinted from the *Strategic Plan for State Forest Management:* Chapter 5: Off-Highway and All-Terrain Vehicle Use (p. 217):

ATV Case Study: DEC Region 6 (1985-2008)

"In the 1980s, all of the multi-use trails in the Brasher State Forest were opened to ATV use; 36 different trails were opened as well as all 15 truck trails. Use was low to minimal to begin with, consisting mainly of local ATV enthusiasts who lived adjacent to the State Forest. In a relatively short time, ATV use escalated dramatically, and environmental issues began to surface.

By the early 1990s, ATV use was curtailed on trails that had become badly rutted or which had developed severe mud holes. In most cases, "Braid Trails" were illegally established by ATV riders to avoid the obstacles created by previous ATV activity. With no dedicated funding source available to maintain the trails or remediate damage, unacceptable environmental impacts led to further closures. By 2000, 12 trails remained open, and by 2004, only five trails remained legally opened to ATV use. Illegal ATV use continued to occur on the closed trails. Illegal braid trails continued to be created, and unauthorized new trails saw ATV use.

DEC worked with a local ATV club to remediate damage to several key trails, and the volunteers did some excellent work to fix the damage that had occurred on those trails. The rest of the trails that were closed due to ATV damage have yet to be remediated. A series of court decisions applying Vehicle and Traffic Law §2405 annulled local laws that had opened roads to ATV use. The courts ruled that public roads cannot be opened to ATV use unless it is otherwise impossible to access adjoining trails or riding areas. Since the few remaining open trails were linked by miles of Public Forest Access Roads that remained open to car and truck traffic, all roads and trails were closed to ATV traffic."

In general, the main problems with the former ATV trail system in Brasher State Forest can be summarized as follows:

- All trails were initially opened to ATV use. In hindsight, ATV use should have been restricted to roads and trails that were dry or which had undergone trail hardening in wet sections. Wetter trails should not have been opened to ATV use at any time.

- Little to no money or staff time was available for trail maintenance. This resulted in trails deteriorating and many mud holes and rutted sections developing. Many of these trails had to be closed because there was not sufficient money or staffing to rehabilitate the trails.

- There was a continual problem with ATVs driving in areas that were off limits – either trails not open to ATVs, new illegal trails created by riders, or areas where vehicles deliberately mud-bogged through wetlands, or "hill climbed" on sandy slopes prone to erosion.

2.3 Project Summary

The proposed action consists of upgrading an existing road and trail network on Brasher, Bombay, Buckton, and Ft. Jackson State Forests to provide a multi-use trail system, including ATV use. Some roads and trails will require brushing, grading, culvert or bridge installation, and placing of hard fill to provide a stable trail surface. SEQR analysis for any road or trail sections opened for ATV use that are not located on State-owned lands as part of the larger trail system is not covered by this document. Any such analysis that is determined to be necessary will be conducted by St. Lawrence County as an amendment or supplement to the October 2012 Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed St. Lawrence County Multi-Use Recreational Trail System.

3.0 Potential Impacts and Mitigation

An Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") was prepared to determine the potential significant impacts of the Brasher State Forest Proposed ATV Trail. The EAF identified the following potential impacts which needed to be further addressed: Soil Compaction and Erosion, Noise, Invasive Species, Illegal Trails and Trespass onto Private Land, Conflicts with Other Users, Effects on Wildlife, and Effects on Air Quality.

3.1 Soil Compaction and Erosion

Existing Conditions:

Soils provide the foundation, both figuratively and literally, of forested ecosystems. They support an immense number of microorganisms, fungi, mosses, insects, herpetofauna and small mammals which form the base of the food chain. They filter and store water and also provide and recycle nutrients essential for all plant life. For information on DEC's policies for the protection of forest soils, as well as water resources, please see the Strategic Plan on page 108 at http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/64567.html.

The topography in this area is generally flat with an elevation range from 160 feet above sea level at the Grass River Indian Meadows in Massena, to 580 feet above sea level on Fort Jackson State Forest in the Town of Stockholm. The area is best characterized as having a large number and wide disbursement of wetlands interspersed with a series of glacial tills in the forms of eskers and drumlins. Eskers are best described as relatively narrow ridge-like formations while drumlins are hill-like formations resembling the shape of an inverted spoon.

While many different soil types can be found in this large block, the following listing gives the most prevalent soil types found beneath the general forest cover types.

Upland Natural Hardwood and/or Softwood Stands

Naumburg loamy fine sand: A very deep, level and somewhat poorly drained low lime, sandy soil formed in lake laid deposits. The available water capacity is very low and permeability is rapid.

Carbondale muck: Deep, level and very poorly drained muck soil formed in organic residues. The organic soil material is greater than 51 inches thick over any mineral soil material. The available water capacity is high and the permeability is moderate.

Wegatchie silt loam: A very deep, level and poorly to very poorly drained medium lime, silty soil formed in lake laid deposits. The available water capacity is high and the permeability moderately slow.

Fahey loamy fine sand: Very deep, nearly level and moderately well drained. A low lime, sandy and gravely soil formed in wave washed material. The sand and gravel are underlain by loamy glacial till material. The sand and gravel thickness varies from 3 feet to greater than 6 feet. The available water capacity is very low. Permeability is rapid in the upper sand and gravel layer but moderately slow below.

Croghan sand, 0 to 8% slopes: Very deep and nearly level to gently sloping. A moderately well drained, low lime sandy soil formed in lake laid deposits. The available water capacity is very low and permeability very rapid.

Planted Forests

Croghan loamy fine sand: Very deep, nearly level to gentle slope and moderately well drained. Low lime, sandy soil formed in lake laid deposits. Available water capacity is very low and permeability is very rapid.

Adams loamy fine sand, 2 to 8% slopes: Very deep and gently sloping. A well to excessively drained low lime sandy soil formed in out wash. The available water capacity is low to very low. Permeability is rapid in the upper 2 feet and very rapid below that.

Trout River loamy sand, 3 to 8% slopes: A very deep, gently sloping and somewhat excessively drained low lime, sandy and gravely soil formed in wave washed material. The sand and gravel are underlain by loamy glacial till material. The thickness of sand and gravel varies from 3 feet to greater than 6 feet. Available water capacity is very low and permeability is rapid in the upper section but moderately slow below.

Coveytown loamy fine sand: Very deep, nearly level and somewhat poorly drained medium lime soil. The upper 2 to 3 feet is formed in sandy lake laid deposits and the lower part is loamy glacial till. Available water capacity is very low. Permeability is moderately rapid to rapid in the upper part and moderately slow to moderate in the lower part.

Lowland Swamps

Borosaprists & Fluvaquents, frequently flooded: Nearly level, moderately shallow to very deep and very poorly to somewhat poorly drained soils that are in flood plain areas. Most of these soils have formed in

organic material (muck). Some have formed in mineral soil material (sand, silt or clay). These areas are subject to frequent flooding from nearby streams.

Fluvaquents - Udifluvents complex, frequently flooded: Shallow to deep, nearly level, very poorly to well drained**,** sandy to clayey soils that are in flood plain areas. These areas are subject to frequent flooding from nearby streams.

The soils underlying the proposed multi-use trail system are generally well drained sands or loamy sands. Poorly drained organic soils are sometimes encountered along recreational trails which cross small wetlands or areas affected by beaver flooding activity. Wet trails must receive maintenance to improve drainage and harden the trail surface before being opened to motor vehicle use.

List of Potential Impacts:

- Erosion
- Soil compaction
- Increased sedimentation and turbidity

Trail placement and maintenance in this unit requires careful planning to avoid wet soils, intermittent streams, and vernal pools, which are frequently encountered across the landscape. Once established, trails require regular maintenance and may require periodic closing during wet weather to prevent rutting. This is especially true of roads and trails open to motor vehicles.

Soil erosion can be a major problem on roads and trails exposed to ATV traffic. Low density soils are often compacted by repeated ATV travel, which decreases soil permeability to water and increases the chance for soil erosion. Water logged soils or soils with a high clay content are subject to severe compacting during wet weather. Rill and gully erosion may occur when water flows down channelized wheel tracks in a trail which has become compacted. Erosion is also prone to occur on steep sandy slopes which have little vegetation to secure the soil. A secondary effect of erosion is increased sedimentation in nearby streams and wetlands when eroded soil washes from roads and trails during rain events or during spring snowmelt.

The primary methods used to limit or eliminate erosion are to harden trail surfaces before motor vehicle usage, provide culverts or bridges at wetland crossings, provide undisturbed buffers along streams / wetlands, and limit trail usage to times of dry or frozen ground.

List of Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Whenever possible locate trails on well drained and stable soils. Harden any trail surfaces susceptible to rutting, and install cross drainage (culverts or bridges) to allow water passage under the trail.
- Do not locate trails on steep slopes or steep uphill grades. Maximum slope on trails should be

15%.

- Use soil stabilization practices on exposed soil around bridges after construction.
- Whenever possible, provide buffer strips of undisturbed vegetation between trails and any streams or wetlands. Minimum suggested buffers are 300' for fish bearing streams, 150' for other permanent non fish-bearing streams, and 150' for ponds and other wetlands over an acre. Minimize or eliminate stream crossings.
- Limit trail usage by ATVs to times of dry ground. Under this proposal, the trail system would be open to ATV use from May 15th to Sept. 15th of each year. ATV usage outside this time period is liable to either cause trail damage due to wet conditions, or to conflict with snowmobile usage of the trail system. Trails may also be closed during other periods of prolonged wet weather.
- A trail monitoring program will be initiated during the ATV riding season (mid-spring to mid-fall) to identify and correct trail erosion, illegal trail building, invasive species, and other similar problems before they become permanent.
- Monitor trail conditions before trails are opened, as well as changes caused by trail usage.
- There will be DEC staff (Lands and Forests, Operations, and/or Law Enforcement) assigned to spend at least 5 days a month during the open riding season to ride trails, monitor conditions, enforce regulations, and do trail maintenance.
- There must be funds available to the local DEC Operations staff specifically dedicated to buying materials and equipment, and providing regular maintenance of the multi-use trail system.
- The Department will work with willing partners and outside groups such as ATV clubs, local towns, and St. Lawrence Co. to help maintain the trail system through the issuance of Temporary Revocable Permits (TRP's), Volunteer Stewardship Agreements (VSA's), or Cooperative Agreements (CA's).

3.2 Noise

Existing Conditions:

The properties in this unit are very rural and sounds from manmade disturbance are relatively infrequent and intermittent, such as a car passing every few hours along a seasonal road. Road and trail usage is more common during big game hunting season, but is still mostly limited to sporadic short term visits.

List of Potential Impacts:

- Noise created by ATVs and snowmobiles

- Impact to non-motorized recreational users
- Disturbance of nearby private properties
- Disturbance of bird and animal species

Increased noise from ATVs has been shown to be disruptive to some mammal species as well as nesting and breeding birds. Noise from ATVs may also be disruptive to hunters and non-motorized recreational users located near the trail corridor.

The major past noise complaints have been from large scale rallies or "poker-runs" of 20 or more snowmobiles or ATVs which can cause a large amount of noise as they pass along a common route.

Initial construction activity will result in temporary noise impacts. There will be short-term noise impacts during initial trail rehabilitation activities including grading, ditching, culvert installation, and spreading of gravel for surface hardening. Most significant noise impacts will cease after completion of the initial trail rehabilitation and construction stage. Yearly trail maintenance will cause temporary noise impacts lasting a few days at each work location.

List of Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Site trails away from houses and reduce speed limits.
- Restrict organized rallies or "poker-runs" which would cause a large number of motorized vehicles to congregate along a given route. 6 NYCRR Section 190.8(cc) requires sponsors of organized riding events of more than twenty people to obtain a permit from the Department.
- Adopt regulations setting a maximum ATV speed limit of 25 miles per hour on DEC maintained roads, the same as cars and trucks, and a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour on trails open to ATVs. Users would be ticketed for exceeding the posted speed limits.
- Adopt regulations limiting trail usage to the late spring, summer and early fall seasons, and restricting operating hours. Under this proposal, the trail system would be open to ATV use from May 15th to Sept. 15th of each year. Operating hours would be from 6 am to midnight during the open riding season. These hours correspond to commonly used open hours on Town roads, as well as portions of the St. Lawrence County Multiuse Trail System that have been opened to ATV use.

3.3 Invasive Species

Existing Conditions:

As global trade and travel have increased, so has the introduction of non-native species. While many of these non-native species do not have adverse effects on the areas in which they are introduced, some become invasive in their new ranges, disrupting ecosystem function, reducing biodiversity and degrading natural areas. Invasive species have been identified as one of the greatest threats to

biodiversity, second only to habitat loss (McGinley and Duffy, "Invasive species"). Invasive species can damage native habitats by altering hydrology, fire frequency, soil fertility and other ecosystem processes.

Several species of invasive plants are present across the project area. Invasive species found in upland areas include Common Buckthorn (*Rhamnus cathartica*), Honeysuckle (*Lonicera* spp.), Japanese Knotweed (*Fallopia japonica*), and Pale Swallow-wort (*Vincetoxicum rossicum*). Buckthorn is common along roads and trails and near old home sites, while knotweed and swallow-wort are commonly found near old house sites, power line rights of way, and other disturbed sites.

Wetland areas are sometimes affected by invasive plants such as Common Reed (*Phragmites australis*) and Purple Loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*). Both are commonly found in disturbed or degraded wetlands near major roads, but are less frequently found in more remote and undisturbed areas.

List of Potential Impacts:

- Invasive plants can be transported from one location to another via soil and plant debris carried on ATV tires or frames.
- Displacement of native plant species, leading to reduced biodiversity and forage.

Known invasive species populations have been mapped on a GIS layer available to DEC staff. This layer is regularly updated as new invasive species locations are found.

Most invasive species are still relatively low in density and have not caused widespread degradation to natural species assemblages. The two species that appear to have the highest potential for further expansion and resource damage are Pale Swallow-wort in upland areas and Common Reed in wetlands.

List of Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Require cleaning of ATV tires and chassis when entering and leaving the Multi-use trail system
- Remove invasive plants from trails when feasible
- Control invasive plants at staging areas so that they do not spread onto trails
- A trail monitoring program will be initiated during the ATV riding season (mid-spring to mid- fall) to identify and remove invasive species before they become permanent

3.4 Illegal Trails and Trespass onto Private Land

Existing Conditions:

Illegal trails created by users can be very damaging to understory vegetation and soils, especially those which travel through wet areas. Some trails are deliberately sought out for "mud bogging" in wet areas or "hill climbing" on steep slopes, which are prone to severe erosion and damage. It can be very

difficult to effectively prohibit ATV access to a road or trail that is closed to ATVs. Barriers and gates are often by-passed by the creation of new illegal trails around the barriers.

ATVs are only allowed on roads and trails that are specifically signed as open to ATV use. Any other re-routes, braid trails, newly established trails, hill climbs, mud bogs, or any other undesignated ATV use is illegal. Users are ticketed for riding on any roads or trails not posted as open to ATV use.

There are currently many illegal ATV trails spread throughout the unit. These include roads and trails that were once open to ATV use that have since been closed, newly created trails, or trails that bypass wet sections of trail that have become otherwise impassible.

List of Potential Impacts:

- Erosion and rutting
- Damage to wet areas
- Damage to vegetation
- Creation of new illegal trails onto existing trail network
- Trail locations might encourage trespass onto private lands

Trails sited close to private property can be disruptive to landowners and can encourage trespass onto private lands. Also, private landowners may create their own illegal trails which connect their property to an existing road or trail network.

In order to have a sustainable and environmentally sound trail system, users must be limited to trails that can sustain usage without environmental damage. This requires limiting motorized usage to roads and trails that have hardened trail surfaces, adequate drainage, and stabilized wetland crossings.

List of Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Do not open trails to ATVs in areas that have historically been subject to frequent illegal riding or trespass.
- Conduct periodic patrols of the trails by law enforcement to enforce regulations and ticket violations.
- Partner with willing outside groups such as ATV clubs, local towns, and St. Lawrence Co. to help educate users about illegal use and help monitor/patrol trails to prevent illegal use.
- Monitor illegal usage on roads and trails that are not open to ATV use. If an excessive amount of sampled roads and trails are found to be used illegally in a given month, this may result in the DEC portion of the trail system being closed temporarily. Repeated incidents of excessive illegal ATV use may result in permanent closing of the DEC portion of the trail system.

3.5 Conflicts with Other Users

Existing Conditions

The State Forests in this unit are used for a wide variety of recreational uses. Sportsmen extensively use these areas for hunting, fishing, and trapping throughout the year. Other common recreational uses include hiking, mountain biking, horse riding, cross country skiing, snowmobiling, canoeing, camping, bird watching, and general enjoyment of the natural world.

Overall, there has been a peaceful coexistence of most recreational and trail user groups.

List of Potential Impacts:

- Conflicts between ATV use and other recreational users

Recreationists who value and use State Forests because they provide places where one can experience solitude are opposed to the development of ATV trails because of concerns such as noise, pollution, disturbance to wildlife and ground or vegetation impacts. The impacts, intensity, and nature of both legal and illegal ATV use has been shown to cause other recreational uses to decline, and in some cases completely cease, once an area is opened for ATV use (Moore 1994; Strategic Plan 2010).

Some non-motorized trail users, such as hikers, mountain bikers, and skiers, have expressed a preference for trails which are relatively remote and not open to motorized users such as cars, ATVs, or snowmobiles, due to safety concerns as well as reduced noise. Some users recommend that multi-use trails for motorized recreation should be allowed in certain areas but there should also be trails dedicated to non-motorized recreation, especially on smaller isolated parcels such as Buckton and Southville State Forests.

Initial List of Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Educate users about minimizing potential conflicts on multi-use trails.
- Adopt regulations setting a maximum ATV speed limit of 25 miles per hour on DEC-maintained roads, the same as cars and trucks, and a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour on trails open to ATVs. Users would be ticketed for exceeding the posted speed limits.
- Display signs clearly at trail locations to inform users about trail uses.
- Limit motorized recreational use to designated roads and trails along selected travel corridors.

3.6 Wildlife

Existing Conditions

The State Forests in this unit provide over 30,000 acres of varied wildlife habitat, including coniferous and hardwood forests, large wetlands complexes, and miles of frontage along several major rivers.

Most of the major animal, plant, reptile, fish, and invertebrate species native to the St. Lawrence – Champlain Valley Ecoregion may be found on properties in the St. Lawrence Flatlands management unit.

Hunting is a major recreational use within the area. This includes hunting for deer, turkey, ruffed grouse, waterfowl and small game species. Summaries of deer and bear harvests for this area can be found on the DEC's website at http://www.dec.ny.gov/outdoor/42232.html .

The less severe winter conditions normally encountered within the St. Lawrence Transition zone do not generally result in the winter yarding of deer to the same extent as what normally occurs in the more forested western Adirondack Foothills zone. Still, some yarding does occur and there are two known yarding areas within the Brasher Forest that exceed 200 acres in size.

Fishing opportunities exist on the St. Regis River, Deer River, Redwater Pond and some tributaries. Smallmouth Bass, Walleye and Muskellunge offer the most popular fishing in the rivers while panfish and Largemouth Bass attract anglers to Redwater Pond.

Fishery resources are classified and managed as cool water. Primary sport fish are Walleye, Muskellunge, Northern Pike, and Smallmouth Bass. These fish are found in the larger streams and rivers where summer temperatures tend to be moderate. Cold water species, such as Brown and Brook Trout, have been collected during routine fisheries surveys in the vicinity of the State Forest parcels making up the unit.

Relatively few fisheries surveys (19) have been completed either on or in the vicinity of state-owned parcels incorporated in the unit. In general the low number of survey events is due to limited fishery resources and access. Relevant fishery resources are primarily found in the larger streams. A total of 69 fish species have been found within the watersheds at elevations below 800 feet.

Trapping is a popular pastime in this unit. The large wetland complexes spread throughout the area support healthy populations of Muskrat, Beaver, Mink, and River Otter. Upland areas support populations of Red Fox, Bobcat, Coyote and Fisher. Trapping is often necessary to control the large Beaver population in this area, which often dam road culverts and cause localized flooding problems.

The presence of at-risk species and communities on the St. Lawrence Flatlands Unit and in the surrounding landscape has been investigated to inform appropriate management actions and protections. This investigation was conducted in development of the draft St. Lawrence Flatlands Unit Management Plan (UMP) and the associated inventory of State Forest resources. A more focused assessment will be conducted before undertaking specific management activities in sensitive sites. Appropriate protections may include reserving areas from management activity or mitigating impacts of activity. For more information on protection of at-risk species, please see the Strategic Plan page 115 at http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/64567.html.

Investigation included the following:

- A formal plant survey was conducted on this Unit in 2007 by the New York Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP).
- Element Occurrence Records for the NYNHP Biological and Conservation Data System were consulted for information.
- Review of the State Forest Predicted Richness Overlay (SF PRO) GIS layer, created by the NYNHP.
- Consultation of NYNHP species guides.
- Consultation of the NYS Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy

Table 3.A lists the At-Risk species confirmed or predicted on State Forests near the proposed trail alternatives. Data sources such as the Breeding Bird Atlas and SF PRO GIS layer provide information for a generalized area, but do not include specific locations where Rare, Threatened, or Endangered (RTE) species have been located. When RTE species have been confirmed within 300' of a proposed trail alternative, those species are listed specifically in the text for that alternative.

*Table 3.A. - At-Risk Species**

Species Name	NYNHP Rank	Habitat	Record Source	NYS Status
Confirmed or Predicted within the Unit				
Animals				
Indiana Bat (*Myotis sodalis*)	S1	Forest	SF PRO (PRED)	E SGCN
Birds				
American Bittern (*Botaurus lentiginosus*)	S4	Wetland	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN
Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)	S2S3B,S2N	River	NHEO (CONF)	T SGCN
Black Tern (*Chlidonias niger*)	S2B	Wetland	NHEO (CONF)	E SGCN
Common Nighthawk (*Chordeiles minor*)	S4	Forest	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN
Cooper's Hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*)	S4	Forest	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN
King Rail (*Rallus elegans*)	S2B	Wetland	SF PRO (CONF)	T SGCN
Least Bittern (*Ixobrychus exilis*)	S3B, S1N	Wetland	NHEO (CONF)	T SGCN

Northern Goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*)	S4B, S3N	Forest	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN
Northern Pintail (*Anas acuta*)	S2	Wetland	BBA (CONF)	GAME SGCN
Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*)	S4	River	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN
Pied-billed Grebe (*Podilymbus podiceps*)	S3B, S1N	Wetland	NHEO (CONF)	T SGCN
Red-shouldered Hawk (*Buteo lineatus*)	S4	Forest	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN
Sharp-shinned Hawk (*Accipiter striatus*)	S4	Forest	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN
Upland Sandpiper (*Bartramia longicauda*)	S3B	River	NHEO (CONF)	T SGCN
Whip-poor-will (*Caprimulgus vociferous*)	S4	Forest	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN
Fish				
Blackchin Shiner (*Notropis heterodon*)	S1	River	SF PRO (PRED)	U SGCN
Eastern Sand Darter (*Ammocrypta pellucida*)	S2	River	NHEO (CONF)	T SGCN
Iowa Darter (*Etheostoma exile*)	S2	River	NHEO (CONF)	U SGCN
Lake Sturgeon (*Acipenser fulvescens*)	S1S2	River	NHEO(CONF)	T SGCN
Mooneye (*Hiodon tergisus*)	S1	River	NHEO (CONF)	T SGCN
Northern Brook Lamprey (*Ichthyomyzon fossor*)	S1	Stream	NHEO (CONF)	U
Mollusks				
Black Sandshell (*Ligumia recta*)	S2S3	River	SF PRO (PRED)	U SGCN
Yellow Lampmussel (*Lampsilis cariosa*)	S3	River	NHEO (CONF)	U SGCN
Dragonflies				
Brook Snaketail (*Ophiogomorphus aspersus*)	S2	River	NHEO (CONF)	U SGCN

Extra-striped Snaketail (*Ophiogomphus anomalus*)	S1	River	NHEO (CONF)	PSC SGCN
Rapids Clubtail (*Gomphus quadricolor*)	S1S2	River	SF PRO (PRED)	U SGCN
Reptiles				
Blanding's Turtle (*Emys blandingii*)	S2S3	Wetland	NHEO (CONF)	T SGCN
Plants				
Alpine Cliff Fern (*Woodsia alpina*)	S1	Cliff	SF PRO (PRED)	E
Arctic Rush (*Juncus trifidus*)	S2	Cliff	SF PRO (PRED)	T
Auricled Twayblade (*Listera auriculata*)	S1	Wetland	SF PRO (PRED)	E
Balsam Willow (*Salix pyrifolia*)	S2S3	Wetland	NHEO (CONF)	T
Brown Bog Sedge (*Carex buxbaumii*)	S2	River	NHEO (CONF)	T
Hill's Pondweed (*Potamogeton hilli*)	S2	Wetland	SF PRO (PRED)	T
Hooker's Orchid (*Platanthera hookeri*)	S1	Forest	SF PRO (PRED)	E
Lake-cress (*Neobecki aquatica*)	S2	Wetland	NHEO (CONF)	T
Dwarf Sand-cherry (*Prunus pumila var depressa*)	S2	Grassland	SF PRO (PRED)	T
Meadow Horsetail (*Equisetum pratense*)	S2	Forest	NHEO (CONF)	T
Mingan Moonwort (*Botrychium minganense*)	S1	Forest	SF PRO (PRED)	E
Northern Reedgrass (*Calamagrostis stricta*)	S2	Wetland	SF PRO (PRED)	T
Northern Bog Aster (*Symphyotrichum boreale*)	S2	Wetland	SF PRO (PRED)	T
Pink Wintergreen (*Pyrola asarifolia ssp. Asarifolia*)	S2	Forest	NYNH (CONF)	T

Rhodora (*Rhododendron canadense*)	S2	Wetland	NHEO (CONF)	T
Riverweed (*Podostemum ceratophyllum*)	S2	River	SF PRO (PRED)	T
Roseroot (*Rhodiola rosea*)	S1	Cliff	SF PRO (PRED)	E
Sartwell's Sedge (*Carex sartwellii*)	S1	Wetland	SF PRO (PRED)	T
Scarlet Indian-paintbrush (*Castilleja coccinea*)	S1	Grassland	NHEO (CONF)	E
Slender Marsh Bluegrass (*Poa paludigena*)	S1	Wetland	SF PRO (PRED)	E
Small Bur-reed (*Sparganium natans*)	S2	Wetland	NHEO (CONF)	T
Smooth Cliff Brake (*Pellaea glabella* ssp. *glabella*)	S2	Cliff	SF PRO (PRED)	T
Southern Twayblade (*Listera australis*)	S1	Wetland	SF PRO (PRED)	E
Southern Yellow Flax (*Linum medium var. texanum)*	S2	Grassland	NYNH (CONF)	T
Virginia False Gromwell (*Onosmodium virginianum*)	S1	Grassland	SF PRO (PRED)	E
Whorled Mountain-mint (*Pycnanthemum verticillatum var. verticillatum*)	S1S2	Grassland	NHEO (CONF)	T
Confirmed or Predicted in the Landscape and May Be Affected by State Forest Management				
Birds				
Golden Winged Warbler (*Vermivora chysoptera*)	S4	Grassland	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN
Grasshopper Sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum*)	S4	Grassland	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN

Horned Lark (*Eremophila alpestris*)	S5	Grassland	BBA (CONF)	PSC SGCN
Loggerhead Shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*)	S1	Grassland	BBA (CONF)	E SGCN
Northern Harrier (*Circus cyaneus*)	S3	Grassland	BBA (CONF)	T SGCN
Sedge Wren (*Cistothorus platensis*)	S2	Grassland	BBA (CONF)	T SGCN

*Defined as NYNHP rank S1, S2, S2-3, G1, G2 or G2-3 OR identified as an SGCN. Readers should note that species identified only from the SF PRO GIS layer are predicted occurrences which have not been confirmed as being present.

Key to Codes

BBA - Breeding Bird Atlas

(PRED) - Predicted Species

(CONF) - Confirmed Species

NHEO – Natural Heritage Element Occurrence GIS Layer

NYNH – NY Natural Heritage Program: Biodiversity Inventory of Regions 5 and 6

SF PRO – State Forest Predicted Richness Overlay GIS coverage

Status

E - Endangered Species (New York)

T - Threatened Species (New York)

PSC - Protected, Special Concern Species (New York)

SGCN - Species of Greatest Conservation Need

U - Unlisted (New York)

GAME - Game Species (New York)

Several species of fish listed as either State Endangered (E) or Threatened (T) have been reported in the Raquette River and St. Regis River watersheds. Eastern Sand Darter (E) and Lake Sturgeon (T) have both been reported in DEC surveys in the vicinity of the St. Lawrence Flatlands unit. Mooneye (T) have been reported at the downstream portions of the St. Regis River. Lake Sturgeon have been stocked in the lower Raquette and St. Regis Rivers in an effort to bolster populations and de-list the species.

This unit is also known to host at least two active Great Blue Heron (*Ardea herodias*) rookeries, located on Bombay and Brasher State Forests. Both rookeries are situated in large wetland complexes which are in remote sections of these forests.

Potential Impacts:

- Damage to habitat
- Noise disruption to wildlife near trail
- Cause wildlife injury and mortality

Wildlife habitat may be damaged through the trampling of vegetation along well used recreational trails, and the introduction of non-native invasive species.

Noise and disturbance from ATVs have been found to have a wide variety of potential negative effects on wildlife, including increased stress, altered movement patterns, avoidance of high use areas, and disrupted nesting activities of birds. ATV use may also cause direct mortality of animals, reptiles, and amphibians which are crossing roads or recreational trails.

Most of the rare, threatened, or endangered species in this unit are found in wetland or riverine habitats, or use these habitats during some period of their development. Any potential degradation of wetlands or other sensitive habitat could have a potentially severe negative impact on rare, threatened, or endangered species which are dependent on that habitat.

Special care must be taken to minimize disturbance during trail construction and maintenance activities which occur near known RTE species locations.

Initial List of Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Limit ATV use to designated trails.
- Minimize wetland and stream crossings. Trails will cross these sensitive areas only at stabilized crossings which may require culverts or small bridges. Do not alter surrounding wetland water levels during trail construction.
- Adopt regulations setting a maximum ATV speed limit of 25 miles per hour on DEC-maintained roads, the same as cars and trucks, and a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour on trails open to ATVs. Users would be ticketed for exceeding the posted speed limits.

3.7 Air Quality

Existing Conditions:

The air quality in the State Forests in this management unit is generally good. These forests are very rural with little heavy industry or industrial air pollution, compared to more urban areas. It is rare to have ozone warnings or other health related issues in this vicinity.

Potential Impacts:

- Air pollution caused by ATV exhaust
- Particulate matter stirred up by driving ATVs on unpaved roads

There are varying opinions about the environmental impacts of the air pollution produced by ATVs. Presently, it is not possible to measure air pollution caused specifically by ATVs. Noise pollution is generally an issue of concern for those who currently use or live near State Forests as described above. The Strategic Plan states "that machines will be monitored for compliance with muffler requirements and a minimum 1,000 foot buffer zone must be left between the trail and neighboring private structures."

Initial List of Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Adopt regulations setting a maximum ATV speed limit of 25 miles per hour on DEC-maintained roads, the same as cars and trucks, and a maximum speed limit of 15 miles per hour on trails open to ATVs. Users would be ticketed for exceeding the posted speed limits.
- ATVs used on this trail system must be licensed and registered, and must meet current EPA guidelines for air pollutants and exhaust.

3.8 Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts

Unavoidable adverse environmental impacts associated with the upgraded road and trail network are very minor. These are temporary, and include noise, dust, odors and fumes.

3.9 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Environmental Resources

There are no actions that will be undertaken that will result in significant irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources. If at some later time, the improved road and trail network is no longer used, the trails and roads and any improvements made to them will revert back to a natural state. The only permanent commitment of resources are the raw materials used for upgrading the road and trail network, and the energy source expended during the construction phase and maintenance of the area, all of which will be extremely minimal.

3.10 Growth Inducing Aspects of the Proposed Action

An increase in use to the area can be expected as a result of upgrading the existing road and trail network to a multi-use trail system allowing ATV use. The influx of users can be expected to benefit local economies.

3.11 Impacts of the Proposed Action on the Use and Conservation of Energy

The proposed action will cause only a minor increase in the use of energy. This will occur during the construction phase of the project as a result of the use of fossil fuels to operate machinery for road and trail hardening and grading, culvert and bridge construction, and for brushing of vegetation. This will cause only a temporary increase in energy use.

4.0 Alternatives Analysis

The *Strategic Plan for State Forest Management* allows for ATV use on state maintained roads and trails under two conditions (p. 222):

"Based on evaluation of past efforts to accommodate ATV use and the many impacts and constraints associated with off road vehicles, the Department will not permit ATV use on State Forests , except;

- as may be considered to accommodate a "connector trail" through Unit Management Planning or a similar public process; and
- on those specific routes designated for use by DEC-issued Motorized Access Permit for People with Disabilities (MAPPWD)."

Connector Trails

The following conditions must be met for a proposed ATV Connector Trail across State Forest land (Strategic Plan p. 223):

"In the event another entity is establishing a legitimate public ATV trail system on lands adjacent to a State Forest, and a State Forest is needed to serve as a connecting link, or in the event that a State Forest road or trail could serve to connect already designated ATV trails open to the public, DEC will evaluate and consider the proposal. Any such trail proposal must comply with state law, department policy and regulations. If it is determined to be environmentally compatible, a connecting trail could be established on the State Forest. This would be dependent on the availability of sufficient funds to establish and maintain a sustainable trail. The State Forest based connector trail, if approved, must follow the shortest environmentally acceptable route available.

The inclusion of a connector trail in a UMP and the subsequent establishment of any such trail could only occur if it does not compromise the protection of the natural resources of the Unit, significantly conflict with neighbors of State Forests, nor interfere with other established recreational areas. Such designation shall only occur through the amendment or adoption of a UMP or another process which provides similar opportunities for public review and comments and full SEQRA review of the proposed designation.

Connector trails will be monitored to ensure that legal use does not lead to illegal off-trail use within State Forest lands or on neighboring private property. Should illegal use increase significantly adjacent to any connector trail, that trail will be subject to closure."

Additionally, any trail alternatives which open roads that are open to motor vehicles must comply with the New York State Vehicle and Traffic Law (VTL) Section 2405, which prohibits the opening of highways (i.e. any road open for public motor vehicle use) to ATV use unless "it is otherwise impossible for ATVs to gain access to areas or trails adjacent to the highway." Courts have repeatedly interpreted this to mean that public roads can only be open to ATV use when that portion of road being opened provides a critical connection between existing trail systems in order to make the trail system viable. Highways designated as open to ATV use are not trails for purposes of the VTL, so road-to-road connections are suspect under VTL §2405. Alternatives which open large sections of public road without direct trail-to-trail connections could be subject to a legal challenge under VTL §2405. To comply with VTL §2405, the roads could be closed to all motorized vehicles but ATVs, but that alternative would deny the use of these areas to any other motorized vehicles.

4.1 Proposed Connector Trail through Brasher State Forest

This section provides an alternatives review of each of the Brasher State Forest connector trail proposals. Roads and trails maintained by the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) are denoted in the text.

Alternative 1a (preferred alternative). (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1a and 1b). During scoping sessions for the Brasher UMP in 2001, local ATV clubs requested a multiple use recreational trail (including ATVs) which would cross portions of Brasher State Forest, as well as St. Lawrence County Forest #18 located on the Bush Road. This route is the preferred alternative for a connector trail through Brasher State Forest.

The following roads and trails are proposed for opening to ATV use, beginning in the southeast portion of Brasher State Forest at the junction of St. Lawrence County Route 50 and the Burns Trail, and heading northerly:

Road or Trail Name	Distance (miles)
Burns Trail (DEC)	1.4
Shop Loop Haul Road (DEC)	0.3
Ranger Trail (DEC)	0.3
Camp / Larue PFAR (DEC)	0.9
Kennehan Haul Road (DEC)	0.8
North Kennehan Trail (DEC)	0.8
County Trail	0.2 (St. Lawrence County Forest)
John G. Trail	0.4 (St. Lawrence County Forest portion)

John G. Trail (DEC)	1.4 (state forest portion)
McCarthy PFAR (DEC)	0.2
Bush PFAR (DEC)	0.5
Wilson PFAR (DEC)	0.1
Ralph B. Trail (DEC)	0.6
Bobcat Trail (DEC)	0.9
Bush PFAR (DEC)	0.5
Bush Road (town)	0.3

The proposed ATV route would end at the junction of the Bush Road and St. Lawrence County Route 55 in the hamlet of Brasher Iron Works. This route would travel through the central portion of Brasher State Forest, and would involve opening a total of 2.2 miles of DEC Public Forest Access Roads, 1.1 miles of Haul Roads, and 5.4 miles of other recreational trails on Brasher State Forest to ATV use. An additional 0.6 mile of trails would need to be opened on St. Lawrence County Forest #18, and would require the St. Lawrence County Legislature to officially designate the county portion of the trail as opened to ATV use. A 0.3 mile portion of the Bush Road in Brasher Iron Works would need to be opened to ATV use by the Town of Brasher. The longest continuous stretch of road opened to ATV use would be 1.7 miles long (Camp/Larue PFAR & Kennehan Haul Road).

There are several portions of these roads and trails which would require rehabilitation before they could be re-opened to ATV use. The main PFARs are in good condition and would require no additional maintenance. The haul roads are generally in good condition but would require brushing, grading, and limited trail hardening, especially the Kennehan Haul Road. Most of the DEC trails included in this route have received minimal maintenance over the last several years due to staffing shortages and are in fair to poor condition. They would require brushing, grading, and localized trail hardening and culvert installations.

There are two trail sections that are in very poor condition and would require substantial improvement.

The North Kennehan Trail contains several seasonally wet and muddy sections that need surfacing and ditching. A major problem area is “Alligator Swamp” which is located near the boundary line of St. Lawrence RA 5 (Brasher State Forest) and the southwestern boundary line of County Forest #18. The trail crosses the outlet of a large 200 acre+ wetland. There is a section of trail approximately 200 feet long that is under standing water during much of the year. This section would require either large culverts or a small bridge to cross the outlet, as well as substantial fill for raising the trail surface and tread hardening. This area is within the 100’ buffer of a classified state and federal protected wetland. Any fill or trail work within this area will require permits from the appropriate regulatory agency – both

the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (State Classified Wetlands) and the US Army Corps of Engineers (Federal Classified Wetlands).

The Bobcat Trail contains a section of seasonally wet trail (near the intersection with the Ralph B. Trail) that was previously hardened with cobble rock, but still remains wet. There is an approximately 150 foot long section that needs additional drainage, buildup of the trail surface, and culvert installation.

Most of the work needed along roads and trails will occur in areas that are wet and require stabilization. Many road and trail segments are seasonally wet for short distances, and may require ditching, culvert installation and surfacing with a foot or more of hard fill, such as crushed stone or cobble rock.

Some sections of trail have become damaged by past ATV use, and consist of low rutted areas which are filled with standing water for distances of 10 to 50 feet. These areas would be smoothed, and geotextile would be placed in the wet trail section. Then crushed stone or cobble would be placed on the geotextile to raise the trail surface a foot or more and provide a hard, stable trail surface. In some cases, it may be preferable to re-route a trail in a better location, rather than re-use a trail which is poorly located and will require frequent maintenance.

Large wetlands or streams will require drainage structures to let water pass under the trail unimpeded. Wetland crossings would utilize either a large diameter open bottomed arch culvert, or a snowmobile bridge ranging from 10 to 25 feet long. A snowmobile bridge would require installation of abutments, which would be composed of either wood cribbing or large rock rip-rap. Both culverts and bridges would require the placing of crushed stone or fill for covering approaches to the wetland crossing. Silt fencing will be used near wetlands to minimize soil movement and erosion from the trail corridor. All road and trail work will be performed using guidelines found in the *New York State Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality: BMP Field Guide.*

Heavy equipment usage will be required to perform rehabilitation and maintenance on the trail system. Activities which involve transporting crushed rock and stone will require the use of a small dump truck to deliver the material as close to the worksite as possible. The material will then be re-loaded into either a Utility Task Vehicle (UTV) with a dump box or a small pull behind dump trailer and taken to the worksite. A small mini-excavator would be used for ditching, culvert installation, and placing of hard fill. A small bulldozer or a tractor and York rake would be used for grading trails when accessibility and trail conditions permit.

Trees located along haul roads and trails may need to be removed or limbed in order to increase headroom clearance for motor vehicles or horse riders using the trail system. Trees may also be removed to straighten and widen narrow sections of trail, or improve areas with poor sight distance along the trail. In general, tree removal is expected to be relatively minor and the existing road and trail dimensions will be maintained or slightly widened.

This is the preferred alternative because it would utilize primarily trails, with limited use of roads only where no other suitable routes were available. It would provide a connecting link to County Forest #18

in the central portion of Brasher State Forest, as well as the communities of Brasher Falls and Brasher Iron Works. This alternative would also use trails that are more scenic and remote, which riders have said they prefer compared to traveling along well traveled motor vehicle roads.

Alternative 1b. (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1a and 1b). This alternative is very similar to Alternative 1a, with some minor re-routing in the vicinity of County Forest #18.

The southern section of the trail would remain the same, utilizing the Burns Trail (DEC), Shop Loop Haul Road (DEC), Ranger Trail (DEC), Camp / Larue PFAR (DEC), Kennehan Haul Road (DEC), and North Kennehan Trail (DEC). It would then travel north on the County Trail a distance of 0.8 mile to the junction with the Bush PFAR. Then it would travel east on the Bush PFAR (DEC) a distance 1.3 miles to the junction with the McCarthy PFAR (DEC). It would then follow the same route as Alternative 1a, using the Bush PFAR (DEC), Wilson PFAR (DEC), Ralph B. Trail (DEC), Bobcat Trail (DEC), Bush PFAR (DEC), and Bush Road ending at St. Lawrence County Route 55 in Brasher Iron Works.

This alternative would increase travel along the Bush PFAR from 0.5 to 1.3 miles, but would eliminate 1.4 miles of travel on the John G. Trail (State Forest portion) and 0.2 mile on the McCarthy PFAR. The distance traveled on trails on County Forest #18 would increase from 0.6 to 0.8 mile.

This alternative would use more roads and fewer trails, which would likely decrease needed rehabilitation and maintenance. The 2 poorest trail sections (North Kennehan Trail and Bobcat Trail) would still require substantial rehabilitation.

Total distances traveled on this route would be 2.8 miles of DEC Public Forest Access Roads, 1.1 miles of Haul Roads, and 4.0 miles of other recreational trails on Brasher State Forest. A total of 0.8 mile of trails would need to be opened on St. Lawrence County Forest #18, and 0.3 mile of the Bush Road (town road).

Alternative 1c. (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1c and 1d). This route uses primarily town of Brasher roads for a trail corridor, but also includes a short section of the Bush Public Forest Access Road (PFAR), which would allow connection to the northern end of County Forest #18.

Under this alternative, the Town of Brasher would have to re-open public roads previously used by ATVs. New York State Vehicle and Traffic Law (VTL) Section 2405 prohibits the opening of highways (i.e. any road open for public motor vehicle use) to ATV use unless "it is otherwise impossible for ATVs to gain access to areas or trails adjacent to the highway." Courts have repeatedly interpreted this to mean that public roads can only be open to ATV use when that portion of road being opened provides a critical connection between existing trail systems in order to make the trail system viable. Highways designated as open to ATV use are not trails for purposes of the VTL, so road-to-road connections are suspect under VTL §2405. Because Alternative 1c opens large sections of public road without direct trail-to-trail connections, implementation of this alternative could be subject to a legal challenge under VTL §2405. To comply with VTL §2405, the town could close the roads identified in Alternative 1c to all

motorized vehicles but ATVs, but that alternative would deny the use of Brasher State Forest to any other motorized vehicles.

The southern portion of the trail would begin at the junction of the Leary-Flint Road and the Burns Road. It would travel west 2.4 miles on the Burns Road to the junction with St. Lawrence County Route 50. Then it would travel 0.9 mile west on St. Lawrence County Route 50 to the intersection with the Vice Road near the village of Brasher Falls. It would then travel 0.5 mile north on the Vice Road and turn sharply left, continuing north on the Vice Road for an additional 3.9 miles to the junction with the Bush Public Forest Access Road. A 1.0 mile section of the Bush PFAR (DEC) leading from the Vice Road east to County Forest #18 would be opened to ATV use, and would allow ATV users access to any trails opened to ATV use on the County Forest. Users could then return to the Vice Road and continue north 3.1 miles on the Vice Road, to the intersection with the Meyers Road. Riders would then continue 2.3 miles east on the Meyers Road to the junction with St. Lawrence County Route 55, between the hamlets of Brasher Iron Works and Helena. From here the trail would travel 0.8 mile southeast on County Route 55, to the junction with the Smith Road. It would then travel 0.3 mile north on the Smith Road to the junction with the Quinell Road. The trail would then continue 2.9 miles northwest on the Quinell Road to the hamlet of Helena.

The St. Lawrence County Roads which would need to be opened to ATVs are as follows (1.7 miles total):

St. Lawrence County Route 50 – 0.9 mile

St. Lawrence County Route 55 – 0.8 mile

The Town of Brasher Roads which would need to be opened to ATVs are as follows (15.4 miles total):

Burns Road – 2.4 miles

Vice Road – 7.5 miles

Meyers Road – 2.3 miles

Smith Road – 0.3 mile

Quinell Road – 2.9 miles

The DEC Public Forest Access Roads which would need to be declared open to ATVs are as follows:

Bush Public Forest Access Road – 1.0 mile

Most of the roads along this route are in fair to good condition and would require little additional maintenance to allow a multi-use trail system. However, the northernmost 2.5 mile section of the Vice Road (between Brasher Center and the Meyers Road) has not been maintained in many years and is in very poor condition. It would require, at minimum, ditching, grading and culvert installation.

There is a confirmed record of Eastern Sand Darter, a threatened fish species, being present in the Deer River near this proposed alternative route.

Alternative 1d. (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1c and 1d). This alternative is similar to Alternative 1c above, but uses different roads in the central section.

The southernmost section would remain the same, beginning at the junction of the Leary-Flint Road and the Burns Road. The trail would proceed northwest using the Burns Road, St. Lawrence County Route 50, and the Vice Road. At the intersection of the Vice Road and the Bush PFAR, the trail would proceed east 1.0 mile on the Bush PFAR (DEC) to St. Lawrence County Forest 18. Riders could then access any trails on the County Forest that were open to ATV use. Riders would then continue northeast on the Bush PFAR (DEC) an additional 3.6 miles to the Bush Road, and then proceed north 0.3 mile on the Bush Road to the intersection with St. Lawrence County Route 55 in Brasher Iron Works. The trail would then proceed north 0.3 mile on St. Lawrence County Route 55 to the junction with the Smith Road. The trail from this point would follow the same route as Alternative 1c, utilizing the Smith and Quinell Roads to reach the hamlet of Helena.

This option would eliminate the northernmost 2.5 mile portion of the Vice road that is in poor condition, as well as the Meyers Road, and would re-direct traffic onto the Bush PFAR and Bush Road.

Compared to Alternative 1c, the total amount of St. Lawrence County roads open to ATVs would decrease from 1.7 to 1.2 miles. Town of Brasher roads open to ATVs would decrease from 15.4 to 10.3 miles. DEC maintained PFARS open to ATVs would increase from 1.0 to 4.6 miles.

There is a confirmed record of Eastern Sand Darter, a threatened fish species, being present in the Deer River near this proposed alternative route.

4.2 Proposed Loop Trails through Brasher and Bombay State Forests

The Draft St. Lawrence Flatlands Unit Management Plan was offered for public review and comment from November 5th, 2014 to January 15th, 2015. As part of the review and comment process, the St. Lawrence County Recreational Trails coordinator, in conjunction with the Town of Brasher, submitted a proposal for 6 loop trails covering various routes in Brasher and Bombay State Forests. These routes would also intersect with the proposed Connector Trail through Brasher State Forest (Alternative 1a), as well as Town of Brasher Roads, St. Lawrence County Roads, and trails across county and private land which would be opened to ATV use.

The following is an alternatives review of each of the loop trail proposals. Roads and trails maintained by the DEC are denoted in the text.

Alternative 2a (Loop 1). (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1a and 2a). This proposal would utilize a system of Town of Brasher roads and DEC roads to form a loop southwest of Brasher Iron Works. The loop would begin at the intersection of the Meyers Road and Vice Road. It would then travel southwest 1.3 miles on the Vice Road to the intersection with the northern end of the Hastings Falls Haul Road. Riders would then travel 2.0 miles southwest on the Hastings Falls Haul Road (DEC) to the

intersection with the Vice Road. The trail would then continue 0.2 mile south on the Vice Road to the intersection with the Bush PFAR. It would then continue 2.8 miles northeast along the Bush PFAR (DEC) to the intersection with the Wilson PFAR. Then It would travel 2.1 miles north on the Wilson PFAR (DEC) to the intersection with the Meyers Road. Lastly, It would travel 0.3 mile northwest on the Meyers Road to the beginning point.

This route would travel through the central portion of Brasher State Forest, and would involve opening a total of 4.9 miles of DEC Public Forest Access Roads, 2.0 miles of DEC Haul Roads, and 1.8 miles of Town of Brasher Roads to ATV use. This loop overlaps with portions of the proposed Connector Trail through Brasher State Forest (Alternative 1a). The roads common to both proposals include the Bush PFAR (0.5 mile) and the Wilson PFAR (0.1 mile).

Most of the roads along this route are in fair to good condition and would require little additional maintenance to allow a multi-use trail system. However, the northernmost 1.3 mile section of the Vice Road (between Brasher Center and the Meyers Road) has not been maintained in many years and is in very poor condition. It would require, at minimum, ditching, grading and culvert installation.

This section of Brasher State Forest can be accessed by using the Meyers Road and the Vice Road (Town of Brasher Roads). County Forest #18 would still be accessible from the proposed Connector Trail through Brasher State Forest (Alternative 1a). This proposal does not meet Strategic Plan requirements for a connector trail, which state that "The State Forest-based connector trail, if approved, must follow the shortest environmentally acceptable route available." In this case, the general area could be accessed by the proposed Brasher State Forest Connector Trail (Alternative 1a), plus Town of Brasher Roads, without opening additional DEC maintained roads.

This route opens a total of 8.7 miles of Town of Brasher and DEC Roads to ATV use. This proposal for opening the Hastings Falls Haul Road, Bush PFAR, and Wilson PFAR to ATV use does not meet the requirements of Vehicle and Traffic Law §2405, which prohibits the opening of highways (i.e. any road open for public motor vehicle use) to ATV use unless "it is otherwise impossible for ATVs to gain access to areas or trails adjacent to the highway." Courts have repeatedly interpreted this to mean that public roads can only be open to ATV use when that portion of road being opened provides a critical connection between existing trail systems in order to make the trail system viable. Highways designated as open to ATV use are not trails for purposes of the VTL, so road-to-road connections are suspect under VTL §2405. Alternatives which open large sections of public road without direct trail-to-trail connections could be subject to a legal challenge under VTL §2405.

Alternative 2b (Loop 2). (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1a and 2b). This proposal would utilize a system of Town of Brasher roads, DEC roads, DEC trails, and trails on St. Lawrence County Forest #18 to form a loop leading from Brasher Falls north to the County Forest and then returning to Brasher Falls.

The trail would begin at the intersection of the Vice Road and the Camp / Larue PFAR north of Brasher Falls. It would travel 1.4 miles north on the Camp / Larue PFAR (DEC) to the intersection with the Kennehan Haul Road. Riders would then travel 0.8 mile north on the Kennehan Haul Road (DEC) to the

intersection with the North Kennehan Trail. The trail would then travel north 0.8 mile on the North Kennehan Trail (DEC) to the intersection with the County Trail (located on St. Lawrence Co. Forest #18). It would then travel 0.8 mile north on the County Trail to the intersection with the Bush PFAR. Users would then travel 0.9 mile west on the Bush PFAR (DEC) to the intersection with the Vice Road. The route would then travel 3.9 miles south along the Vice Road to the beginning point.

This route would travel through the central portion of Brasher State Forest, and would involve opening a total of 2.3 miles of DEC Public Forest Access Roads, 0.8 mile of DEC Haul Roads, 0.8 mile of DEC trails. 0.8 mile of county trails, and 3.9 miles of Town of Brasher Roads to ATV use. This loop overlaps with portions of the proposed Connector Trail through Brasher State Forest (Alternative 1a). The roads and trails common to both proposals include the Camp / Larue PFAR (0.9 mile), Kennehan Haul Road (0.8 mile), and the North Kennehan Trail (0.8 mile).

Most of the roads along this route are in good condition and would require little additional maintenance to allow a multi-use trail system. However, the Kennehan Haul Road and North Kennehan Trail will require maintenance (see description of work needed under Alternative 1a).

This section of Brasher State Forest can be accessed by the proposed Connector Trail through Brasher State Forest (Alternative 1a). Opening the southern portion of the Camp / Larue PFAR does not provide access to additional areas. This proposal does not meet Strategic Plan requirement for a connector trail, which states that "The State Forest-based connector trail, if approved, must follow the shortest environmentally acceptable route available." In this case, the general area could be accessed by the proposed Brasher State Forest Connector Trail (Proposal 1a), without opening additional DEC maintained Roads.

This route opens a total of 7.0 miles of Town of Brasher and DEC Roads as well as 1.6 miles of DEC and county trails to ATV use. This proposal does not meet the requirements of Vehicle and Traffic Law §2405, which prohibits the opening of highways (i.e. any road open for public motor vehicle use) to ATV use unless "it is otherwise impossible for ATVs to gain access to areas or trails adjacent to the highway." Courts have repeatedly interpreted this to mean that public roads can only be open to ATV use when that portion of road being opened provides a critical connection between existing trail systems in order to make the trail system viable. Highways designated as open to ATV use are not trails for purposes of the VTL, so road-to-road connections are suspect under VTL §2405. Alternatives which open large sections of public road without direct trail-to-trail connections could be subject to a legal challenge under VTL §2405.

Alternative 2c (Loop 3). (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1a, 2c, 2d). This proposal would utilize a system of Town of Brasher roads, St. Lawrence County roads, and DEC roads to form a loop around the Walter F. Pratt CC Dam / Redwater camping area near North Lawrence. The trail would begin at the intersection of the Old Keenan Road and the CC Dam PFAR. It would travel southwest 1.3 miles along the CC Dam PFAR (DEC) to the intersection with St. Lawrence Co. Route 55. Riders would then travel south 0.5 mile on SLC Route 55 to the intersection with the East Cotter Road. It would then travel 1.0

mile northeast along the East Cotter Road to the intersection with the Old Keenan Road. Users would then travel 0.6 mile north along the Old Keenan Road to the beginning point.

This route would travel through the southeastern portion of Brasher State Forest, and would involve opening a total of 1.3 miles of DEC Public Forest Access Roads, 1.6 miles of Town of Brasher Roads, and 0.5 mile of St. Lawrence County Roads to ATV use.

The CC Dam PFAR and County Route 55 are in good condition and would require little additional maintenance to allow a multi-use trail system. However, the East Cotter and Old Keenan Roads have not been maintained in many years and are in very poor condition. They would require, at minimum, ditching, grading and culvert installation.

The CC Dam PFAR was open to ATVs during the late 1980s and into the 1990s. This area contains a popular camping area that is heavily used during the summer months. The camping area was subject to repeated problems with ATV use: ATVs driving in closed areas such as on lawns and on the dam impoundment, ATVs not following the posted speed limits, and large group ATV rides which disturbed other campers and recreationalists. It is likely that if this route were re-opened to ATV use, many of these problems would re-occur. Due to past problems with ATV use in this area, the Department does not support opening roads and trails in the Walter F. Pratt / CC Dam picnic area to ATV use now or in the future.

This section of Brasher State Forest can be accessed by using the Old Keenan and East Cotter Roads (Town of Brasher Roads). This proposal does not meet Strategic Plan requirements for a connector trail, which state that "The State Forest-based connector trail, if approved, must follow the shortest environmentally acceptable route available." In this case, the general area could be accessed by Town of Brasher Roads, without opening additional DEC maintained roads.

This route opens a total of 3.4 miles of Town of Brasher, DEC, and County Roads to ATV use. This proposal for opening the CC Dam PFAR to ATV use does not meet the requirements of Vehicle and Traffic Law §2405, which prohibits the opening of highways (i.e. any road open for public motor vehicle use) to ATV use unless "it is otherwise impossible for ATVs to gain access to areas or trails adjacent to the highway." Courts have repeatedly interpreted this to mean that public roads can only be open to ATV use when that portion of road being opened provides a critical connection between existing trail systems in order to make the trail system viable. Highways designated as open to ATV use are not trails for purposes of the VTL, so road-to-road connections are suspect under VTL §2405. Alternatives which open large sections of public road without direct trail-to-trail connections could be subject to a legal challenge under VTL §2405.

There is a confirmed record of Northern Brook Lamprey, an imperiled fish species, being present in Redwater Creek near this proposed alternative route.

Alternative 2d (Loop 4). (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1a, 2c, 2d). This proposal would utilize a system of Town of Brasher roads and DEC roads to form a loop northeast of the Walter F. Pratt CC Dam /

Redwater camping area. It would begin at the intersection of the Old Keenan Road and the Liberty PFAR. It would travel northeast 1.7 miles along the Liberty PFAR (DEC) to the end of the currently maintained road. Here the road becomes the Pascal Haul Road (DEC), which is an unmaintained road in poor condition. The route would continue 2.5 miles northwest along the Pascal Haul Road (DEC) to the intersection with the Old Keenan Road. The trail would then travel 1.0 mile south along the Old Keenan Road to the beginning point.

This route would travel through the eastern portion of Brasher State Forest, and would involve opening a total of 1.7 miles of DEC Public Forest Access Roads, 2.5 miles of DEC Haul Roads, and 1.0 mile of Town of Brasher Roads to ATV use.

The Liberty PFAR is in good condition and would require little additional maintenance to allow a multi-use trail system. However, the Pascal Haul Road and Old Keenan Roads have not been maintained in many years and are in very poor condition. They would require, at minimum, ditching, grading and culvert installation.

This route has several difficulties. If the Old Keenan Road were opened to ATV use, opening the DEC maintained Liberty PFAR and Pascal Haul Road to ATVs would be redundant – riders could access the main north south route along the Old Keenan Road without opening any DEC roads in this area.

The Pascal Haul Road is also in very poor condition, containing many wet and flooded sections of road. In the Draft St. Lawrence Flatlands UMP, this road is proposed for rebuilding to PFAR standards, and would be opened to ATV use through the MAPPWD program, in which persons with disabilities may obtain permits to use ATVs on roads and trails posted as MAPPWD routes. The Pascal Haul Road was selected for this designation because it is a relatively isolated area which would be amenable to hunting and other recreational uses. Opening this area to ATV use by other riders would potentially limit is effectiveness and value to MAPPWD trail users.

This section of Brasher State Forest can be accessed by using the Old Keenan Road (Town of Brasher Road). This proposal does not meet Strategic Plan requirements for a connector trail, which state that "The State Forest-based connector trail, if approved, must follow the shortest environmentally acceptable route available." In this case, the general area could be accessed by Town of Brasher Roads, without opening additional DEC maintained roads.

This route opens a total of 5.2 miles of Town of Brasher and DEC Roads to ATV use. This proposal for opening the Liberty PFAR and Pascal Haul Road to non-MAPPWD ATV use does not meet the requirements of Vehicle and Traffic Law §2405, which prohibits the opening of highways (i.e. any road open for public motor vehicle use) to ATV use unless "it is otherwise impossible for ATVs to gain access to areas or trails adjacent to the highway." Courts have repeatedly interpreted this to mean that public roads can only be open to ATV use when that portion of road being opened provides a critical connection between existing trail systems in order to make the trail system viable. Highways designated as open to ATV use are not trails for purposes of the VTL, so road-to-road connections are

suspect under VTL §2405. Alternatives which open large sections of public road without direct trail-to-trail connections could be subject to a legal challenge under VTL §2405.

Alternative 2e (Loop 5). (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1a, 2e, 2f). This proposal would utilize a system of Town of Brasher roads, Town of Moira roads, DEC roads, and DEC trails to form a loop leading from Shady City east into Bombay State Forest in Franklin County, then north towards Brasher Iron Works, and finally returning south to Shady City.

The loop would begin at the intersection of the Old Keenan Road and the Hurley Road in Shady City. It would travel 2.2 miles east along the Hurley Road to the Franklin County line. Here the Hurley Road changes to the Best Road (Town of Moira). The route would continue an additional 1.1 miles east on the Best Road to the intersection with the Railroad Bed PFAR. It would then travel 4.3 miles northwest along the Railroad Bed PFAR (DEC) through Bombay State Forest and Brasher State Forest to the intersection with the Old Keenan Road. Users would then travel 2.5 miles south along the Old Keenan Road to the beginning point. In addition to this route, it is also proposed to open 2 DEC trails as alternate routes leading from the Old Keenan Road to the Railroad Bed PFAR. These trails include the Bear Run Trail (0.4 mile) and the Hoggsback Trail (1.9 miles).

This route would travel through the eastern portion of Brasher State Forest, and would involve opening a total of 4.3 miles of DEC Public Forest Access Roads, 2.3 miles of DEC trails, 4.7 miles of Town of Brasher Roads, and 1.1 miles of Town of Moira Roads to ATV use.

The Railroad Bed PFAR is in good condition and would require little additional maintenance to allow a multi-use trail system. However, the Hurley, Old Keenan, and Best Roads have not been maintained in many years and are in very poor condition. They would require, at minimum, ditching, grading and culvert installation.

This section of Brasher State Forest can be accessed by using the Hurley and Old Keenan Roads (Town of Brasher Roads) and the Best Road (Town of Moira Road). This proposal does not meet Strategic Plan requirements for a connector trail, which state that "The State Forest-based connector trail, if approved, must follow the shortest environmentally acceptable route available." In this case, the general area could be accessed by Town of Brasher and Moira Roads, without opening additional DEC maintained roads and trails. This would provide access from Shady City to Brasher Iron Works, as well as Moira in Franklin County. Additionally, the Hoggsback trail was open to ATVs during the 1980s and 1990s and was later closed to ATV use due to rutting in the central portion of the trail. The Hoggsback Trail can be used by snowmobiles under frozen conditions, but it is not suitable to ATV use.

This route opens a total of 10.1 miles of Town of Brasher, Town of Moira, and DEC Roads, as well as 2.3 miles of DEC trails to ATV use. This proposal for opening the Railroad Bed PFAR to ATV use does not meet the requirements of Vehicle and Traffic Law §2405, which prohibits the opening of highways (i.e. any road open for public motor vehicle use) to ATV use unless "it is otherwise impossible for ATVs to gain access to areas or trails adjacent to the highway." Courts have repeatedly interpreted this to mean that public roads can only be open to ATV use when that portion of road being opened provides a

critical connection between existing trail systems in order to make the trail system viable. Highways designated as open to ATV use are not trails for purposes of the VTL, so road-to-road connections are suspect under VTL §2405. Alternatives which open large sections of public road without direct trail-to-trail connections could be subject to a legal challenge under VTL §2405.

There are confirmed records of several threatened species located along this proposed alternative route. Species know to be present nearby include: Blanding's Turtle (reptile), Least Bittern and Pied-billed Grebe (birds), and Balsam Willow and Meadow Horsetail (plants).

Alternative 2f (Loop 6). (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1a, 2e, 2f). This proposal would utilize a system of Town of Brasher roads, DEC trails, and trails across private land to form a loop leading from Helena to Brasher Iron Works and return. It would begin at the intersection of Depot Street and the Quinell Road in Helena. It would proceed 2.9 miles southeast along the Quinell Road to the intersection with the Smith Road. The route would then travel north 0.5 mile along the Smith Road to the intersection with the Railroad Bed Access Trail. Users would then travel northwest 0.8 miles along the Railroad Bed Access Trail (DEC) to the intersection with the Quinell Road. Riders would then use either the Quinell Road or a snowmobile trail across private lands to return 1.8 miles to the starting point in Helena.

This route would travel through the northern portion of Brasher State Forest, and would involve opening a total of 0.8 mile of DEC Trails, 3.4 miles of Town of Brasher Roads, and up to 1.8 miles of trails on private land to ATV use.

This section of Brasher State Forest can be accessed by using the Quinell and Smith Roads (Town of Brasher Roads). This would provide access from Helena to Brasher Iron Works. This proposal does not meet Strategic Plan requirement for a connector trail, which states that "The State Forest-based connector trail, if approved, must follow the shortest environmentally acceptable route available." In this case, the general area could be accessed by Town of Brasher Roads, without opening additional DEC trails.

There is a confirmed record of Eastern Sand Darter, a threatened fish species, being present in the Deer River near this proposed alternative route.

4.3 Proposed Connector Trail through Buckton and Ft. Jackson State Forests

During the comment period for the draft St. Lawrence Flatlands UMP, the St. Lawrence County Recreational Trails coordinator submitted a proposal for a connector trail through Buckton and Ft. Jackson State Forests in the town of Stockholm.

The following is an alternatives review of the proposed Connector Trail through Buckton and Ft. Jackson State Forests. Roads and trails maintained by the DEC are denoted in the text.

Trail improvements needed to prepare State Forest roads and trails for use as ATV routes may commence upon approval of SEQR findings associated with this SGEIS, and the St. Lawrence Flatlands UMP, pending suitable on-site conditions, along with necessary permits, and approved work plans being secured. However, State Forest roads and trails necessary for the connection to the cross-county trail

will be opened only when landowner permissions for crossing all additional properties necessary for the connection have been secured to the satisfaction of the department, so that the entire connection can be opened at one time.

Alternative 3a. (See Figure 10 – Alternatives 1a and 3a). This proposal would create a multi-use connector trail through Buckton and Ft. Jackson State Forests. This trail would use a combination of DEC roads and trails, Town of Stockholm roads, and trails across private land to provide a multi-use corridor trail. Only those sections of the multi-use trail which cross State Forests will be considered in this alternative review.

In Buckton State Forest, the trail would begin at the northern edge of the forest at the intersection of U.S. Highway 11 and the Club Road. It would travel south along the Club Road for 0.4 mile. It would then follow an existing snowmobile trail (DEC) 0.3 mile south to the state forest boundary. Then it would follow the snowmobile trail 0.2 mile across a private inholding and back onto Buckton State Forest. The route would then continue 0.7 mile south along the snowmobile trail (DEC) to the junction with the Buckton Haul Road. Users would then continue south along the Buckton Haul Road (DEC) 0.8 mile to the junction with the Buckton Road.

This route would travel through the central portion of Buckton State Forest, and would involve opening a total of 0.8 mile of DEC Haul Road, 1.0 mile of DEC Trail, 0.4 mile of Town of Stockholm Road, and 0.2 mile of trail across private land to ATV use.

This route is potentially acceptable as a multi-use trail corridor. It utilizes trails not open to motor vehicles as much as possible. It also crosses the state forest in the shortest environmentally acceptable route.

The roads and trails do, however, need considerable improvement and maintenance. The northern portion of the Club Road crosses a State and Federal Classified Wetland which seasonally floods the road. This area would need a bridge or large culverts, and would need hard fill to stabilize the road. Any fill or trail work within this area will require permits from the appropriate regulatory agency – both the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (State Classified Wetlands) and the US Army Corps of Engineers (Federal Classified Wetlands).

The trail crossing the private inholding would need the landowner's permission to be opened to ATV use.

The portion of trails and road south of the private inholding would require grading, localized hardening, culvert installation, and brushing.

In Ft. Jackson State Forest, the connector trail would begin at the northern edge of the forest at the junction of the Nichols Road and the Sheldon Access Trail. It would then proceed 0.6 mile southeast along the Sheldon Access Trail (DEC) to the junction with the Snowmobile Trail. It would then travel 0.1 mile south along the Snowmobile Trail (DEC) to the junction with the Loop Trail. It would then

travel 0.2 mile south along the Loop Trail (DEC) to the junction with the Sheldon PFAR. It would then travel 0.4 mile south (DEC) on the Sheldon PFAR to the southern boundary of Ft. Jackson State Forest.

This route would travel through the central portion of Ft. Jackson State Forest, and would involve opening a total of 0.4 mile of DEC Public Forest Access Road and 0.9 mile of DEC Trails to ATV use.

This route is potentially acceptable as a multi-use trail corridor. It utilizes trails not open to motor vehicles as much as possible. It also crosses the state forest in the shortest environmentally acceptable route.

The roads and trails do, however, need considerable improvement and maintenance. The Sheldon Access Trail contains some wet and rutted sections that will require drainage and hard fill. Portions of the Snowmobile and Loop Trails are very sandy and will require hard surfacing. The remainder of the roads and trails to be opened would require grading and brushing.

This proposed multi-use trail across Buckton and Ft. Jackson State Forests could potentially be opened in the future, as part of a larger connector trail system using roads and trails located off from State Forest properties. Any such proposed connector trail system would require its own SEQR analysis for the complete trail proposal.

Alternative 3b). *No action alternative.* This alternative would maintain the current conditions, with no DEC maintained roads or trails open to ATV use. This would deny the public a legitimate use of state forest lands for a connector trail, as well as possible economic benefits to adjoining communities. For these reasons, the no action alternative is not the preferred alternative.

Any future proposals to open roads or trails under DEC jurisdiction to ATV use would need to be reviewed on a case by case basis. Any potential connection between ATV trails in Brasher State Forest and St. Lawrence County's county-wide multi-use trail system will require the crossing of private lands in order to ensure compliance with the VTL. Any further development of that connection that involves the potential use of state land will be handled through an additional modification to the St. Lawrence Flatlands UMP as well as supplemental SEQR analysis, as necessary. DEC will continue to work with St. Lawrence County to ensure the viability of such a connection.

5.0 Comments and Responses to the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

The following is a summary of the public comments that were received during the creation of the Draft SEIS for the Proposed Multi-Use Recreational Trail System Located in the St. Lawrence Flatlands Unit Management Planning Area. The DSEIS was posted on the St. Lawrence Flatlands UMP Website (http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/22578.html). The comment period was open between April 15 and May 15, 2015. Comments were received through email and letters. **Comments** are in bold text, with *DEC responses* in italics.

In Section 1.0 (Introduction), the DSEIS should balance environmental, social and economic impacts, positive and negative as required by SEQR.

It is true that environment factors are not the sole consideration in decision making. The State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) requires that social, economic, and environmental factors be "considered together in reaching decisions on proposed activities" (Environmental Conservation Law Section 8-0103). However, this same statute also provides that State agencies must "regulate such activities so that due consideration is given to preventing environmental damage," and that they "have an obligation to protect the environment for the use and enjoyment of this and all future generations." Therefore, negative environmental consequences cannot be ignored simply because a significant economic benefit may be derived as a result of the activity causing that damage.

The purpose of this environmental review is to analyze the potential environmental effects of the trail system on state managed lands. Potential environmental, social, and economic benefits include increased tourism, ability of users to visit previously inaccessible areas, gas and food sales, and hotel visits. The amount and frequency of these increased benefits are difficult to quantify. A review of potential economic benefits for a similar area can be found in the "Tug Hill Region ATV Economic Impact Study", cited in the appendix.

In Section 2.1 (Project Background), if the Multi-Use Trail were allowed on State Forest lands the resources of NYSDEC could be leveraged with Trail funds to provide better trail maintenance and improved public access.

It is possible that the creation of a multi-use trail system may provide additional funding sources for monitoring and maintenance. However, it is imperative that permanent funding for materials, equipment, and staff time dedicated to trail monitoring and maintenance be established before the multi-use trail system begins operation.

In Section 2.2 (History of ATV use in this Unit), poor maintenance of the trails in the past may be due to poor management of NYSDEC resources. Is it possible that NYSDEC management did not request the needed funds for trail management or directed funds and resources to other projects, which lead to the condition of the trails to degrade and closure of all trails.

In the past, the local DEC Operations crew had no dedicated funding source or staff time available for trail maintenance. They were also not provided with the necessary equipment (mini excavator, UTV with dump box, etc.) and materials to perform regular trail maintenance.

Section 3.1 (Soil Compaction and Erosion) of the DSEIS lists several conditions which are necessary for a future sustainable trail system, including: proper trail location, trail monitoring by DEC Forestry / Operations / Law Enforcement staff, and dedicated funding and staff time geared specifically to trail maintenance.

In Section 2.3 (Project Summary), the DSEIS describes how the NYSDEC segmented the project, whereas the NYSDEC should have worked closer with St. Lawrence County. A segmented project is contrary to SEQR regulation.

SEQR regulations discourage segmented review of an "action" unless segmented review is "clearly no less protective of the environment." In the case of this analysis, the action being reviewed is the design, construction and maintenance of multi-use trails on state-owned lands in this management unit.

The DSEIS was developed in conjunction with the draft St. Lawrence Flatlands Unit Management Plan (UMP), which reviews other potential management issues on state land in this unit. Also, the analysis conducted for the DSEIS is supplemental to the environmental review that was conducted for the Strategic Plan for State Forest Management, which is a Generic Environmental Impact Statement and covers the other actions proposed in the UMP.

Any proposed connector trail system crossing state managed land will also likely utilize a system including town roads, county roads, and trails crossing private land. These routes are often located miles away from the nearest state forest land in this management unit. As such, their potential inclusion in a connector trail system is beyond the scope of this analysis, and would require its own environmental review.

In Sections 3.1 to 3.5 (Potential Impacts and Mitigation: Soil Compaction and Erosion, Noise, Invasive Species, Illegal Trails and Trespass onto Private Land, Conflicts with Other Users), the DSEIS totally focuses on the Multi-Use trail as an ATV trail and concentrates on the negative impacts and does not explore any positive impacts, such as emergency access to injured hikers via ATV's/vehicles to remote areas. The DSEIS is totally devoid of positive social or economic impacts.

The Strategic Plan for State Forest Management offers a comprehensive review of other potential recreational uses of the multi-use trail, including hiking, mountain biking, horse riding, cross country skiing, snowshoeing, and snowmobiling. It also serves as an Environmental Impact Statement for the potential effects of these uses. It was therefore unnecessary to repeat this environmental review for the multi-use trail system in the St. Lawrence Flatlands UMP unit. The purpose of the DSEIS is to review potential negative environmental effects of the proposed alternatives, and suggest methods to avoid and/or mitigate these negative effects.

In Section 4.1 (Proposed Connector Trail Through Brasher State Forest). We agree with the proposed 1a or 1b alternatives to include Quinell Road, Smith Road, a portion of Rte. 55 and the Burns Road. The Quinell Road will connect to our staging area at the Brasher Garage and our Snowmobile Grooming Building.

Alternative 1a is the preferred alternative for a connector trail through Brasher State Forest. It minimizes the use of roads open to cars and trucks, and provides the shortest environmentally acceptable route across state managed land. The Quinell Road, Smith Road, Burns Road, and County Route 55 are not under the jurisdiction of the DEC and their opening to ATV use would be under the purview of the Town of Brasher and St. Lawrence County, respectively.

In Section 4.3 (Proposed Connector Trail through Buckton and Ft. Jackson State Forests), Alternative 3a would continue to be used for our snowmobile trail use as state right of way on Rte. 11 is allowed for snowmobiles but not ATV's. We would like this included as a future option for the multi-use trail as private landowners may change. We would like an alternate trail considered for the multi-use trail from the intersection of Rte. 11, Rte. 420, and County Route 49. The trail would use 1.1 miles of CR 49 towards Ft. Jackson and connect onto two parcels of a private landowner and enter the Buckton State Forest below the private inholding between the two Buckton State Forest parcels and continue with the rest of the proposed Alternative 3a through Ft. Jackson State Forest. We feel this route will be a lesser impact on residents from Rte. 11 to Club Road.

The initial proposal for a connector trail through Buckton State Forest (Alternative 3a) uses existing roads and snowmobile trails for the trail route. The proposed revised route uses areas with few or no trails across state forest land, and would likely require substantial work to avoid wetlands and to provide stabilized wetland crossings. This would not satisfy the Strategic Plan for State Forest Management's requirement that any proposed connector trail "must follow the shortest environmentally acceptable route available". Such a re-route would be preferred only if the existing roads and trails proved impossible to use. The Department would prefer to upgrade and use existing roads and trails rather than create entirely new routes. Additionally, this proposal includes road and private land issues over which the Department has no authority.

The term "Multiple Use" trail is a misnomer. When motorized and non-motorized users share the same trail, motorized usage tends to dominate. Hikers and skiers need to be vigilant to protect themselves from rapidly moving ATVs or snowmobiles. It is not the same quality experience as traveling on non-motorized only trails.

It is DEC policy to provide recreational opportunities for as broad a spectrum of users as possible. Rather than providing separate trails for separate user groups, which would result in an extreme proliferation of trails, the department provides trails that are open to multiple user groups. This does not mean the Department expects that all users will have the best possible experience in all places. This policy does however provide more options for more users in more locations. Non-motorized users may choose not to use trails where motorized use is allowed.

Regulations will be adopted which describe the maximum speeds allowed for motorized vehicles on the trail system, i.e. 15 miles per hour (MPH) on trails. Additionally, there are many other trails available in this unit that will continue to be open only to non-motorized recreation.

How will trails be maintained to sustain additional motorized use? Many of the trails are already in poor condition due to past damage caused by motorized use and a general lack of maintenance. Without a stable funding source it seems unlikely the expensive trail repair and improvement can take place let alone the necessary continued maintenance to mitigate the already substantial impact ATVs have on the environment.

In Section 3.1 (Soil Compaction and Erosion), the Department suggests numerous mitigation measures for improving trail maintenance and preventing re-occurrence of past problems. After roads and trails have undergone an initial rehabilitation and trail hardening, they would be sustained through regular monitoring and maintenance by DEC staff, with funding directed specifically for trail monitoring and maintenance. Volunteer assistance is also recognized as a possible resource for maintaining the trail system.

We are concerned with enforcement of regulations. Financial constraints will limit the frequency and efficacy of enforcement patrols and user education. Also, due to the lack of much-needed updates in laws and regulations, the DEC is constrained on how they can enforce regulations to control inappropriate behavior.

Law enforcement will patrol the trail system to enforce regulations and laws. Regulations will be adopted to limit speeds to 15 MPH on trails; regulations already limit speed to 25 MPH on DEC maintained roads. Regulations would also be adopted specifying the trail system as open to ATV use from May 15th to September 15th each year, and hours of operation would be from 6 am to midnight. Protocols will also be put in place to monitor the effectiveness of the mitigation measures used. If monitoring results indicate that mitigation efforts are not successful, those efforts will need to be improved or the trail system will need to be closed until such time as they can be improved.

The proposal for six loop trails in Brasher State Forest is not acceptable. It does not minimize ATV impact on the forest and does not meet the standards of a connector trail. The loops also do not comply with Vehicle and Traffic Law Section 2405 which prohibits the opening of roads and highways to ATV use unless it is otherwise impossible for ATVs to gain access to legally open areas adjacent to the highways.

These are some of the reasons why none of the loop trails are included in the preferred alternative. The Department has undertaken a thorough review of the proposed alternatives, and is confident that the preferred alternative fully complies with any and all relevant laws, regulations, policies and other legal guidance.

The impact of invasive species deserves special attention. The proposed cleaning and decontamination measures seem unlikely to be effective given the shortage of staff and money. It is unlikely that ATV users will voluntarily take the time to wash their vehicles free of plant matter prior to entering the St. Lawrence Flatlands Unit.

The Department agrees that transport and establishment of invasive species along the multi-use trail is a potentially serious problem. Information about invasive species will be posted at staging areas and trail heads. Regular trail monitoring will look for new invasive species along the trails and will attempt to control them before they become permanently established.

We oppose all of the alternatives brought forth in the DSEIS due to their extensive potential for causing irreversible environmental damage to the Brasher State Forest.

The Department feels that the rehabilitation of roads and trails necessary to create a connector trail will improve them substantially from their current condition. Regular maintenance and mitigation of potential problems should also minimize deterioration of trail quality.

We do not support the addition of ATV riding on state lands until ATV use is reformed at a state-wide level. For ATV riding to become a more accepted and sustainable form of recreation, numerous state policy and budgetary changes will need to be made, including but not limited to:

- **Enacting legislation that prohibits recreational riding on our state's most sensitive lands, including, but not limited to, the Adirondack Park Forest Preserve.**
- **Amending Section 2405 of the Vehicle and Traffic Law to clarify its intent and encourage trail construction of private trail networks.**
- **Increasing the fees to register ATVs, and dedicating all funds to well-planned construction of private trail networks, rider education and enforcement staffing and resources.**
- **Enacting legislation to encourage "bad actors," who are caught by law enforcement, to not become repeat offenders.**

The Department acknowledges these comments, but legislative changes are beyond the scope of this environmental review.

Bibliography

Anonymous. *Cumulative and Universal: ATV Impacts on the Landscape and Wildlife.* A whitepaper prepared by Backcountry Hunters and Anglers. Missoula, MT. 2011. 36 pp.

Crocoll, Scott. *Raptor Management on State Forests.* New York State Department of Environmental Conservation: Albany, NY. Unpublished report. 2013. 49 pp.

Geographic Information System (GIS) Data Layers. Available to DEC Staff. Layers commonly used include: Soils, State Classified Wetlands, Federal Classified Wetlands, State Classified Streams, Invasive Species, Special Management Zones, Breeding Bird Atlas, Rare Threatened and Endangered Species (both confirmed and predicted), State Land Transportation, State Land Assets

Groenier, James "Scott", Monlux, Stephen, and Vachowski, Brian. *Geosynthetics for trails in wet areas: 2008 edition.* Tech. Rep. 0823-2813-MTDC. Missoula, MT: USDA Forest Service, Missoula Technology and Development Center. 2008. 26 pp.

Hesselbarth, Woody, Vachowski, Brian, and Davies, Mary Ann. *Trail Construction and Maintenance Notebook: 2007 edition.* Tech. Rep. 0723-2806-MTDC. Missoula, MT. USDA Forest Service, Missoula Technology and Development Center. 2007. 166 pp.

Huebner, Cynthia D., Olson, Cassandra, and Smith, Heather C. *Invasive Plants Field and Reference Guide: An Ecological Perspective of Plant Invaders of Forests and Woodlands.* USDA Forest Service. Morgantown, WV. 2005. Publication NA-TP-05-04.

Kariel, Herbert. "Noise in Rural Recreational Environments." *Canadian Acoustics*. Vol 19 (5). 1991. Pp. 3-10.

McGinley, Mark, and Duffy, J. Emmett. "Invasive species". In: *Encyclopedia of Earth*. Eds. Cleveland, Cutler J. (Washington, D.C.: Environmental Information Coalition, National Council for Science and the Environment). http://www.eoearth.org/view/article/51cbee3f7896bb431f6966be/. Retrieved 02/02/15.

Meadows, Dexter, Foltz, Randy, and Geehan, Nancy. *Effects of All-Terrain Vehicles on Forested Lands and Grasslands.* 0823 1811-SDTDC. San Dimas, CA: USDA Forest Service, San Dimas Technology and Development Center. 2008. 110 pp.

Meyer, Kevin G. *Managing Degraded Off-Highway Vehicle Trails in Wet, Unstable, and Sensitive Environments.* Tech. Rep. 0223-2821-MTDC. Missoula, MT: USDA Forest Service, Missoula Technology and Development Center. 2002. 48 pp.

Moore, Roger L. *Conflicts on Multiple-use Trails: Synthesis of the Literature and State of the Practice.* Federal Highway Administration: Washington, D.C. 1994. Report No. FHWA-PD-94-031. 68 pp.

N'dolo, Michael. *Tug Hill Region ATV Economic Impact Study*. Cooperative Tug Hill Council. Prepared by Camoin Associates. Saratoga Springs, NY. 2006. 75 + pp.

New York Natural Heritage Program. *State Lands Assessment Project: Biodiversity Inventory of Regions 5 & 6 State Forests & Forest Preserve.* Albany, NY. 2008. 2,898 pp.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. *New York State Forestry Best Management Practices for Water Quality: BMP Field Guide.* NYS DEC: Albany, NY. 2011. 81 pp.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. *New York State Strategic Plan for State Forest Management.* NYS DEC: Albany, NY. 2010. 356 pp.
Available online at: http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/64567.html

Steinholtz, Robert T., and Vachowski, Brian. *Wetland Trail Design and Construction: 2007 edition.* Tech. Rep. 0723-2804-MTDC. Missoula, MT: USDA Forest Service, Missoula Technology and Development Center. 2007. 82 pp.

Stokowski, Patricia A., and LaPoint, Christopher B. *Environmental and Social Effects of ATVs and ORVs: An Annotated Bibliography and Research Assessment.* University of Vermont – School of Natural Resources. Burlington, VT. 2000. 32 pp.

Switalski, T. Adam, and Jones, Allison. "Off-road vehicle best management practices for forestlands: A review of scientific literature and guidance for managers." *Journal of Conservation Planning*. Vol 8 (2012). pp 12-24.

Van Driesche, Roy; Blossey, Bernd; Hoddle, Mark; Lyon, Suzanne, and Reardon, Richard eds. *Biological Control of Invasive Plants in the Eastern United States.* USDA Forest Service. 2002. Publication FHTET-2002-04. 413 pp.

Wiest, Richard L. *A Landowner's Guide to Building Forest Access Roads.* USDA Forest Service: Radnor, PA. Northeastern Area, State and Private Forestry. Publication NA-TP-06-98. 1998. 56 pp.

APPENDIX C – PARCEL ACQUISITION HISTORY

Bombay State Forest – Franklin County Reforestation Area 2

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	687.52	Howard P. Sears	1935	L 216 / P 134	6126
B	143.88	Lawrence & Floyd Durant	1935	L 216 / P 226	6126
C	76.60	V. Delbert & Floyd Durant	1935	L 216 / P 228	6126
D	220.48	M. Alice Crowley	1935	L 216 / P 232	6126
E	74.64	Clint Barrett	1935	L 216 / P 235	6126
F	129.66	Alice Smith	1937	L 221 / P 50	5977
G	36.89	W.C. & J.J. Shields	1937	L 225 / P 339	6248
H	318.50	Dennis L. Hurley	1940	L 230 / P 224	6127
I	90.94	Heirs of Peter Villnave	1940	L 229 / P 348	6127, 6249
J	176.44	Estate of H. Corbin Brush	1940	L 231 / P 111	5978
AA	206.17	Federal Land Bank of Springfield, Mass.	1940	L 232 / P 167	6015*

*769.99 acres total; remainder is in St. Lawrence RA 1 Proposal AA

Bombay State Forest – Franklin County Reforestation Area 4

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	642.97	J.J. & W.C. Shields	1937	L 225 / P 335	5984
B	72.31	Harry & Lillian Jock	1948	L 287 / P 531	6255
C	43.16	Albert & Bertha Sova	1949	L 297 / P 139	6256

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 1

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	378.94	Bernice D. Clark	11/04/1932	L 278 / P 472	5822
B	68.66	George H. Dishaw	11/04/1932	L 278 / P 474	5822
C	66.78	Mary Alvina Nicklaw	11/04/1932	L 278 / P 475	5822
D	77.23	Alice Saulsbury	08/21/1933	L 283 / P 66	5692
E	526.62	Bernice E. Clark	10/30/1934	L 289 / P 255	6013
F	26.00	Charles Dishaw	02/19/1935	L 291 / P 118	6014
G	51.82	Michael M. Hurley	05/15/1935	L 292 / P 209	6014
H	136.92	Augustus Delosh	05/15/1935	L 292 / P 211	6014
I	24.20	David Delosh	05/15/1935	L 292 / P 208	6014
J	262.30	Ellen Gaffney	05/20/1935	L 292 / P 241	6014
K	172.11	Nelson J. and Josephine Gardner	10/14/1935	L 295 / P 39	5693
L	152.75	Amos Lavare	03/13/1936	L 297 / P 76	5823
M	17.03	Alexander Lavare	04/30/1936	L 297 / P 405	5823
N	52.59	Floyd & Irene Yaddow	01/28/1937	L 304 / P 11	5823
O	96.91	Catherine T. Taylor	07/15/1936	L 299 / P 69	5694, 5695
P	49.43	Mary Alvina Nicklaw	09/22/1936	L 301 / P 14	5696
Q	120.97	Blanche C. Barton	11/06/1936	L 301 / P 89	5824
R	22.54	Katherine Shorette	06/30/1937	L 305 / P 145	5824
S	53.03	Charles Dishaw	09/02/1938	L 312 / P 179	5697
T	26.77	Jerry Griffin, executor for David Delosh	01/19/1939	L 314 / P 438	5698

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 1 (continued)

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
U	25.52	St. Lawrence County c/o Alton Scruton	03/23/1939	L 315 / P 398	5699
V	199.28	Daniel Tower	02/15/1940	L 321 / P 247	5862
W	----	(Acquired later as part of Proposal AA)	----	----	5825
X	47.21	Florence L. Davis	02/27/1940	L 321 / P 313	5862
Y	298.07	William & Victoria Arquiett	11/18/1940	L 326 / P 359	5827
Z	45.30	Frank & Jennie Dumas	03/27/1941	L 328 / P 278	5700
AA	563.82	Federal Land Bank of Springfield, Mass.	10/21/1941	L 334 / P 16	6015***
BB	310.58	Jeremiah E. Hurley	04/02/1948	L 416 / P 336	5828
CC	51.52	James & Agatha McGraw	02/27/1948	L 415 / P 79	5828
D-2 *	48.71	Katherine Shorette	01/31/1963	L 716 / P 130	6495
E-2 *	234.08	Henry & Bridget Barse	12/04/1963	L 730 / P 212	6532
F-2 **	134.03	Roderick & Norene J. Mathieson	01/24/1985 05/24/1985	L 987 / P 748 L 990 / P 53	10386 (correction)
G-2 **	98.79	Peggy Henning	04/18/1988	L 1018 / P 13	10587
----	97.2	Nancy Warner	03/27/2006	L 2006 / P 5075	----

* Multiple Use Area ** 1972 Bond Act ***769.99 acres total; remainder is in Fr. RA 2 Proposal AA

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 5

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	408.75	Bert S. Crapser	04/25/1933	L 281 / P 164	6020
B	115.29	Jesse & Marguerite Hastings	04/25/1933	L 281 / P 163	6020
C	4.20	George Kennehan et al.	06/05/1933	L 281 / P 442	6020
D	235.39	Richard E. and Clara Heffernan	06/05/1933	L 281 / P 444*	6020
E	164.42	Michael & Mary O'Connell	07/19/1933	L 282 / P 305	5839
F	92.02	Nelson & Grace Locke	11/14/1933	L 284 / P 236	5718
G	25.55	James B. McNulty	08/23/1935	L 293 / P 417	5719
H	23.70	Sherman & Bessie Jesmer	01/03/1936	L 296 / P 59	5720
I	40.11	William &Ethel Thomas	02/13/1937	L 302 / P 339	5721
J	84.45	Michael O'Connell et al	03/19/1938	L 310 / P 10	5722
K	240.48	Mary F. O'Brien	08/25/1938	L 312 / P 110	5840
L	62.67	James & Elizabeth Goodnow	09/16/1938	L 312 / P 274	5840
M	52.11	John & Cornelius Crowley	08/25/1938	L 312 / P 112	5840
N	97.73	N. Walter Locke	10/29/1938	L 313 / P 245	5723
O	1.85	Peter & Kate Normile	08/25/1938	L 312 / P 109	5840
P	155.70	Richard E. Heffernan	09/16/1938	L 312 / P 276	5840
Q	62.83	Walter & Margaret Tyo	09/16/1938	L 312 / P 278	5840
R	57.60	Charles H. Taylor	09/21/1939	L 318 / P 444	5724

*Also a quit claim recorded 08/09/1935 at L. 293 P. 345.

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 5 (continued)

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
S	30.11	Charles & Nellie Wolcott	01/30/1940	L 321 / P 127	5841
T	165.20	Katherine & Margaret Cotter Margaret Cotter, Admin. for Timothy Cotter	12/31/1940 12/31/1940	L 327 / P 207 L 327 / P 205	5842
U	71.50	Frank Dumas	05/07/1942	L 337 / P 147	5843
V	66.13	Walter & Margaret Tyo	04/09/1942	L 335 / P 405	5843
W	84.35	Walter Tyo	07/25/1947	L 402 / P 516	5725
X	12.60	Joseph Stark, Jr.	06/28/1950	L 460 / P 128	5726
Y *	412.83	Lawrence Mallette estate	03/21/1963	L 717 / P 424	7214
Z *	120.81	Clifford & Keitha Savage	11/09/1962	L 713 / P 63	Sketch map
A-2 *	204.88	Gerald & Carolyn Normile	07/12/1962	L 706 / P 377	6447
B-2 *	39.50	Loren Aldrich	11/29/1963	L 730 / P 104	7214
C-2 *	136.37	Cornelius P. Crowley (estate)	12/23/1963	L 731 / P 278	6549
D-2	35.75	St. Lawrence County	01/24/1969	L 816 / P 177	7273
E-2 **	39.02	Joseph P. Doboze	05/10/1979	L 940 / P 729	9725
F-2 **	65.91	Paul V. Dillon	08/11/1989	L 1031 / P 895	----
G-2	13	Jarmila & Asen Ganev	05/03/1996	L 1097 / P1066	----

*Multiple Use Area **1972 Bond Act

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 6

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	78.33	John D. McCarthy, exec. for William Cotter Mary H. Cotter	06/15/1933 06/15/1933	L 282 / P 75 L 282 / P 77	6021
B	50.38	John Hamlin et al.	06/15/1933	L 282 / P 82	6021
C	313.98	George & Marsha Lacomb	06/15/1933 06/29/1933	L 282 / P 78 L 282 / P 170*	6021
D	78.74	Harriet Sabray	06/15/1933	L 282 / P 79	6021
E	108.62	Fred Sova	02/15/1935	L 291 / P 86	6021
F	166.08	Henry & May Lashomb	06/07/1935	L 293 / P 100	5727
G	267.34	George & Martha Youmell	10/14/1935	L 295 / P 38	5846
H	148.03	Alexander Sova	10/28/1935	L 295 / P 70	5846
I	92.43	Allen Lashomb	11/30/1936	L 301 / P 273	5728
J	283.67	Richard E. Heffernan	05/21/1937	L 304 / P 191	5847
K	119.42	Richard & Clara Heffernan	01/19/1938	L 308 / P 399	5848
L	89.96	Carl H. Hamlin et al.	08/09/1939	L 318 / P 108	5849
M	242.15	Cornelius & Gladys Leary	09/21/1939	L 318 / P 442	5849
N	160.43	Henry Lashomb estate	11/22/1939	L 320 / P 129	5850
O	119.98	William, James, and Elizabeth Goodnow	11/22/1939	L 320 / P 127	5850
P	123.23	Michael Hammill et al.	12/07/1939	L 320 / P 229	5850

*Release of Life Use recorded 12/13/1950 at L. 469 P. 280.

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 6 (continued)

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
Q	218.95	John C. Crapser	11/22/1939	L 320 / P 123	5851
R	589.73	Ella Lantry	08/08/1942	L 338 / P 340	5852
S	98.44	Richard Heffernan estate	07/22/1940	L 324 / P 195	5853
T	27.59	William Quinell et al.	08/27/1940	L 324 / P 479	5853
U	162.90	Barney & Mary Lantry	11/18/1940	L 326 / P 361	5854
V	63.56	St. Lawrence County	11/18/1940	L 326 / P 363	5854
W	256.06	Frank B. Corbett	12/05/1942	L 340 / P 430	5855
X	91.36	John F. & Viola Wells	12/05/1942	L 341 / P 146	5729
Y	635.45	Carl & Marion Hamlin	09/30/1946	L 382 / P 446	5856
Z	47.64	John & Mary Robare	11/25/1947	L 410 / P 467	5730
AA	175.05	Bertram & Orma Shorette	06/28/1950	L 460 / P 125	5857
B-2	263.58	Rebie Ormsby	04/23/1958	L 630 / P 561	5845
C-2	300.74	Earl & Florence Savage	10/15/1959	L 661 / P 556	5844
D-2 *	56.27	Lottie M. Cotter	07/12/1962 01/08/1963	L 706/P384*** L 715 / P 298	6270
E-2 *	65.64	William S. Crapser	03/10/1965	L 751 / P 365	2802
F-2	17.5	Margaret Sova et al.	12/29/1993	L 1075 / P 181	----
G-2	8.00	Champion International Corp., c/o the Conservation Fund	07/01/1999	L 1999 / P 13117****	----

*Multiple Use Area **1972 Bond Act ***Release of Claim. Property was appropriated.

****Referenced in the Deed as parcels 47, 48, and 49.

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 7

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	50.38	Ellen Gaffney	07/24/1934	L 287 / P 471	6022
B	----	Rejected - Acquired as Proposals H & M	----	----	6022
C	52.75	Ella T. Lantry	07/24/1934	L 287 / P 472	6022
D	54.90	William A. Nowland	07/24/1934	L 287 / P 476	6022
E	62.78	Florence & Ida Richardson	07/24/1934	L 287 / P 477	6022
F	24.09	Ida A. Richardson	07/24/1934	L 287 / P 474	6022
G	102.43	William Toomey	08/03/1934	L 288 / P 67	6022
H	201.50	James Gaffney	07/24/1934	L 287 / P 473	6022
I	313.65	William & May Durant	12/21/1934	L 290 / P 216	6023
J	26.36	Johnson & Elizabeth Drewery	12/21/1934	L 290 / P 214	6023
K	98.50	Cora E. McIntosh et al.	09/12/1935	L 294 / P 103*	5731
L	150.83	Catherine Crowley	03/17/1936	L 297 / P 99	5858
M	99.07	James Gaffney estate	12/10/1937	L 308 / P 155	6022
N	104.23	New York Central Railroad Company	04/14/1939	L 316 / P 54	6015
O	169.66	Joseph & Helen Dupuis	08/03/1940	L 325 / P 31	5859

*See also Grant of Right of Way from Atlasta Farm, Inc., to John and Lee LaTulipe, recorded 08/19/1975 at L. 902 P. 86.

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 7 (continued)

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
P	48.04	Robert & Floy Smith	06/17/1949	L 441 / P 148	5733
Q	54.04	Ernest Buell et al.	03/30/1951	L 473 / P 113	5860
R	264.33	Johnson Drewery	03/16/1951	L 472 / P 364	5861
----	50.0	Kenneth Johnston et al.	08/01/2002	L 2002 / P 12994	----

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 10

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	183.25	Lindsey& Ellen Jesmer	07/24/1935	L 294 / P 8	6026
B	169.56	George & Marcia Lacomb	07/24/1935	L 294 / P 5	6026
C	300.49	Michael Kirkey et al.	07/24/1935	L 294 / P 3	6026
D	254.09	Albert & Etta Christian	07/24/1935	L 293 / P 263	6026
E	184.85	Burt & Mary McGregor	07/27/1935 08/20/1935	L 293 / P 267 L 293 / P 390	6026 (correction)
F	160.69	Henry& Lula Brothers	10/14/1935	L 294 / P 361	6026
G	172.43	George & Alice Burgess	10/14/1935	L 294 / P 362	6026
H	200.92	Bert & Mary McGregor	10/28/1935	L 295 / P 71	6026
I	25.30	Sophia Eamon	07/24/1935	L 293 / P 265	6026
J	105.16	Thomas &Jessie Raymo	07/24/1935	L 293 / P 262	6026
K	72.96	Joseph & Alphretta Bilow	07/24/1935	L 294 / P 6	6026
L	94.46	Guy Jesmer et al.	01/04/1937	L 302 / P 60	5871

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 10 (continued)

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
M	32.93	Eliza & William Quenell	11/30/1936	L 302 / P 56	5871
N	33.35	Frank & Maude Eldridge	11/18/1936	L 301 / P 210	5739
O	15.14	Lester & Victoria Eldridge	11/18/1936	L 301 / P 209	5739
P	83.26	William & Ethel Crouch	04/02/1937	L 303 / P 229	6027
Q	70.27	Agnes & Angus McGregor	06/30/1937	L 305 / P 147	6027
R	13.94	William Baxter et al.	06/30/1937	L 305 / P 144	6027
S	103.88	Mary K. Dawson	07/16/1937	L 305 / P 222	6027
T	162.51	William & Hattie Hough	07/16/1937	L 305 / P 219	6027
U	156.04	William L. Goodnow	06/20/1939	L 317 / P 161	5872
V	66.07	John & Lulu Crapser	09/25/1939	L 318 / P 472	5873
W	7.53	John & Lulu Crapser	09/27/1939	L 318 / P 495	5873
X	196.62	Michael Murray	08/20/1940	L 324 / P 410	5874
Y	46.03	Ivan F. & Eleanor Eldridge	09/03/1941	L 331 / P 359	5741
Z	92.70	Belle O'Neill	06/21/1948	L 421 / P 25	5742
A-2	114.56	Emery L., Anita E., & Jennie Baxter	06/28/1950	L 460 / P 131	5875

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 10 (continued)

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
B-2	77.94	George & Alice Burgess	04/03/1958	L 629 / P 594	5876
C-2	24.49	Vilas Green	10/17/1958	L 642 / P 268	5743
D-2	37.30	Lois L. Bashaw	06/08/1961	L 688 / P 272	6515
E-2 *	86.91	Ross & Marion Giles	11/09/1962	L 713 / P 70	6505
F-2 **	33.44	Arnold Leggue	01/26/1990	L 1036 / P 763	----
----	39.10	Edward & Helen Luczkiewicz	10/30/2001	L 2001 / P 19316	----

*Multiple Use Area **1972 Bond Act

Brasher State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 17

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	216.44	James & Agatha McGraw	12/07/1939	L 320 / P 227	6033
B	270.96	Dan & Addie McIntyre	08/01/1939	L 317 / P 484	6033
C	51.10	Peoples Trust Co., exec . for Charles McConnell	12/07/1939	L 320 / P 225	6033
D	208.61	Laura F. Butler et al.	07/24/1939	L 317 / P 401	6033
E	53.35	Harlow K. Yaddow	10/07/1939	L 319 / P 177	6033
F	62.53	St. Lawrence County c/o Alton Scruton	10/26/1942	L 341 / P 55	5747
G	10.80	Michael J. Dawson	08/01/1939	L 317 / P 474	6033
----	47	Joyce E. Saler & Jerry Spivak	11/02/2005	L 2005 / P 19210	----

Buckton State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 31

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	184.97	John H. Connolly	05/17/1950	L 457 / P 440	6048
B	188.89	Charles Chambers et al.	05/17/1950	L 457 / P 443	6048
C	55.11	Olevia Erma Chambers	05/17/1950	L 457 / P 434	6048
D	153.95	Glenn S. Hardy & Gayle Hardy Kent	05/17/1950	L 457 / P 437	6048
E *	70.72**	Gayle Hardy Kent	03/28/1962	L 701 / P 328	6553
F *	214	Daniel T. & Leo D. Kelly	12/15/1961	L 698 / P 4	8552
G *	208.19	Eugene Thompson	05/19/1964	L 736 / P 424	6477

*Multiple Use Area **Deed calls for 57 acres. Later survey indicates 70.72 acres is more correct.

Fort Jackson State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 22

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	247.13	Theodore & Ella Rivers	06/08/1950	L 458 / P 558	6039
B	111.49	Jessie Clark Sanford	06/23/1950	L 459 / P 552	6039
C	252.11	Harold & Anita Phippen	06/29/1950	L 460 / P 155	6039
D	24.15	Henry N. Buckland	06/09/1950	L 458 / P 592	6039
E	109.32	Henry Sheldon	08/01/1950	L 462 / P 128	6039
F	44.78	Henry Sheldon et al.	08/05/1950	L 462 / P 284	6039
G *	83.46	Helen & Murray Premo	04/03/1962	L 701 / P 474	6433
H	41.5	Lois L. Cree	07/22/1992 05/03/1993	L 1060 / P 586 L 1067 /P1139	---- (correction)
I	23.53	St. Lawrence County	01/06/1994	L 1075 / P 559	----

*Multiple Use Area

Grantville State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 15

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	229.92	Henry & Hattie Soper Mabel Sharp, exec. J. Frank Sharp	05/27/1937 09/25/1950	L 304 / P 238 L 465 / P 21	6031
B	137.85	Henry Allen estate	05/27/1937	L 304 / P 235	6031
C	177.17	Amos E. & Mary J. Phelix	05/27/1937	L 304 / P 237	6031
D	89.20	Mrs. A.D. Spotswood	07/19/1948	L 422 / P 539	5745
E	22.72	Aram & Arek Baratian	12/08/1949	L 450 / P 506	5746
F	119.60	Lucia S. Chawner & Grace Y. Soule estate	03/02/1950	L 454 / P 105	5883

Knapp Station State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 11

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	272.01	Mark & Mary Mahoney	03/30/1936	L 297 / P 202	6028
B	110.36	No. NY Trust Co, trustee for Frank Smith	03/30/1936	L 298 / P 17	6028
C	115.92	Walter Planty et al.	03/30/1936	L 298 / P 19	6028
D	51.89	George & Mabel Gardner	03/30/1936	L 297 / P 204	6028
E	102.60	Anna McCarthy Gresser	09/20/1937	L 306 / P 363	5877
F	----	(Rejected)	----	----	6028
F-1	4.03	David Gregg	07/16/1937	L 305 / P 220	6028
G	112.96	Lindon & Ruth Riggs	02/19/1951	L 471 / P 491	5878

Knapp Station State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 11 (continued)

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
H**	95.32	William & Sadie Rule	11/26/1963	L 730 / P 23	6327
I*	39.61	Cecil & Elizabeth Flint	05/08/1964	L 736 / P 99	6473
J*	10.75	Eva & Howard Owney	12/19/1962	L 714 / P 527	6811
K*	87.26	Iva I. Arquiett, widow of Anthony	06/10/1963	L 721 / P 171	6517

* Multiple Use Area **Appropriated

Lost Nation State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 9

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	205.82	Elbert F. Felton et al.	08/21/1933	L 283 / P 60	6025
B	109.29	Roy C. & May A. Hatch	08/21/1933	L 283 / P 63	6025
C	40.41	Edwin Hosmer	08/21/1933	L 283 / P 62	6025
D	149.19	Joseph& Marie Lacomb	08/21/1933	L 283 / P 65	6025
E	31.95	Philip E. Murray	07/15/1936	L 299 / P 68	5736
F	85.84	Clinton & Maud Burnap	12/05/1933	L 284 / P 364*	5737
G	94.95	Clara Heffernan exec. Richard Heffernan	04/30/1941	L 330 / P 8	5867
H	257.97	William Brothers	04/15/1940	L 323 / P 44	5868
I	144.75	The Canton Savings and Loan Association	12/07/1939	L 320 / P 231	5868
J	229.76	Karl & Goldie Van Kennen	12/01/1942	L 340 / P 398	5738

*Proposal F was subject to a ROW granted by Clinton and Maud Burnap to Ralph and Dora Stearns recorded 07/16/1929 at L. 249 p. 326. The parcel accessed by this ROW was later acquired as Prop O.

Lost Nation State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 9 (continued)

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
K	59.88	Homer French	02/16/1951	L 471 / P 459	5869
L	121.34	A. Dolphis & Erdine Gauthier	11/26/1958	L 644 / P 473	5870
M *	150.00	Edwin & Cecile Chapman	08/19/1963	L 725 / P 82	7551
N *	197.90	Daniel L. Mahoney	08/19/1963	L 725 / P 79	6518
O	4.86	St. Lawrence County	10/25/1968	L 812 / P 415	5737
P **	16	St. Lawrence County	10/22/1990 02/15/1991	L 1044 / P 581 L 1047 / P 403	---- (correction)
Q	9.0	St. Lawrence County (4H lots)	12/20/1993	L 1074 / P 973	----
R	1.0	Robert Maginn (4H lot)	02/08/1994	L 1076 / P 238	----
----	1.0	Michael Caza (4H lot)	05/30/2001	L 2001 / P 9372	----
----	1.0	Ann McWilliams (4H lot)	06/11/2001	L 2001 / P 10341	----

*Multiple Use Area ** 1972 Bond Act

Raymondville State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 33

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	200.35	Ralph F. Jandrew	01/16/1951	L 470 / P 369	6050
B	164.25	Lyndon & Nora L. Whittaker	01/16/1951	L 470 / P 376	6050
C	98.82	Daniel A. & Mildred E. Dechane	01/16/1951	L 470 / P 382	6050
D	57.03	Silas A. Pelo & Walter Campbell	01/16/1951	L 470 / P 366	6050
E	25.42	Earl Snyder	01/16/1951	L 470 / P 373	6050
F	70.18	Aram & Arek Baratian	01/16/1951	L 470 / P 379	6050
G	26.89	Clarkson University	05/29/1990	L 1039 / P 815	----

Sodom State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 25

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	374.55	William & Emma Bradley	09/07/1949	L 445 / P 492	6040
B	258.97	William & Bernice Borrman	09/07/1949	L 445 / P 495	6040
C	451.89	Thomas F. O'Neil et al.	09/12/1949	L 446 / P 53	6040
D	68.80	Mabel B. Sharp	11/21/1952	L 503 / P 202	5896
E	4.97	Henry & Bertha Luther	11/21/1952	L 503 / P 205	5896
F	264.82	Mary E. Frego	11/21/1952	L 503 / P 198	5896

Southville State Forest – St. Lawrence County Reforestation Area 23

Proposal	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
A	265.76	Rachel Ober Page & Howard R. Sanford	02/21/1941	L 327 / P 496	5891
B	96.41	Marium M. Sanford	02/21/1941	L 327 / P 498	5891
C	132.35	Charles De Longy & Howard R. Sanford	02/21/1941	L 327 / P 494	5891
D	46.97	Howard R. Sanford & Charles De Longy	02/21/1941	L 327 / P 492	5891

Detached Forest Preserve Parcels

Parcel	Acres	Grantor	Recorded	Deed	Map #
FP SL 12 Lisbon	20.38	NYS Comptroller Tax Deed - Sale of 1900	03/24/1900 05/05/1904	L 154C/ P 1805 L 163B/ P 1201	----
FP SL 13 Lisbon	11.74	NYS Comptroller Tax Deed - Sale of 1890	01/25/1892 04/05/1899	L 1366/ P 1814 L 153B / P 648	----
FP SL 14 Waddington	7.0	NYS Comptroller Tax Deed - Sale of 1900	03/24/1900 05/05/1904	L 154C/ P 1802 L 163B/ P 1201	----
FP SL 15 Waddington	3.42	NYS Comptroller Tax Deed - Sale of 1900	03/24/1900 05/05/1904	L 154C/ P 1805 L 163B/ P 1203	8687
FP SL 17 Louisville	350.33	Mortgage Foreclosure - 1907	*	*	----
FP SL 18 Massena	43.39	Treaty with St. Regis Indians	02/21/1845 (treaty)	**	160*** 198**** 8815

* Records indicate no deed on file with the St. Lawrence County Clerk's Office in Canton. Property description is from a mortgage with the NYS Department of Finance.

**Recorded in the Office of the Secretary of State in Book of "Original Treaties and Other Indian Papers" No. 1 at page 301.

***Map is in the office of the Surveyor General. Mix's catalog p. 257.

****Map is in the office of the Surveyor General. Mix's catalog p. 260.