

# **Seboomook Unit Management Plan**

## **IX. Appendices**

**Appendix A: Advisory Committee Members**

**Appendix B: Summary of Management Issues**

**Appendix C: Bureau Response to Written Public Comments**

**Appendix D: Deed Restrictions and Agreements**

**Appendix E: Guiding Statutes**

**Appendix F: Glossary**

**Appendix G: References**

## **Appendix A**

### **Seboomook Unit Management Plan Advisory Committee**

#### **Seboomook Unit Planning and Management Staff**

**David Soucy** - *Director, Bureau of Parks and Lands*  
**Ralph Knoll** – *Deputy Director (retired), Bureau of Parks and Lands*  
**Kathy Eickenberg** - *Management Plan Coordinator*  
**Cindy Bastey** – *Chief Planner, Bureau of Parks and Lands*  
**Peter Smith** – *Regional Manager, Public Reserved Lands Western Region*  
**Leigh Hoar** – *Forester, Western Reserved Lands Region*  
**Tim Hall** – *Regional Manager, State Parks Northern Region*  
**Matt LaRoche** – *Manager, Penobscot River Corridor*  
**Tom Charles** – *Chief of Silviculture, Bureau of Parks and Lands*  
**Joe Wiley** – *IF&W Wildlife Biologist assigned to the Bureau of Parks and Lands*  
**Brooke Wilkerson** – *Maine Natural Areas Program specialist assigned to the Seboomook Unit*  
**Scott Ramsay** – *Supervisor, Off-Road Vehicle Program of the Bureau of Parks and Lands*  
**Tom Desjardin** – *Historic Sites Specialist*  
**George Powell** – *Boating Facilities Director, Bureau of Parks and Lands*  
**Stephen Richardson** – *Senior Forest Engineer, Bureau of Parks and Lands*

#### **Other State Agency and Public Members**

**John Banks**, *Bangor*  
**Kevin Bernier**, *Brookfield Power*  
**Michelle Belanger**, *Whitewater Boating Specialist, Dept of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife*  
**Fred Candeloro**, *Northern Lights ATV Club*  
**Rep. Roderick Carr**, *Lincoln*  
**Diano Circo**, *Natural Resources Council of Maine*  
**Alexandra Connover**, *Willemantic*  
**Albro Cowperthwaite**, *North Maine Woods*  
**Sen. Paul Davis**, *Sangerville*  
**Steve Day**, *Maine Forest Service, Greenville Office*  
**Pat Dorian**, *Maine Warden Service*  
**Louis Durgin**, *Dover-Foxcroft*  
**Paul Fichtner**, *Penobscot Lake Lodge*  
**Bob Guethlen**, *Rockwood*  
**Alan Hutchinson**, *Forest Society of Maine*  
**Doug Kane**, *Wildlife Biologist, IF&W Greenville Office*  
**Dan Legere**, *Maine Guide Fly Shop*  
**Jennifer Mills**, *Pittston Farm*  
**Paul Napolitano**, *Ragged Riders Snowmobile Club*  
**Sandra Neily**, *Greenville*  
**Tim Obrey**, *Fisheries Biologist, IF&W Greenville Office*  
**Bill Patterson**, *The Nature Conservancy*  
**Rep. Earl Richardson**, *Greenville*  
**Greg Shute**, *Chewonki*  
**Rick Sylvester**, *Seboomook Wilderness Campground*

## **Appendix B**

### **Summary of Planning Issues**

The following is a summary of management issues raised by staff, and through public comments voiced during public meetings or submitted in writing to the Bureau prior to issuance of the Preliminary Plan on May 24, 2005 (for a more complete record of comments for the entire planning period, from August 31, 2004 to November 3, 2006, see Appendix C: Summary of Written Comments, as well as the meeting notes for the public meetings held during the preparation of this Plan, available on the Bureau's website.)

#### **Seboomook and Canada Falls Parcels**

##### **Significant Natural Resources Management Issues**

- Concern about the fragility of wetlands in the area and potential harm from ATVs.
- Concern about potential overuse of the area, and impact on the special character of the area.
- Invasive aquatic species are always a concern at boat launches. Finding ways to prevent the spread of these species, including educating boaters, is important to maintaining the quality of the lakes.
- The exemplary areas on the unit are all associated with wetlands. Buffers of these wetlands during timber harvests should be adequate to maintain the quality of the exemplary areas. While most of the rare plant species on the unit are also associated with wetlands, Orono sedge is found in open areas along roads. Management activities should avoid the use of herbicides that target grasses and sedges and avoid excavation in areas where Orono sedge is found.
- For all threatened and special concern wildlife species on the unit, refer to "Threatened and Endangered Species in Forests of Maine: A Guide to Assist with Forestry Activities,"

##### **Fisheries and Wildlife Management Issues**

- Development of any new recreational facilities should not be undertaken until there has been a more thorough assessment of loon nesting sites following stabilization of the water levels under the new water management regime that Great Lakes Hydro will begin to implement this year. It is not clear whether the study conducted by Biodiversity Research Institute has been completed or is ongoing into the future.
- Personal watercraft should not be allowed on any lakes where loon habitat protection is a priority.
- There is a need to increase the available dense softwood shelter in the Seboomook region given the scarcity of this forest type resulting from the spruce budworm infestation and commercial harvests. Winter cover is the limiting factor for deer populations in this area. Other softwood dependent species that would benefit from increased softwood areas include pine marten, snowshoe hare and spruce grouse. Coyote, red fox, porcupine and weasels are also residents of this habitat.
- Any winter camping areas or winter recreational trails should be located away from designated deer wintering areas.
- Any beech trees in reasonable condition should be retained for mast production for bear forage.

### **Historic and Cultural Resource Management Issues**

- As with any land managed by the Bureau of Parks and Lands, plans for any ground disturbance should first be referred to the Maine Historic Preservation Commission who can determine if carrying out that plan would disturb any of sensitive areas.
- Archaeological resources are particularly accessible and threatened whenever water levels are low on the lakes or impoundments. Except for Seboomook Lake, which can be drawn down by 17 feet under the recent FERC hydropower license, the lakes and ponds in this unit will experience natural or near-natural water level fluctuations with a minimum potential exposure of artifacts. However, low water levels may result during periods of extreme drought.

### **Recreation Management Issues**

Some participants expressed an interest in development of some new recreational facilities, including:

- A hiking trail along the South Branch and West Branch.
- Informational brochure with information about rare plants and rare plant communities
- Improvements to the canoe portages.
- ATV trails with camping opportunities; could be multi-use trails shared with snowmobiles in the winter.
- ATV loop around Moosehead (like the Moosehead snowmobile loop).
- Back-country cross-country ski trails; some groomed. Area at north end of Seboomook and Canada Falls area are of particular interest.
- Horseback riding trails; Pittston Farm has facilities that may be developed to accommodate horseback riding interests. One of only a few places in the state where large horseback riding groups could be accommodated.
- Improved signage and information about the boat access sites (unaware that the site near Pittston Farm was a Public Boat Launch)
- Review canoe/boating put-ins and take-outs on the South Branch – are these adequate? Is parking area adequate?
- Maine Forest Service concern that riverbank near its cabin not be used as a whitewater boating take-out due to potential erosion and conflict with use of the area for a helicopter landing site.
- Are there adequate parking areas defined for the boat access sites – potential conflicts with camping and use of the area by whitewater boaters at Canada Falls dam.

Other recreation management concerns included:

- Large unit – room for both motorized and non-motorized trails. Can accommodate full diversity of recreational users.
- The NMW system does not allow bicycles, horses, or ATVs. Interest in these uses.
- Need for user-training for safety and resource protection.
- Comments favored allowing ATVs on the Unit:
  - Need to serve older and less able recreationists.
  - Concern about loss of snowmobile trails and other recreational opportunities on private lands.

- Examine suitability of existing snowmobile trails as ATV trails.
- ATV Clubs are just forming in this area. They recognize that any ATV trails need to be supported by active clubs that will take responsibility for trail maintenance, education and training for proper use of ATVs and adherence to established trails.
- Concern about or opposition to ATVs:
  - Review the existing snowmobile trail locations (especially at Carry Brook area) to be sure they are avoiding any sensitive natural areas.
  - Concern about ATV trails in proximity to residences; some theft already from snowmobilers.
  - Opposition to allowing ATVs on the unit due to concerns with erosion, disturbance to wildlife, and intrusion upon traditional uses.
  - Findings of a recent tourism survey found people are not embracing more motorized use in this area. Is affecting quality of life.
- Interest in traditional uses, and maintaining a back-country character to the area.
  - Will there be areas without roads? Will the state consider discontinuing some roads for a more remote recreational experience?
  - What signage is adequate and compatible with the backcountry character of the area?
- Opportunity to promote use of the area. Importance of hiking and snowmobile trails to local and regional economy. Need to address public awareness about the opportunities available on these lands – interest in increasing use of the area through increased public awareness by advertising/publicizing the area.
- Need a “winter plan” that will allocate some areas for motorized use and others for non-motorized uses such as cross-country skiing, snowshoeing, winter camping. Snowmobiles now go everywhere, even where there are no groomed trails. Have seen them even in St. John Ponds area.
- Management of resources is a key to attractiveness of the area for users: use dropped when deer herd size dropped and when fishing “take” limits decreased.

### **Timber Management Issues**

- Determine through the allocation process which forest acres will be available for timber management (timber-dominant or important secondary use).
- Develop harvest entry into the Carry Brook mature aspen stands soon after Plan adoption.
- Evaluate the condition of the extensive S1 and M1 stands which have resulted from past clearcuts.
- Determine the condition of the currently zoned deer wintering areas, to learn if they are functioning well and whether any timber harvest or other management activity is warranted in the near future.

### **Management Issues Related to Roads, Access, and NMW Gates**

#### *Access To and Within the Seboomook Unit*

- How will the roads previously developed as woods management roads be managed?
- The current location of the gates on the road to the Socatean Ponds should be revisited.
- Given limited resources, how important is restoration of the Cutoff Road?
- Regional historical use of North Maine Woods – importance of access to roads and trails to economy of the area.

- Access to unit is important to the economy of the region.
- Concern about how the public be assured of continued access to these lands as there are not guaranteed rights over all private roads leading to the Unit.
- Condition of the roads impedes access – especially the 20-mile road from the end of the county maintained section. Part of broader issue of changing management of roads under new landowners- access is becoming more difficult.
- Will this plan deal with closure of roads on the Seboomook Unit?

#### *NMW Gates and Fees*

- Concern about the fee structure and its effect on local businesses and camp owners.
- Concern that fees are discouraging use. Use of NMW is very low compared to past historic use. Hardly anyone there; Canada Falls campground empty, other NMW campsites not nearly used to capacity.
- When people chose to go some other area, like New Hampshire, the state loses revenue – in retail sales, state tolls to get to the area, gas, lodging, guiding, dining. Local businesses lose business even if visitors go elsewhere in Maine.
- View that taxpayers paid for these lands and shouldn't have to pay high fees to use them.
- High fees hit the lower middle income users and retired folks hardest, and they tend to be the traditional users of this area, and account for more of the total use than folks who can afford the fees.
- Getting out of NMW is an option as the unit is on the periphery of the system, like the Nahmakanta Unit was (which was removed from the KI-Jo-Mary System).
- Gate system has benefits for providing oversight of use – registration deters vandalism. Worry about increased use in winter, without gates to provide this security - could see increased vandalism.
- Gates are not operated in the winter. If use increases in the winter, there could be increased vandalism.
- Information provided at the gate is inconsistent or incorrect at times; fees are not consistently charges; gatekeepers are at times discourteous. Need better service ethic and training.
- Impacts of not having a gate, if the unit is withdrawn from the NMW system, including whether the costs for the services now provided at the gate will have to be absorbed by Greenville taxpayers.

### **St. John Ponds Parcel**

#### **Significant Natural Resource Management Issues**

- The St. John Ponds unit was acquired under the condition that it be managed as an Ecological Reserve. This designation requires a prohibition on timber harvesting and strict limitations on motorized recreation. Roads on the unit are currently in very poor condition.
- The exemplary ecosystem and rare plants on the unit are all associated with wetlands. Since the unit is an Ecological Reserve, protection for these areas is not a concern.

### **Historic and Cultural Resource Management Issues**

- Spiess (2004) recommends an archaeological survey of this area, beginning with a careful walkover around the lake basins.

### **Recreation Management Issues**

- Parking area at point of barrier for vehicular travel.
- Are there other roads or trails (besides the Gulliver Brook Road) that would provide a more suitable pedestrian access to this area?

### **Timber Management Issues**

- Though not a timber issue per se, decisions must be made on how to manage the existing logging road access, where to block roads and where to put them to bed. Much will depend on recreational access decisions, as well as environmental threat and the expense of closure.

## **Baker Lake Parcel**

### **Significant Natural Resource Management Issues:**

- The campsite and boat launch area on the north end of the lake shows signs of trampling and heavy use. The boat launch is unimproved, shallow, and can be difficult to use, resulting in sediment being stirred up as boats attempt to launch.
- Invasive aquatic plants are always a concern at any boat launch, and steps should be taken to educate users about the consequences of invasive species.
- Management guidelines for wood turtles and Tomah mayflies include maintaining a 330 ft. riparian management zone for 3.1 mi. (5 km) upstream and 3.1 mi. (5 km) downstream from the occurrence. “Threatened and Endangered Species in Forests of Maine: A Guide to Assist with Forestry Activities” recommends that 25 feet of the riparian zone nearest the waterway remain unharvested; the rest of the riparian zone be managed with single tree or small group selection cuts that maintain 60-70% cover; and construction of roads and log landings within the riparian management zone be avoided or minimized. In addition, MDIFW guidelines recommend avoiding the use of broad-spectrum insecticides within a ¼ mile of the stream for 0.6 mi. (1 km) upstream and 0.6 mi. (1 km) downstream of the Tomah mayfly occurrence.
- Rare plants in the unit, blue-beaked sedge (*Carex rostrata*) (ranked S2) and bog bedstraw (*Galium labradoricum*) (ranked S2), are located within a large, non-forested wetland. These plants are probably adequately protected from forestry practices.

### **Fisheries and Wildlife Management Issues**

- Little is known about how the presence of muskies is affecting the population of native species such as brook trout, but it is commonly accepted that brook trout populations will not fare well in the presence of muskies. Muskies are also continuing to spread throughout the St. John River watershed, and their impacts could increase as their population continues to grow. The official IFW policy calls for encouraging anglers to fish out the species, though some would be interested in maintaining muskies as a high-quality sport fishery in the lake.

### **Recreation Management Issues**

- There has been interest expressed for a group campsite on this lake.

### **Administrative Management Concerns**

- Access rights to Baker Lake have not been fully secured, although there has been a long tradition of public access through the North Maine Woods system and policies of the predecessor large landowners such as Great Northern Paper Company.

### **Big Spencer Mountain Parcel**

#### **Significant Natural Resource Management Issues**

- The poorly maintained snowmobile and hiking trail that leads to the lookout tower was not designed for the kind of use it receives and is prone to erosion. If the trail continues to be used for motorized recreation, its design will need to be reassessed.
- The area surrounding the lookout tower has been trampled by visitors to the top of the mountain. Although not part of the state-owned parcel, care should be taken to ensure that this trampled area does not expand.
- As an Ecological Reserve, the unit is subject to prohibitions on timber harvest and restrictions on recreation use.

#### **Recreation Management Issues**

- Future use of the existing trail to the old warden's cabin.
- Future of the old warden's cabin.
- Need for trailhead parking, both summer and winter, for hiking trail up Big Spencer Mountain.



**Appendix C**  
**Maine Department of Conservation**  
**Bureau of Parks and Lands**  
**WRITTEN PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS**  
**WITH BUREAU RESPONSE**

**I. Recurring Comments Received Throughout the Planning Process**  
 (Not including comments related to the North Maine Woods Gate and Gate Fees; see part V.)  
 (August 31, 2004 – November 3, 2006)

Comment	Response
<p><b>Closing the Big Spencer Mountain Snowmobile Trail</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposition to continuing the backcountry snowmobile trail up Big Spencer Mountain was expressed in seven comment letters.</li> <li>• Support for continuing the backcountry snowmobile trail up Big Spencer Mountain was expressed in five comment letters.</li> <li>• Support for closing the trail if an alternative destination trail is established was expressed in one letter.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Closing the Big Spencer Mountain Snowmobile Trail</b></p> <p>The Bureau will close the snowmobile trail up Big Spencer Mountain within two years. However, statutory and policy guidance for this decision as described below is not definitive; rather it requires interpretation and judgment. Recognizing this, and understanding that this is an existing trail that is important to the local snowmobiling community, the Bureau is committed to finding a replacement high vista snowmobile destination that is safer and in the same general vicinity as the Big Spencer Mountain trail, prior to closing the trail. While it is the Bureau's intention to do this within two years if at all possible, our ability to meet this time frame is subject to a number of factors over which we may have little control, including having adequate staff resources to identify and pursue options on either state or private lands; the willingness of private landowners who may have to grant trail rights to the Bureau for the high vista trail or to connect to the high vista trail; and adequate financial resources to construct the trail. Nonetheless, the Bureau is resolved to implement the decision to close the trail, which is based on the following Bureau Policy and language in the statutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Title 12, Section 1805, Designation of Ecological Reserves, subsection 2 defines how existing motorized trails are to be treated in ecological reserves:  <u>"2. Trails and roads for motorized vehicle use.</u> The director shall allow the continuing use of an existing snowmobile trail, all-terrain vehicle trail or a road if the director determines the trail or road is well designed and built and situated in a safe location and its use has minimal adverse impact on the ecological value of an ecological reserve and it cannot be reasonably relocated outside the ecological reserve." Note that snowmobile trails in ecological reserves are not absolutely prohibited, but are subject to significant restrictions. The Bureau is committed to honest implementation of these requirements, keeping in mind the ultimate purpose of the requirements is not compulsive exclusion, but rather preserving the integrity of the ecological resource.</li> <li>• The Bureau's <u>Integrated Resource Policy for Public Reserved and Nonreserved Lands, State Parks and State Historic Sites</u> (BP&amp;L, Dec 18, 2000) incorporates the statutory limits on motorized trails:        "Existing snowmobile and all-terrain vehicle trails and roads may be allowed to continue in Ecological Reserves</li> </ul>

	<p>where they are well designed and built, are situated in safe locations, have minimal adverse impact on the values for which the reserve was created, and cannot be reasonably relocated outside of the reserve. . . However, every effort should be made to relocate roads, motorized use trails and other incompatible activities outside of the Reserve, and to close and revegetate these areas.” (at page 24).</p> <p>The Bureau notes that the specific criteria for continuing existing snowmobile trails do not address destination trails. However, given the overarching direction to relocate motorized use trails outside of the reserve, combined with the poor condition of the trail (it follows an eroding abandoned jeep trail that becomes a stream in runoff conditions), and the questionable safety of the trail (it is narrow and very steep), the Bureau concluded that the trail should be discontinued.</p>
<p><b>Allowing ATVs in the Unit</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposition to or grave concern for allowing ATVs within the Unit was expressed in nine comment letters.</li> <li>• Support for allowing ATVs within the Unit, provided this is restricted to protect sensitive environmental areas, was expressed in 3 comment letters.</li> <li>• Concern that ATV use be restricted, or very limited, without elaborating exactly what was meant by this; or prohibited from certain areas designated for quiet or remote recreation, was expressed in 3 comment letters.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Allowing ATVs in the Unit</b></p> <p>The Bureau’s Off-Road Vehicle Program supports the formation of ATV clubs to work with landowners to develop and steward ATV trails. The Bureau's experience has been that clubs have a very positive influence on the ATV community, with the result that, where clubs are active, landowners are experiencing few problems with off-trail riding and damage to sensitive areas. The demand for ATV trails is growing rapidly. Maine’s system of ATV trails now attracts the ATV touring public from throughout New England. With a new generation of active-minded retirees with second homes in the region adding to the demand, and a general trend towards ATV recreating, this pressure may continue for some time. ATV clubs have expressed an interest in being able to have access through the Unit to Pittston Farm, a refueling station and a stopover option for an extended ATV touring trip. The Bureau recognizes that the opportunity for multi-day excursions with overnight camping or lodging is rare in the region. The Seboomook Unit is large enough to accommodate this along with a variety of other recreational activities including remote camping and hiking. The Bureau will work with all affected parties, including adjacent landowners, to provide access on specified trails when a regional network of trails extends to the Seboomook Unit, and will work with clubs to ensure ATVs do not travel beyond the Seboomook Unit and use only designated trails.</p>

## II. Summary of Written Comments on the Draft Final Plan of the Seboomook Unit Management Plan

(September 20, 2006 – November 3, 2006)

(Not including comments related to the North Maine Woods Gate and Gate Fees; see part V. for these.)  
(Comments excerpted or summarized. Typographical, grammatical, or formatting errors have been corrected where possible.)

Comment	Response
<b>From: John Rust, Vice President, Maine Professional Guides Association (November 3, 2006)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Maine Professional Guides Association (MPGA) appreciates the great amount of work put into creating a management plan for the Seboomook Unit. The plan is a vast resource for those wishing to learn about the area and to share that knowledge with visitors as would Maine Guides. The Maine Professional Guides Association is pleased to submit the following comments and suggestions regarding the Final Draft of the Seboomook Unit Management Plan.</li> <li>• The Maine Professional Guides Association (MPGA) makes these comments in support of: sustainable use of Maine’s natural resources – lands, waters, fish and wildlife; sustaining Maine’s outdoor and natural resource heritage; the principle of multiple land and recreational use; as well as the following positions:</li> <li>• <b>MPGA Supports Landowner Rights</b> - The Maine Professional Guides Association believes that land and water access is vital to guiding, and therefore access must be protected. Access results from respecting and working closely with landowners. For this reason, Guides have a vested interest in developing a mutually beneficial, long term, relationship with the Landowner and the Land – both private and public. We therefore believe that Guides are significant partners in setting policy for and managing recreational uses, especially on publicly owned lands.</li> <li>• <b>Public Benefit Must be Considered</b> - The Maine Professional Guides Association believes there are benefits to conserving special habitats that are vital to wildlife, such as spawning waters, loon nests and deer wintering areas for example. However, the Maine Professional Guides Association does not believe a significant public benefit is derived from converting large tracts into Ecological Preserves where trails, mechanized vehicles, or legal forms of recreation including hunting, fishing, trapping and snowmobiling are prohibited. MPGA opposes the creation of ecological preserves on public lands. In the case of lands and easements donated to the State, MPGA believes that the public’s interest should be considered by the State Legislature before the State accepts ownership.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau appreciates the positive feedback about the Plan. This Plan reflects a new effort in our Management Plans to appeal to the interests of the public and foster appreciation of the resources we manage.</li> <li>• The Bureau welcomes the comments and unique perspective of Maine guides. We have also benefited from having two Maine guides on the Seboomook Unit Management Plan Advisory Committee. Your support for sustainable use and multiple use management are in line with the Bureau’s basic mission.</li> <li>• <b>Landowner Rights:</b> We appreciate that Guides must maintain good relations with both public and private landowners. The Bureau also works to secure rights for the public to use private lands, for example, in its the snowmobile and ATV programs.</li> <li>• <b>Public Benefits:</b> The Bureau understands that protecting wildlife habitat is a public value that is especially relevant to Guides. Maine’s system of Ecological Reserves was established with significant public input and authorized by the Legislature (Title 12, Section 1805). In 2001 the Bureau designated 13 land areas (68,944 acres) as ecological reserves, and since has acquired 3 areas that were deeded to the Bureau as ecological reserves: Big Spencer Mountain (4,242 acres); Mount Abraham (4,033 acres), and the St. John headwater ponds (3,895 acres). In total BPL now manages 81,146 acres in reserves, out of a total reserve lands base of 568,692 acres (14.2 percent). The Legislature has capped the acreage BPL may designate at 100,000 acres. The ecological reserves must serve one or more of the following legislatively defined purposes:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) maintaining natural community types or native ecosystem types that represent an area in a natural condition and range of variation and contribute to the protection of Maine’s biological diversity;</li> <li>(2) serving as a benchmark against which biological and environmental change can be measured;</li> <li>(3) providing sufficient habitat for those species</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

- **Current Uses Must be Supported** - The Maine Professional Guides Association believes that existing recreational practices should be allowed to continue unless they harm the resource in some non-sustainable way. It is not acceptable for one recreational use to be restricted so that another use may be developed. Exclusive use is not an acceptable form of “public access.” The State should not intentionally deprive someone of the way of life they have become accustomed to, unless there are vital environmental reasons.

**Specific Comments Regarding the Seboomook Unit Management Plan:**

“Ecological Preserves” and “Special Management Areas”  
MPGA opposes what appears to be the State’s creation of ecological preserves beyond those given to the State by deed. This would include the “Special Management Areas” that are to be managed by similar policies.

“Non-Extractive” Wildlife Management: MPGA opposes designating non-extractive Wildlife Management areas. Current wildlife policies are in place that allows hunting, fishing and trapping so that all wildlife is protected as needed. It is stated in the Plan that “Hunting, fishing, and trapping are allowed where they do not conflict with the management of historic or cultural areas or the safety of other users.” This would indicate that hunting, fishing and trapping are to be allowed throughout the Unit. There seems to be a conflict in the Plan’s Policies where hunting is allowed by one statement, yet banned by another.

Wildlife Protections: MPGA supports protecting wildlife populations through such efforts as increased water flow management and identifying deer wintering

whose habitat needs are unlikely to be met on lands managed for other purposes; or  
(4) serving as a site for scientific research, long-term environmental monitoring, and education.

The establishment of ecological reserves does not, however, prohibit hunting, fishing and trapping as suggested. These uses, in fact, are specifically allowed by statute (Title 12, Section 1801, subsection 1. Allowed Uses). Existing snowmobile and ATV trails are allowed to continue in an ecological reserve if they meet specific criteria as set forth in the statute (see above response related to closing the snowmobile trail on Big Spencer Mountain).

Regarding lands and easements donated to the State, the Bureau is required by statute (Title 12 Section 1850) to have the Governor’s approval for these acquisitions, and must report annually to the Joint Standing Committee on Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry to describe any acquisitions and to justify any that do not include guaranteed public vehicular access.

- **Current Uses:** The Bureau’s approach to recreation management is to provide a balance of all permitted activities on its lands. It also recognizes that conflicts do take place whenever multiple activities occur together. The resource allocation system, as described in the Integrated Resource Policy planning document (December 2000), provides a mechanism whereby a range of recreational experiences can be accommodated across the land base, so that no one user-group will be excluded, and all will be accommodated, but not necessarily on every acre of the land base. The IRP was developed with a broad array of stakeholders, including the MPGA.

Ecological Reserves/Special Management Areas: See previous response concerning establishment ecological reserves under “Public Benefits.” The Bureau has designated the following types of lands as Special Protection Areas, which are, by their nature, sensitive to impacts from intensive uses and hence in need of special protections: areas identified by the Maine Natural Areas Program as exemplary natural communities or areas containing rare and endangered species of wildlife and/or plants; ecological reserves; and significant historic/archaeological resources. As noted above, hunting, fishing, and trapping are allowed in these areas. “Non-Extractive” Wildlife Management: This phrase refers to Bureau management activities only, and applies only to areas designated as Special Protection Areas. Specifically, this limitation refers to management of timber and vegetation for manipulation of wildlife habitat (such as creation of cleared openings) and does not restrict the public’s right to hunt, fish and trap in these areas. The text in the Plan has been clarified to state this.

Wildlife Protections: The Bureau is fortunate to have a wildlife biologist from IF&W assigned to BPL full time to work on wildlife management issues on our lands. He

areas before creating new campsites and trails. It should be understood that deer wintering areas might change over time, requiring continued monitoring and reallocating recreational uses.

MPGA supports the plan's protection of loon nests. However, loons can and do live in harmony with human activity - even with PWC uses nearby. And since all loon nests have not yet been identified, and new nests will be constructed from time to time, the proposed 1000 foot separation might be too restrictive.

Multiple Uses: MPGA supports the concept of multiple use, and opposes what appears to be the State's creation of exclusive use areas, specifically, by restricting mechanized access where roads and trails currently exist, or exist due to ongoing forestry harvesting. The Plan appears to use "Remote Recreation" as a definition for many of these areas, including a band of non-motorized area surrounding Seboomook Lake, plus other large tracts. Current multiple uses should be retained, especially where the people of the State of Maine may not agree with the wishes of special interests who believe their ways are the best for everyone.

MPGA does not intend that there should be no restrictions whatsoever, and supports restricting motor vehicles, ATVs, mountain bikes, horses, and foot traffic where serious surface environmental damage would occur. But limiting snowmobiles to only groomed trails is not only environmentally unnecessary, it is likely to have a detrimental impact on the region's snowmobile industry as well as guides who use snowmobiles for tours or hunting. Similarly, creating a band of non-motorized area surrounding Seboomook Lake contradicts with current uses including drive-to boating and camping spots - not to mention that snowmobiles are regularly used to access shoreline campsites in winter.

fully appreciates the challenges of managing deer wintering areas.

The 1,000-foot loon nest protection provision is a condition attached by the US Fish and Wildlife Service to its donation of funds for the acquisition of the Seboomook lands. It applies to loon nests known at the time of the acquisition; however, the Bureau will respect the intent of the restriction and will apply it to nests located after the acquisition date to the extent feasible.

Multiple Uses: The Bureau's Allocation system has a number of land management categories, including Remote Recreation areas, that accommodate a wide range of recreational experiences, as is directed in the Integrated Resource Policy (IRP) (Dec 2000) developed with input from an advisory committee of stakeholders including the MPGA. Title 12, Section 1847 (included in Appendix E of this Plan), directs the Bureau to develop management plans that "provide for outdoor recreation including remote, undeveloped areas." The relatively undeveloped nature of the large lakes and rivers in this unit is unusual for state lands and presents an opportunity not found in many other areas to secure a remote waters experience in a relatively accessible location. At the same time, the Plan continues the existing drive-to campsites on these waterbodies, which are located at the most accessible sites near the dams, and in the case of Seboomook Lake, also near Pittston Farm at the opposite end of the lake, leaving the main body of the lake relatively remote.

The Remote Recreation allocation around Seboomook and Canada Falls Lakes does not include the shoreline at the southeastern end of Seboomook Lake from the Hallett camp to the dam, or any of the existing drive-to camping areas. These campsites will continue to be accessible by motor vehicle or snowmobile. Further, motorized uses are not strictly prohibited in Remote Recreation areas; rather, they are allowed as an exception subject to specific criteria, including no significant impact on the remote recreation experience.

For roads in the Seboomook Unit, the Plan designates the Seboomook Road, Seboomook Dam Road, and the Roll Dam Road as Public Use Roads (for vehicular use); however, Bureau has not yet determined which of the woods roads put in place by the previous owner will be retained as part of the Bureau's forest management road system, and of those, which may be open for public use, whether motorized or non-motorized. This applies to all woods roads, including those in the designated Remote areas. The Plan directs the Bureau to work with the Advisory Committee to develop a recreation use plan for these roads, and to complete such a plan within two years of Plan adoption. Conceivably, it might make sense to designate some roads for snowshoeing and cross-country skiing, and others for snowmobiling in the winter, and in the summer, there may be some roads designated for motorized uses and others for non-motorized uses. However, until such a plan is completed, the Bureau's general policy of

Snowmobile Trails: MPGA supports open access for snowmobiles, so they may ride off-trail and off the groomed trails. Trails through the unit are part of an extensive system looping around Moosehead Lake and connecting to Jackman and Millinocket, with Pittston Farm being a major service hub. Snowmobile recreation has thrived in the Moosehead area because there are good snow conditions, and many unplowed woods roads to ride on. The extensive road network draws many visitors, and spreads out the use so more can be accommodated. Limiting snowmobile use to only the designated trails will have a detrimental impact on the region's snowmobile industry as well as guides who use snowmobiles for sightseeing tours and hunting. In addition, the proposal to move snowmobile use off existing graded roadbeds and onto new woods trails will unnecessarily restrict traffic unless these trails are properly graded and drained so they can be used during low snow conditions.

Warden's Cabin and Fire Tower on Spencer: MPGA supports maintaining the Fire Wardens cabin, and the watch tower should it ever become possible. These are part of Maine's rich forestry heritage, and an attraction to many visitors. It would be a shame to lose them. MPGA supports the plea by the Forest Society of Maine for time to raise funds for any structural preservation needed, and believes that the ecological preserve deed restriction would never have intended for these structures to be lost.

In addition, MPGA supports maintaining access to Spencer Mountain's views by snowmobiles and ATVs, and hopes the State will be able to accommodate those existing users and vital contributors to the area

Equestrian Trails: Horseback riding is not, nor ever was, a part of Maine's north woods heritage. MPGA opposes using State funds to develop and maintain these trails. It must be noted that trails for motor vehicles, snowmobiles and ATVs are funded through dedicated taxes on those users (registration fees and gas taxes). There are also issues involving how horseback riding would interface with hunters from late August until winter. MPGA opposes taking away hunting access in order to give access to horse riders.

While horseback riding was not part of Maine's north woods heritage, draft horses most definitely were. Perhaps there is a tremendous opportunity for the State, and the resort at Pittston Farm, to develop a forest heritage demonstration area where draft teams from the Farm (and from throughout the State) could show visitors how harvesting was done a century ago. Certain areas must be

allowing snowmobiles and motor vehicles on its inactive management roads will serve as an interim policy on the Seboomook parcel. Until the State acquired the property and removed the gate at the Seboomook Road that Wagner had installed to keep vehicles off these woods roads, the public had no vehicular access to these roads in the summer. A tradition of public use of these roads does not, therefore, exist.

Snowmobile Trails: The Bureau policy as stated in the IRP is that "Snowmobiles are permitted on designated trails and in areas not designated for other uses where the activity does not conflict with allowed uses of the Resource Allocation System categories." Accordingly, snowmobiles would not generally be allowed in the Remote Recreation areas (see preceding response related to Multiple Uses). Note, however, that most of the unit is not allocated as remote, so snowmobile use off-trail is allowed in these areas. Regarding the relocation of the snowmobile trail from the Seboomook Road, the Bureau recognizes that this is a major trail and will take into account the need to have a functioning trail for as much of the season as possible and under a wide range of snow conditions. This could involve designating the road as the trail during low snow conditions, provided the road is not being used for active forest management. The Bureau will work closely with partner snowmobile clubs that groom the trails in the area in planning and implementing any changes to the existing system to minimize disruptions to the trail system.

Warden's Cabin and Fire Tower on Spencer: The Bureau does not own the watch tower on Big Spencer Mountain; however, the Fire Warden's cabin is on Bureau land. The cabin is within an ecological reserve. It should be removed to be faithful to the management requirements of ecological reserves. The significance of this cabin to the region, however, is well understood. BPL has provided in the plan for a two-year window for the Forest Society or other group to raise funds to relocate the cabin to another location off the reserve.

Equestrian Trails: The Bureau manages its lands for a wide range of public recreational opportunities, including many that are not a part of Maine's north woods heritage, such as snowmobiling and ATV riding as well as horseback riding. This Unit may be uniquely situated, with the stable facilities available at Pittston Farm, to provide a backcountry horseback riding opportunity. The Seboomook Unit is a large public reserve, with over 40,000 acres surrounding Seboomook Lake alone. This large area can accommodate a wide range of uses, properly planned and managed, without conflicts. The Bureau will designate appropriate areas for horseback riding trails and will manage them to avoid conflicts with hunting and other uses. The principal sources of funding for non-motorized trails on public reserved lands are timber revenues and grants, not ATV or snowmobile funds. Where motorized and non-motorized uses share

harvested, let it be by horse teams.

Misreading Recreational Trends: It is important to understand the current trends in outdoor recreational activities before investing resources. The Piscataquis County study noted might indicate that respondents felt more favorably toward increases in non-motorized activities than motorized ones, with over half of respondents would like to see increases in current levels of camping and hiking, cross-country skiing, and kayaking and canoeing, it is also noted that participation in those activities is actually declining as shown by visitor data for Baxter Park, NMW, and the Allagash Wilderness Waterway. Activities on the increase include snowmobiling and ATV-riding. Even hunting is increasing with retail sales for hunting footwear being the highest growth market segment for retailing. We must be careful not to rob Peter to pay Paul, especially when Peter (hunting and snowmobiling) is already vital to our economy and is growing, when Paul (camping, canoeing, and hiking) is shrinking.

Glossary: MPGA supports the use of clear language, so that meaning and intent may be fully understood. Some of the terminology used in the Plan is overlapping or not defined at all in the Glossary. These should be corrected, and include: “people-powered”, “motorized”, “non-motorized” and “mechanized/non-mechanized.”

These distinctions are important in relation to environmental impact, as well as their interactions with other users. For instance, some “people-powered” activities like mountain biking have similar environmental impacts as some “non-motorized” and “non-mechanized” activities like horseback riding, as well as some “motorized” activities. Likewise, some “people-powered” activities like snowshoeing and backcountry ski touring have similar environmental impacts as a “non-motorized” activity like dog sledding, as well as a “motorized” activity like snowmobiling.

The Plan defines “**Motorized**” as “a mode of travel across the land base which utilizes internal combustion or electric powered conveyances; which in itself constitutes a recreational activity, or facilitates participation in a recreational activity. And includes the use of mechanized forms of travel, such as a bicycle, for the same purpose.”

The Plan defines “**Non-mechanized**” as “a mode of travel across the land base which does not utilize internal combustion, electric, or mechanically powered conveyances; which in itself constitutes a recreational activity, or facilitates participation in a recreational activity.” It is not very clear how this definition would treat bicycles. “Non-Mechanized” would include the “People-Powered” activities of paddling, hiking and ski touring, but not the “People-Powered” activities of mountain biking. “Non-mechanized would include horseback riding and dog sledding.

“**People-Powered**” is not defined. It is not the same as “non-motorized”. “People-Powered” includes a

the same trail, the funding sources could reasonably be combined. In addition, the Bureau anticipates that Pittson Farm will be an active partner in making this opportunity available.

Recreational Trends: The Plan includes information collected by others related to recreation trends and attitudes toward various recreational activities. The Plan does not propose to reduce funding to snowmobile and ATV interests to pay for non-motorized activities. BPL’s objective is to provide a balance of opportunities across the spectrum of recreational activities.

Glossary: The definitions in the Plan are standard definitions taken from the IRP, where the principle application of the terms “motorized” and “non-mechanized” was in the context of the Back-Country Recreation allocation, which is not an allocation used in the Seboomook Plan. This can be confusing, and so the terms and definitions in the Seboomook Plan have been revised accordingly. A definition for “non-motorized” has been added and the term “non-mechanized” has been eliminated in this plan. The Bureau chooses not to use “people-powered.” The Bureau has used the term “non-motorized” in all of its planning documents to date and believes it encompasses the a broader range of types of recreation than people-powered, including horseback riding and dogsledding, for example. See previous response for “non-extractive wildlife management.”

Setting aside terminology issues, BPL understands the different impacts of the various uses, and BPL’s management decisions and actions are guided accordingly. The vision statement and the description of uses allowed by allocation generally speak to the actual uses, not the class of uses.

<p>“mechanized” activity like mountain biking, but not horseback riding or dog sledding.</p> <p>The term “<b>Non-extractive</b>” should be added to the Glossary. It is used in the plan but it is missing from the glossary. Does it mean no picking of berries, or cutting of dead wood for campfires? Does it allow catch and release fishing?</p>	
<p><b>From: Roger and Suzanne AuClair, Rockwood (November 3, 2006)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We wanted to thank the Dept. of Conservation and to say how much we appreciate what appears to be a well planned and thoughtful final draft for the 10-year Management Plan of the Seboomook Unit.</li> <li>• We agree that the Baker Lake campground needs to be upgraded somewhat.</li> <li>• We also have observed the rare wood turtles each spring while fiddleheading on the backwaters of the North Branch, so appreciate that these will be protected.</li> <li>• We re-iterate that King's Landing campground does not need to be expanded because, in our common visits there, we have either encountered no one else or perhaps two other parties. The current campsites are well appointed and well maintained. It is not a high traffic stop, though does support a high quality of wildlife and outdoor experience. This would not make a good dedicated campsite area for motorized groups (such as ATVs), but is a superb place for wildlife watching. We habitually see eagles, loons, mink, moose and deer there, as well as many other water fowl, birds and small mammals.</li> <li>• Finally, again we would not recommend allowing ATVs to be used in the Seboomook Unit. ATV group activities will cause a tremendous problem, both physically to the high quality of our natural resources and to the overall enjoyment of this remote area during the busiest times of year -- spring, summer and fall, where the woods and waters are more fully used by more people and more animal activity than in the winter. Noise, especially of this sort, travels far over water and can be heard from miles around, and regulations will be difficult, if not impossible, to enforce.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau appreciates the feedback from residents in the area close to the Unit, who have first hand knowledge of the resources we manage.</li>   <li>• Regarding King’s High Landing, BPL respects the views expressed about the potential impacts to wildlife from any expansion of the camping area, and its present low use. It already includes six campsites; BPL will monitor use and consider carefully whether this is an appropriate site for more drive-to campsites. The Plan has been redrafted to more generally recommend that any additional drive-to campsites be located in proximity to existing drive-to campsites.</li>   <li>• Regarding ATVs, see the response in Part I of these comments.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Dawn Sipos (email, November 1, 2006)</b></p>	
<p>I have been vacationing in the great North Maine Woods, for the past 20 years. My family and I have camped at Seboomook Campgrounds, for 10 of those years. In 2005, my parents finally purchased a camp.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would just like to express my thought on some things that may or may not change in the area. I hope snowmobiling will always be allowed, the trails are great, they are well maintained, and the area is so vast.</li> <li>• It would be nice to see some cross country trails made available. I am not fond of ATVs. They are noise and rip up the trails.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau actively manages its land to implement the concept of multiple use of its reserved lands, including snowmobiling, ATV riding, and cross-country skiing in appropriate areas. All trails must be located to avoid impacts to sensitive resources. The Bureau has a policy to separate snowmobile and cross-country ski trails wherever possible by a distance that will minimize the sound of snowmobiles to skiers. The Bureau policy for ATV use on public reserved lands limits their use to designated roads and trails, where it is suitable for ATV use in terms of environmental impact, safety, and compatibility with other uses. As with snowmobiles, the Bureau would consider noise in siting any trails. See also the response in Part I. related to the issue of ATV trails.</li> </ul>



<b>From: Judith Canepa, New York, NY (October 7, 2006)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a visitor who very much appreciates your beautiful state, I am writing about the new management plan for the public lands now held by the state of Maine near Moosehead Lake. In particular, I urge your agency to designate Big Spencer Mountain and St. Johns Pond as ecological preserves, as they are ecologically sensitive and important to the health of the wilderness. And I also ask that both areas be made off-limits to motor vehicles of any kind (including sports vehicles such as snowmobiles and all-terrain vehicles), as those types of vehicles cause degradation to the soil and adversely affect the wildlife. Any snowmobile trail on the mountain (Big Spencer) should be located outside the area to be designated as an ecological preserve.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both Big Spencer Mountain and the St. John Ponds parcels are designated Ecological Reserves, where motorized uses will be limited in accordance with statutory direction (see also the response in Part I related to the snowmobile trail on Big Spencer Mountain).</li> </ul>
<b>From: Lydia Garvey Clinton OK (October 6, 2006)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I strongly urge you to preserve these vital ecological treasures! NO ORVs- Keep it Wild! These precious areas have much potential &amp; so many species, Protect them!- Our Public lands &amp; watersheds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See previous responses in Part I related to ATVs. The Bureau policy regarding snowmobiles as stated in the IRP is that “Snowmobiles are permitted on designated trails and in areas not designated for other uses where the activity does not conflict with allowed uses of the Resource Allocation System categories.” Accordingly, snowmobiles would not generally be allowed in the Remote Recreation areas, or in Special Protection Areas (including Ecological Reserves), except in narrow circumstances. Specifically, existing snowmobile and all-terrain vehicle trails and roads may be allowed to continue in Ecological Reserves where all the following criteria are met: they are well designed and built, are situated in safe locations, have minimal adverse impact on the values for which the reserve was created, and cannot be reasonably relocated outside of the reserve.</li> </ul>

### III. Summary of Written Comments on the Preliminary Plan and First Draft of the Seboomook Unit Management Plan

(May 23, 2005 – December 31, 2005)

(Not including comments related to the North Maine Woods Gate and Gate Fees; see part V. for these.)

(Comments excerpted or summarized. Typographical, grammatical, or formatting errors have been corrected where possible.)

Comment	Response
<b>From: Sherwin Start, Sanford (June 14-15, 2005)</b>	
<u>Seboomook and Canada Falls Parcels:</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>In-holdings</u>: We are concerned that "In-holdings"- (Private Lands )within this unit are going to have a serious adverse affect on the State's ability to effectively manage this unit. In addition these private parcels of Lands could at any time be subdivided into to small lots. The State should see if they can get a permanent conservation easement on all of these private lands or even purchase them. I realize that the LURC does control all development in the unorganized areas of the State.</li> <li>• <u>Horses</u>: I have nothing against horses and neither does my wife, but there also has to be limits placed on where and when they can be allowed to go and what they are used for. Unshodded horses cause very little damage as opposed to those with hardened steel shoes. Trails must be kept at minimum pitch and on high -dry ground. Each rider should be responsible for his or her animal's dung. Horse riders should have to pay a small trail construction and maintenance fee.</li> <li>• <u>ATVs</u>: In our opinion, seeing how much damage that ATVs have done in SW Maine, we would recommend that NO ATVS be allowed on any lands within this unit, until such time that hardened surface roads/trails can be built to accommodate them. If the ATV clubs want to post a construction, repair and maintenance bond and assist the State in the development and construction of ATV trails and physically assist in their maintenance as needed, then we would go along with those plans. These ATV trail locations should be very restricted, keeping in mind that resource protection is of the highest priority.</li> <li>• <u>Ecological Reserves</u>: No ATV or snowmobile trails should be allowed in any Ecological Reserves!! We would however be in favor of developing backpacking, cross country skiing and snowshoeing trails, in addition to backcountry primitive tent camping sites. Walk in-walk out and provide your own self contained cooking stoves- no camp fires of any type should be allowed!! In addition traditional hunting, fishing, trapping ,white-water rafting, and canoeing.</li> <li>• <u>Wildlife and Botanical Resources</u>: Protection of natural communities is also critical, and there are numerous plant and animals communities that are very rare and/or protected by either State and/or Federal Laws. These must all costs be preserved in perpetuity!!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>In-holdings</u>: There are very few in-holdings in the Seboomook Unit. They include seven small camplots on Seboomook Lake, three small camplots on Canada Falls Lake, the dam lots retained by Great Lakes Hydro America, a commercial campground on Seboomook Lake which is leased (the Bureau plans to acquire the lands associated with this lease); and a number of small camplots on Moosehead Lake. None of the camplots are large enough to be subdivided.</li> <li>• <u>Horses</u>: The Bureau will designate appropriate areas for horseback riding trails and will manage the use of the trails to avoid environmental damage and conflicts with hunting and other uses. The Bureau anticipates these trails will be multi-use trails (especially in the winter), and will work out a collaborative arrangement with Pittston Farm for the cost and maintenance of these trails.</li> <li>• <u>ATVs</u>: See previous responses in Part I related to ATVs.</li> <li>• <u>Ecological Reserves</u>: The Bureau's <u>Integrated Resource Policy for Public Reserved and Nonreserved Lands, State Parks and State Historic Sites</u> (BP&amp;L, Dec 18, 2000) incorporates the statutory limits on motorized trails in ecological reserves: "Existing snowmobile and all-terrain vehicle trails and roads may be allowed to continue in Ecological Reserves where they are well designed and built, are situated in safe locations, have minimal adverse impact on the values for which the reserve was created, and cannot be reasonably relocated outside of the reserve." Criteria for new trails require, in addition, that the trail be a "crucial link" in a regional trail system.</li> <li>• <u>Wildlife and Botanical Resources</u>: The Bureau has designated Special Protection zones around significant plant communities and the habitat of wildlife species that are rare, endangered or of special concern within the unit.</li> </ul>

- Draw down of Canada Falls Lake is excellent right where it is and should be held at this level or even less if possible! Draw down of Seboomook Lake is going in the right direction and every effort should be made to minimize this as much as possible.
  - Although in our opinion EVERY WETLAND is an important eco-system, there appear to be numerous ones in the Seboomook unit that have very special significance. These must be protected at all costs from all types of human encroachment!! There is a very serious need for a great deal more study as far as wildlife and fisheries are concerned in this unit and we whole heartedly agree that no development plans should be formulated until ALL of these studies are 100% complete!!
  - Forest management: There also appears to be a need for the Professional Foresters to do an intensive compartmentalization of the Unit to bring this Unit back up to full wildlife habitat standards. Our Prescription would be for a balanced hard wood/soft wood mix where possible given the soil, water and ground conditions, especially in those areas are all bodies of water and wetlands.
  - Roads: A very carefull study must be undertaken by all members of the management team in determining which of the existing roads and trails are of ABSOLUTE VITAL necessity and permanently close those that are not!! All of these roads should be water barred, blocked/diked/ditched to exclude any and ALL types of motorized equipment, top-soiled, seeded /mulched and trees planted there-on.
  - Mountain bikes: The use of mountain bikes should be discouraged as next to ATVs they cause unbelievable loss of soil and trail erosion and destruction, and that is a fact!
  - ATV on snowmobile trails: Another thing to be VERY CAREFULL of is allowing ATVs to use Snowmobile trails! We have seen it time and again where this has happened and the outcome is devastating to the point that there is almost always total destruction of the snowmobile trail or trails.
- St. Johns Ponds Parcel.
- Again it looks like access is a big issue that needs to be dealt with. In view of the fact that this parcel is an ecological reserve there really isn't much that can be done here except for the following recommendations: Have the perimeter surveyed, boundary marked and posted with signs to the effect that "the land behind this sign property of the State of Maine-Ecological Reserve". No motor vehicles of any kind are allowed except in designated areas-ONLY!" All roads that can be used for motorized vehicular travel MUST BE PERMANENTLY CLOSED, except for a small graveled parking area on the SE corner of Third St. John Pond. From there we would want to see a foot trail only. This hiking trail could be used to access about 15 backcountry tent platforms for camping. This trail hiking and backpacking would be exactly as
- Lake Drawdowns: The Bureau does not regulate the drawdowns on the lakes within the Unit. That is done through a federal hydropower licensing process.
  - Forest Management: Bureau timber harvest prescriptions are prepared by professional foresters according to Bureau policies, with input from staff specialists. The Bureau does generally manage for a balanced hard wood/soft wood mix, depending on site conditions; and other needs such as deer wintering areas. See also the Timber Management recommendations in the Plan and also the section on Monitoring and Evaluation related to Timber Harvests.
  - Roads: The Bureau has not determined as yet which of the woods roads put in place by the previous owner will be retained as part of the Bureau's forest management road system, and of those, which may be open for public use, whether motorized or non-motorized. BPL will evaluate all roads to determine which are needed for forest management, and which should be discontinued and revegetated, and as directed in the Plan, will work with an Advisory Committee concerning the recreational use of these roads.
  - Mountain bikes: The Bureau evaluates potential environmental impacts before siting or designing any trails, and is aware of the potential for erosion from mountain biking.
  - ATV on snowmobile trails: As above, The Bureau evaluates potential environmental impacts before siting or designing any trails, and is aware of the potential for erosion from ATVuse.
  - As an ecological reserve, the St. John Ponds parcel will be off-limits to motorized vehicles. The Plan recommends that no facilities be developed on this parcel, and that existing management roads be closed except if needed for fire control. Note that under LURC regulations, the Bureau may not allow public vehicular access within one-quarter mile of this "remote pond;" hence the Bureau is choosing to close management roads that are not needed for fire control, as no management will be taking place on this parcel other than fore control.

done on the AT. No wood fires to be built unless it is a life or death situation. A seasonal Ranger Cabin would be necessary. This cabin would be very "Rustic" and provide only the barest of amenities. Sleep 2, outside privy, meals cooked on Coleman Stove and light With Coleman lantern(s).It would not be built to be lived in during the winter. The ranger would be in attendance from May1 to October 1. No ATVs, snowmobiles, trail bikes, cross country motor bikes would be allowed except on the water(ice) portion of Third St. John Pond (snowmoblies only)!! I envision a tough time telling the snowmobilers that area is closed to snowmobiling after they have been allowed to be on it for so many years, but this the stipulation and we must follow through with it!!

#### Baker Lake Parcel:

- It appears to us that the Baker Lake Parcel is pretty well set other than trying to find another location for the public boat launch and closing the existing one permanently.
- Perhaps a nature scenic trail could be built around the lake? This area has a number of very rare plant communities and a few wildlife species as well that deserve our protection in perpetuity. By one means or another, we must provide the general population the opportunity to visit and experience these rare and beautiful sites and wildlife
- The mere fact that Baker pond is home of one the VERY FEW Muskellunge fisheries west of the Ohio River, will in itself bring many thousands of anglers from all over the Region and Canada. I personally consider this a VERY IMPORTANT fishery, and instead of the IF&W trying to eliminate it, they should be encouraging it's proliferation!
- We are not in favor of "group campsites" any where around or near this Lake! If there are to be campsites here, they should be like those we proposed for the St. Johns Parcel, i.e. Carry in- Carry -out on your back -LEAVE NO TRACE Appalachian Trail type Camping only!!

#### Big Spencer Mountain:

- Being a Ecological Reserve, here again there isn't much to be done except close off all ATV and Snowmobile Trails that encroach into this area. Here again signs need to be posted on ALL ATV and snowmobile trails that lead into this area, that the Area IS CLOSED TO ALL MOTORIZED USE Except for those types as allowed in designated areas (Automobiles only).
- However there will always be a need for a FOOT TRAIL to the top from one or both ends. If the existing trail to the top is too far gone then close it off permanently, but not before a new for FOOT TRAVEL ONLY has been established.
- The Fire Tower and the "In-Holding" boundary should be surveyed ,marked and posted, as well as the boundary of the Ecological Reserve.
- The DOC/BPL can have the naturalists set up signs and information kiosks to educate the public on what is allowed and not allowed and the attributes, natural communities, visual resources.

- The Plan does not include development of any nature trails for Baker Lake. This parcel is a draw to anglers and canoeists, and presently there is not a demand for more nature trails in this area. The rare plants and animals on this parcel are located in wetlands best accessed by water. The current boat launch needs improvement, but does provide access to those who may wish to see these features.
- The Bureau does not establish IF&W policy. However, their policy related to the Muskellunge fishery is consistent with our management guidelines supporting native species.
- The Bureau establishes group campsites where there is a need to accommodate groups recreating on Bureau lands. This area is the start of many St. John River canoe trips, which often involves groups rather than individuals.
- The Bureau understands the need to provide information to recreation users about its properties, and as standard procedure, develops informational brochures about each unit and posts these and other information, including applicable rules, at trailheads and common other points of entry to its lands.
- The Plan recommends stabilizing or replacing the existing trail and limiting it to foot traffic. See also the response in Part I of these comments.
- The in-holding has been surveyed. It is 2.3 acres, and at the top of a mountain where there is no vehicular access. The risks of a trespass are therefore minimal.
- See comment above (first under Big Spencer Mountain:)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We suggest that the Old Wardens Cabin as well as the two "Squatters Cabins" be bulldozed and covered over, otherwise sooner or later someone will torch it and start a forest fire.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan calls for these structures to be removed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Jeff Bagley, Fisheries Biologist, IF&amp;W Greenville</b> (June 20, 2005)</p>	
<p>In reviewing the (Preliminary) Plan, I have just a few comments regarding fisheries management in the Seboomook Unit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fishing regulations in place for waters in the Seboomook Unit are currently meeting our management objectives.</li> <li>We feel that access such as trails and launches to waters within the Seboomook Unit are currently adequate.</li> <li>Note: on page 22 of the Plan under bullet North Branch flow augmentation, line 3; it is stated that flow will provide another fall big river <u>salmon</u> fishery, this should read <u>brook trout</u> fishery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan does not recommend any changes to IF&amp;W fishing regulations except for limitations on personal watercraft and boat motor size. These relate to the Bureau's recreation management objectives, and not to fishery management.</li> <li>Boat access facilities on Seboomook and Canada Falls Lakes are owned by Great Lakes Hydro America. The recommended river trails are for nature walks, not fishing access.</li> <li>This error (replacing salmon with brook trout) was corrected in the draft Plan issued in September of 2005.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Alexandra Conover, Guide, Willimantic</b> (July 27, 2005)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the Seboomook Management Plan, here are just my most important observations, coming from the perspective of a wilderness guide conducting regional and global ecotourism canoe trips in this area.</li> <li>P. 53 of the (Preliminary) Plan: "The Bureau plans to continue to improve and upgrade these roads . . . etc." These Seboomook lands are rare and unique when compared with public lands in the lower 48 states. The water is drinkable, there are wild native trout populations and wildlife is abundant. Though the woods have been harvested heavily, they are still visually pleasing from the water. Places like this are extremely rare in the U.S.</li> <li>The quickest way to change the atmosphere and character of this place is to upgrade roads and develop campgrounds and motorboat access ramps for this only attracts the least responsible type of user and eliminates the eco-tourists that are generally responsible, low impact, and prefer quiet undeveloped camping areas. The day or weekend high impact user already has the majority of Maine's public reserved lands and state parks to use, let alone all of KOA and America to drive, car camp and motor around in.</li> <li>So why are we, the state of Maine, even contemplating improving access and roads when we know from experience that it will lead to more public pressure for facilities and ultimately create more management problems? All of these "improvements" cost money and in the long run degrade the Seboomook lands to a level of use that can be found almost anywhere in America.</li> <li>Why aren't we protecting and promoting what is unique in Maine? Do we want Seboomook to become Sebago Lake? Why would anyone drive as far as Seboomook to arrive at a place that delivers an outdoor experience that can much more easily be gotten in even central Maine?</li> <li><u>Recommendations:</u> Abandon the S. Seboomook road (\$17,000m proposed '05 cost) and the Cut-Off Road (\$5,000). <u>Reasoning:</u> It is duplicatory. The Golden Road on the North and its two spur roads – one to Seboomook Dam and the other to both Canada Falls Dam and Kings High Landing provide ample access to the Seboomook Unit.</li> </ul>	<p>This letter articulates a case for discontinuing the Seboomook Road and making the area between Pittston Farm and Seboomook Campground essentially a non-motorized roadless area. The Bureau chose not to accept this proposal, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Seboomook Road, which has existed since the mid 1800's, is key to the Bureau's ability to achieve a number of management goals for this Unit, including provision guaranteed access and free day use, and the ability to manage the forest for wildlife, recreation, and timber values.</li> <li>Because \$19 million of the approximately \$20 million used to purchase the Seboomook Unit was contributed by the federal Forest Legacy program, timber management must be a significant part of the management of this Unit. This program is aimed at preventing the conversion of forest to non-forest uses, and thereby protecting an array of traditional forest uses, including timber management. The Seboomook Road is necessary for management of timber on the Unit.</li> <li>Discontinuing the Seboomook Road would require visitors to Seboomook Campground, to the West Branch, and to camps along the northern shore of Moosehead Lake, to travel over the Golden Road to reach these destinations. The Golden Road is a road where logging trucks travel at often considerable speed and have the right-of-way. Many of the visitors to Seboomook Campground travel in or tow recreational motor homes. Visitors to the West Branch include anglers towing small boats and recreational boaters sporting a canoe or kayak atop their cars. Putting this kind of traffic out onto the Golden Road, when the Seboomook Road provides a safer and shorter route, is not a responsible policy.</li> <li>The Bureau is currently considering options for accomplishing its objective of free day use for the Unit. Having this road system, which departs from the NMW gated system just after the 20-Mile gate, is important to this objective as it avoids the use of NMW roads, whereas the option of using the Golden Road to gain access to the eastern end of the Seboomook parcel</li> </ul>

<p><u>Result:</u> Focused (versus scattered) specific access points which make management easier and problems fewer. The Department of Conservation saves \$22,000.</p>	<p>would most likely subject users to NMW fees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roadless area created by discontinuing the Seboomook Road could only be truly non-motorized backcountry if the Moosehead Loop snowmobile trail, one of the busiest snowmobile trails in the state, was relocated off the Unit, a move that would seriously impair its functionality and negatively impact the regional snowmobile trail network and the businesses it supports, particularly Pittston Farm.</li> <li>• There is no evidence supporting the statement that motor vehicle recreationists are the "least responsible type of user." The Bureau rejects this unfair characterization.</li> </ul>
---	---

**From: Jennifer Mills, Pittston Farm (July 31, 2005)**

<p>The following are my opinions and comments regarding horseback riding and trails in the Seboomook Unit. After reviewing the Integrated Resource Policy established for parks and land use I give the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was clear after reviewing the policy that dispersed activity includes horseback riding, snowshoeing, nature observation and snowmobiling:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sec. 4A Policy. Sec. 23 Trail Establishment Policy: A variety of land trail opportunities will be provided on Bureau-managed land including trails for horseback riding, historic interpretation, snowmobiling, cross-country skiing, snowshoeing and canoe portage.</li> <li>2. On page 63 Sec. 25 of the plan Horseback riding shall be permitted on bureau-managed land where guide-lines are established to ensure safety, control erosion and variety of riding opportunities.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• It is our intent to develop, hopefully along with the Bureau of Parks and Lands' assistance, bridle trails from the current discontinued wood roads near the farm. We have tentatively reviewed the area, and one road called "Windy Pitch" just down from the original "Pittston Y", across the Seboomook thoroughfare, is a nice area for riding. There are also many other wood logging roads with a few miles of the farm that will offer a variety of rides for enjoying the surrounding area. The trails include streams and a variety of terrains, flat and hilly. We have the necessary facilities for this new recreational opportunity and will be making modifications as necessary for improvements and establishment of this beginning in hopefully the 2006 summer or early fall season.</li> <li>• We have done quite a lot of marketing work with various horse associations throughout Maine, New England and on the internet as well. All associations contacted have been very positive about the new recreational opportunity for horseback riding in the North Maine Woods. They have indicated their current places for riding in the southern part of the state are becoming closed or limited to them. They have told us to let them know as soon as possible when we are ready to open the riding and they will be there. Our research since last winter indicates, the opportunities are very limited for this type of horseback riding and accommodations (food and lodging for both) in our state. We discovered two or three, including Acadia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IRP does address horseback riding trails as an opportunity to be provided on public reserved lands "where the activity does not conflict with other uses allowed by the Resource Allocation System."</li> <li>• The Bureau is interested in working with Historic Pittston Farm to establish horse trails, subject to a comprehensive review of the road system on the Unit and determination of appropriate recreation uses, to be developed in consultation with the Seboomook Unit Management Plan Advisory Committee.</li> </ul>
---	---

<p>National Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will be developing packages, for this activity and that will include all the necessary provisions for customers. Our barn is on the National Historic Register and we will be increasing and improving our current stalls into boxed stalls to house the horses. We also will have in residence at least one team of work horses for conducting cultural log twitching demonstrations for the farm, as well as other activities involving their traditional use. We will also have our own pleasure riding horses.</li> <li>• We will be developing, marking trails and producing a map for distribution to horseback riding customers on the 44 plus acres of Pittston Farm as well as utilizing the Seboomook unit adjacent to us.</li> <li>• We feel honored, and anxious to work with the State of Maine in bringing horseback riding back to this area after a long absence. It is a natural fit for Historic Pittston Farm, since historically it was the place where the “Teamsters lived, and where they cared for the horses that hauled the logs out of the woods.” This lumbering occupation established Great Northern Paper Co. and our great state of Maine as a lumbering giant in the world in the 1920’s. What a great opportunity to mold historic, cultural, and participatory tourism recreational activity into a great vacation of learning for our citizens and all other visitors as well.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>From: Doug Kane, Wildlife Biologist, IF&amp;W Greenville (September 7, 2005)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overriding wildlife issue in the Seboomook Unit is deer wintering area (DWA) management concerns. Much of the mature softwood cover type left in this unit has deer wintering activity. We have both mapped areas and areas that still need to be fleshed out and mapped.</li> <li>• In addition, there is an extensive old burn site with residual birch/aspen where we hope the Bureau will move fairly soon to do some fairly heavy handed cutting to improve the area for grouse/woodcock.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan recommends review of current deer yard designations and expansion of these where appropriate. As staff and budgets allow, the Bureau will coordinate with MDIF&amp;W on aerial and ground surveys of deer wintering areas on the Unit.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends establishing a ruffed grouse management area in the area of over-mature aspen in the Carry Brook drainage, consistent with this recommendation from IF&amp;W.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Sandra Neily, Greenville (Sept 29, 2005)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could we use “people powered” in the planning document instead of non-motorized?</li> <li>• <u>Winter Remote Areas</u>: If the intent is to “manage Canada Falls and the South Branch for a remote non-motorized winter experience,” the issue of the Canada Falls Road (not owned by the state) is an important one. This might take a cooperative agreement between the state and the landowner to close or post the road during the winter (except when the road is plowed to support logging operations.) A remote-feeling and fairly quiet winter experience in this area cannot be had when sled traffic is on the Canada Falls Road . . . even if users are on a trail near the river. Sled traffic, in general, will need to be carefully managed onto a focused trail system and “people powered” recreation areas clearly marked and facilitated (roads closed and gated; parking available) in order to accommodate diverse users. (This would also apply to winter use in the St. John Ponds Parcel).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau has used the term “non-motorized” in all of its Planning documents to date and feels it encompasses a broader range of recreation activities than “people-powered,” including, for example, horseback riding and dogsledding.</li> <li>• <u>Winter Remote Areas</u>: The Bureau will work with the snowmobile clubs to ensure that the Canada Falls Road is not groomed for snowmobiles. In addition, the Bureau will develop informational materials to advise the recreating public about remote areas to be set aside for non-motorized uses, and will distribute these through a variety of means, including making them available at Pittston Farm and through the local snowmobile clubs. The Bureau recognizes that it will take time to establish new patterns of use in this area, and will work to avoid conflicts by providing ample and attractive opportunities for both motorized and non-motorized winter recreationists. The Bureau will assess the effectiveness of this approach over time and will take additional measures as needed and appropriate.</li> </ul>

Currently winter sled traffic spreads out into the entire parcel so there will be the challenge of changing some use patterns anyway.

- South Seboomook Road: I suggest that (DOC) explore the idea of putting the road south of Seboomook Lake “to bed” and reserving it as a people powered trail. This option would save significant for repair and upkeep and since we’ve had several seasons without it being a useful road, we know that traffic users can access the resources here as well as Seboomook Wilderness campground without the road. Closing the road would allow the lake to offer a more remote wild-feeling experience, rather than trying to squeeze the remote land experience between two heavily used roads (Golden Road and Seboomook Road). We have an important opportunity to return this area to a more remote experience and enhance the quality of its wildlife habitat by not repairing the road where there are alternatives for access to the southern portions of Seboomok Lake and the north shores of Moosehead Lake.
- Creating a wilderness and trail matrix that supports the addition of the Big W lands: There is significant potential for a large contiguous block of wilderness lands and trail systems in this region if the Big W area can be conserved during the Plum Creek Concept Plan “opportunity.” There seems to be a consensus forming that the last remaining undeveloped shorelines on the northwest shore of Moosehead be conserved. The “line” above which future intense development will be considered unacceptable “sprawl” is very clearly drawn below these lands by all interested stakeholders at this time. Several camp owners in the region are also interested in beginning the discussion of a trail system that would offer “people powered” campsites on the lake (as well as motorized ones), a hiking/ biking trail that followed the edge of the lake (where possible) and trails that used the elevations in Big W Township for their value as remote experiences. There are ridges and views in this area that allow for varied terrain and stunning visual experiences.
- Lakeside trail: The Moosehead Region lacks a lakeside trail that connects up to remote feeling (wild feeling) experiences. The Northern Forest Canoe Trail is lacking campsites in this important leg of its trail. The entire region is lacking a high quality, destination bike trail system and by combining the Big W lands to the Seboomook lands we could achieve both high quality large landscape wildlife habitat conservation and a wilderness-type experience (a novel one that would also host the alternative snowmobile trail at the same time as that section has high value as a remote sled trail). Bike trails could access the region below the current gate and that would solve the problem of how to get “bikes” into NMW territory. This option might also reduce pressure at the gate as access to the Seboomook lands could also come through the Big W region.
- Seboomook Wilderness Campground shuttle: When I think of the campground I think of Rick (Sylvester) perhaps offering a shuttle for his campers across the cove
- South Seboomook Road: See previous response to Alexandra Conover’s July 27, 2005 comments.
- Creating a wilderness and trail matrix: The Bureau understands that a regional trail system may be developed in the future as is evidenced by two current proposals, including the Plum Creek Concept Plan and the Western Mountains Foundation all-season trail initiative. The Bureau will evaluate opportunities to establish connections to trails on adjoining lands as they arise, and in the context of the Bureau’s management objectives and current allocations. In addition, this is a Plan for the next ten years. When the Plan is revised, changes in the surrounding lands and new recreational opportunities will be assessed, and allocations will be revisited. The Bureau’s current management allocation for lands abutting Big W township is Timber Management. The Bureau manages its timber resources to produce a multi-aged forest that includes large trees, supports wildlife and creates an attractive environment for recreation. This area would be a compatible adjunct to any future wilderness area.
- Lakeside trail: The Plan recommends re-establishing the historic Carry Brook canoe portage connecting Moosehead Lake to Seboomook Lake, and establishing a campsite on the portage route if a suitable site can be located. This would enhance the Northern Forest Canoe Trail. The Plan also recommends evaluating the suitability and need for additional water-access campsites on Moosehead Lake. BPL will work to resolve issues with NMW that limit recreation options on the Seboomook lands.
- Seboomook Wilderness Campground shuttle: As noted in the Plan, one of the unique aspects of this Unit is the opportunity for public-private partnerships that enhance the value of the state lands to the public. This Unit has



<p>to hike, bike, or kayak into this remote system and I see a shuttle operation that would daily drop people (and their canoes, kayaks or bikes) either at the southern end of Seboomook Lake to explore it for the day or across the cove to explore the Big W lands and trails. This is the kind of experience that gets written up in Outside and Backpacker magazines because the experience is so unusual and high quality.</p>	<p>both Seboomook Campground and Pittston Farm as embedded enterprises that both depend on good management and can contribute value to the public using these lands.</p>
<p><b>From: Dan Legere, Guide, Greenville (Oct 8, 2005)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am pleased with your Proposed Vision for the Management of the Seboomook Unit. I didn't see anything about allowing mountain bikes or ATVs through the gate onto state lands. Has this been addressed?</li> <li>• I'm fine with the Big Spencer Mountain draft allocations. It would be nice if there was a snowmobile trail developed to a vista on the parcel if allowed at all. What are the unauthorized structures on the southern edge of the property?</li> <li>• I am definitely in favor of pursuing the possibility of more remote water access camp sites on Canada Falls. It's a beautiful place well suited for remote recreational use.</li> <li>• I have serious concerns about developing a large campsite for extensive ATV use on the Seboomook Unit. While driving to the East Outlet of the Kennebec River each day to guide fishermen I get a chance to view the ATV trail, governed by a club, that goes along Route 6 for a stretch before the river. It is truly nothing more than a muddy rutted mess that can't be healthy for the land around it. If it was state land it would be shut down. I can only assume that if ATV use is allowed off the established road system problems will surface.</li> <li>• One final note of appreciation for you and your dedicated staff professionals. If I had a large tract of land I could only hope that I would care for that as well as the Bureau of Parks and Lands watches over our public lands for us and the next generation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Vision speaks to having mountain bike and ATV trails on the Unit; and the management recommendations include examining alternatives to the present arrangement with NMW that will enable the Bureau to manage this Unit according to its mission. See also Part V. of this appendix, which elaborates further on this issue.</li> <li>• See Part I of this appendix for the Bureau's response to concerns about the snowmobile trail on Big Spencer Mountain. The unauthorized structures are some old buildings that are part of a camp that is not authorized by the Bureau.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends that if a regional ATV trail network extends to the Unit, that the Bureau consider establishing dedicated camping areas for ATV users. The Plan does not suggest that these would be "large;" and does not envision an "extensive" ATV system on the Unit. Any ATV trails and facilities would be developed with due consideration to other users and sensitive natural resources on the Unit. See also the Bureau response regarding ATV use on the Unit in Part I of this appendix. Regarding the trail along Route 6, that trail has since been repaired and stabilized.</li> <li>• Appreciation noted and appreciated!</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Jym St. Pierre, RESTORE (Oct 8, 2005)</b></p>	
<p>There appear to be many good aspects to the 9/13/05 draft resource allocations. However, I am concerned that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are only two areas totaling 465 acres in the Seboomook Lake Parcel where Special Protection would be the dominant use.</li> <li>• There are no areas in the Canada Falls-South Branch Parcel where Special Protection would be the dominant use.</li> <li>• The size of the area in the Baker Lake Parcel where Special Protection would be the dominant use is not specified.</li> <li>• There are no areas listed for ecological reserves in the Seboomook Lake, Canada Falls-South Branch, and Baker Lake Parcels. Would the areas identified for Special Protection officially become ecoreserves?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Final Plan includes a table that summarizes the allocations across the entire Unit, and a narrative description of each allocation and the specific areas designated for each across the Unit (See Section VI of the Plan, Resource Allocations).</li> <li>• Allocations for Special Protection are determined based on the natural resource characteristics of the land. The Maine Natural Areas Program conducted field investigations of each parcel in the Unit, and identified those areas that qualified for Special Protection. This is a science-based allocation; it is not determined as a policy decision. All areas appropriate for Special Protection have been so designated, barring any future research that may find species or plant communities missed in the initial survey.</li> <li>• Ecological reserves are a type of Special Protection area; however, special protection areas are not also ecological</li> </ul>

	reserves. See our previous response regarding ecological reserves under John Rust's comments of November 3, 2006.
<b>From: Sherwin Start, Sanford (Oct 15, 2005)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have reviewed your proposed draft of the Seboomook Management Plan. It is a very well thought out Plan except for one area-ATVS ! ATVS are going to literally the destroy the Wilderness aspect for both wildlife and humans!! Allowing ATVS, and enforcing their compliance will cost the DOC a great deal of money and manpower and WILL require that a Ranger be on duty YEAR-ROUND !!! Also allowing ATVS is going to create a problem with our neighbor, namely NMWand other land owners such as Plum Creek!! My wife is a Wildlife Conservationist and I am a Natural Resource Conservationist. If ATVS are going to be allowed in Seboomook,we WILL NOT be visiting that Area!!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Part I of this appendix.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Christopher Silsbee, Caribou (Oct 26, 2005)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have read the plan and found it to be very informative and well organized. I was glad to see some of the suggestions that were made by the general public in the plan and appreciate how the State has taken the time to hear public comments and listen to concerns at the public meetings that were held.</li> <li>• I believe this plan is a good foundation for the management of this area. I just hope that as the unit is developed some of the expressed interest in new recreational facilities is reviewed. The plan really addresses the recreation and visual consideration of the unit but with a strong support of special protection with the help of the designated wildlife management areas. With a unit this size, the multi-use concept will be successful if this plan is carried out.</li> <li>• I'm pleased that the state is continuing to acquire new lands as they come available and is dedicated to promote recreational activities while at the same time manage these lands correctly for the enjoyment of future generations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments and support appreciated. The Bureau manages its lands for the public, and values public input in the development of its management plans. This is especially important for new acquisitions, like the Seboomook Unit.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Alan Hutchinson, Forest Society of Maine (Oct 31, 2005)</b>	
<p>The Forest Society of Maine extends its compliments to the Department of Conservation, Bureau of Parks and Lands for its work in developing the management plan for the Seboomook Unit, which includes Big Spencer Mountain. The Forest Society of Maine (FSM) made substantial investments of funds, time, and other resources in conserving these lands as part of the West Branch Campaign, in partnership with the state, and have a long-term commitment to ensuring appropriate management and stewardship of these lands. We feel that the draft plan captures the intent of the West Branch project, addresses the key ecological and recreational issues, and balances the various uses (ecological, recreational, cultural, and sustainable forestry) in a manner that fits FSM's understanding and view of this parcel and the region. Within the draft plan, however, there are several specific questions, issues, or observations that FSM wishes to submit for</p>	

consideration as you work on the final draft that will be presented at public meetings. They are as follows:

- **Introductory Statements:** It seems that some form of introductory paragraph would be appropriate explaining the origins of this parcel as part of the larger West Branch project and the significant role the Forest Society of Maine played in conserving these lands. For example, Big Spencer Mountain was conserved by a \$3 million private fundraising campaign done by FSM. We then gave the mountain to the state as an ecological reserve. Mention could also be made that the West Branch project protected 329,000 acres in total: 282,000 acres under FSM easement and 47,000 as state fee lands, and that they are linked geographically and via the state's recreational access easement that FSM donated.
- **The 240-acre Mud Cove Bog:** It is appropriately identified in the plan as a Special Protection area. This area was acquired earlier and separate from the larger parcel. At that time there was some thought that it should be larger than 240 acres we were able to buy at that time, to include some additional older stands of timber (primarily spruce, I think). Your staff has probably already done so, but the boundaries as shown on the map should be verified to insure that the older timber was adequately considered, and that it is not focused solely on the rare plant wetlands.
- **Jet Ski ban on Baker Lake:** The draft plan recommends that BPL pursue a ban on personal watercraft use on Seboomook Lake, primarily due to the nesting loon population and their special status due to the North Cape funding. Pursuing a similar ban for Baker Lake was proposed by some at the September advisory group meeting due to a general sense that they would be inappropriate in that North Woods setting. FSM urges BPL to pursue it due to nesting loons and the North Cape funding, as well. Baker Lake was one of the identified loon nesting lakes in the surveys.
- **Forestry and wildlife management:** The draft plan states one of the forestry goals for wildlife was to manage for ruffed grouse and woodcock habitat, with a special focus within some of the old aspen stands – especially in the Carry Brook region. FSM expresses our support for that management goal.
- **Socatean Pond:** Is Socatean Pond a designated Remote Pond (if not, does it warrant that level of recognition), and have local fisheries biologists been asked if the draft management recommendations adequately address the fisheries values?
- **Big Spencer Mountain:** FSM has a couple of concerns/questions:
  1. BPL is recommending that snowmobiling be discontinued from the trail to the Ranger's cabin. The draft plan recommends the state pursue an alternative, high-vista destination trail if the Big Spencer trail is eliminated. FSM adds its support to the goal of DOC securing an alternative if the Big Spencer trail is discontinued.
  2. The plan recommends that the Ranger's Cabin be
- **Acknowledgement of the key role of the Forest Society of Maine (FSM) in the acquisition of the Seboomook Unit and the importance of the surrounding West Branch easement held by the FSM, is included in the Plan in Section III. The Planning Context, under *Acquisition History*.**
- **The 240-acre Mud Cove Bog:** The existing protection area is mostly shrub-scrub wetlands. At the time MNAP did the initial field work in this area (2000), there were several hundred acres of old spruce flats immediately west of this bog. These were cut prior to the acquisition. There are still some mature spruce flats east of the wetland, with occasional gaps caused by blowdown, which the Bureau will evaluate during its prescription process to determine if any of it should be added to the adjacent Mud Cove Special Protection area.
- **Jet Ski ban on Baker Lake:** The Plan now includes a recommendation to pursue a ban on personal watercraft on Baker Lake.
- **Socatean Pond:** Socatean Pond is a LURC designated remote pond; accordingly motorized access will be prohibited (except for snowmobiles). The Bureau has also designated a 330-foot wildlife management zone around the pond.
- **Big Spencer Mountain:**
  1. Snowmobile trail: See the response provided in Part I of this appendix.
  2. Cabin: The Plan now allows a two-year window for the Forest Society or another organization to find the funds and remove the cabin to another location. The cabin is not compatible with the purposes of the reserve. An interpretive panel will be prepared to be placed at the trailhead to the Mountain, however, to acknowledge the history of this mountain as an important fire watch

<p>“removed” – we assume meaning torn down or burned. FSM supports the recommendation to remove the ancillary shed, but we are strongly opposed to removing the Ranger’s cabin. The cabin is of historic significance and adds to the cultural history and experience of Big Spencer. We strongly urge DOC to not remove the cabin, at least not at this time. During the analysis of Big Spencer Mountain as an ecological reserve that led to the FSM capital campaign to acquire the mountain and give it to the people of the state of Maine, the cabin was viewed as compatible with the ecological values to be protected, and in fact was viewed as a positive attribute to the property and worthy of protection. It should not be removed and alternatives should be explored to maintain it and to use its potential as a historic way station along the trail. Consideration should also be given to allowing some vegetation management nearby the cabin for the purpose of maintaining the view from the cabin.</p> <p>3. <u>The fire tower.</u> This is not mentioned in the plan since it is not on the state property, but perhaps we need to be paying attention to its future as well. Like the Ranger’s cabin it provides a window to the historic past of Maine’s North Woods and a unique destination viewing opportunity.</p>	<p>station. The site of the cabin will be kept open to maintain the scenic views.</p> <p>3. <u>The fire tower.</u> The Plan does not address the fire tower as it is not on Bureau land. However, given the likelihood that the out-parcel at the top of the mountain will remain an important site for communications infrastructure, and the attractiveness of the views from the summit, maintaining the tower would add little to impacts already present from uses at the summit, and the Bureau supports efforts to retain the tower.</p>
---	---

**From: Suzanne AuClair, Rockwood (Oct 31, 2005)**

Below are comments submitted for the Seboomook Unit:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Canoe/Small boat launch/Campsites:</u> Establish some other public campsites and a primitive boat/canoe launch site along the piece of the south shore of Seboomook Lake that extends from Pittston Farm to Seboomook Dam. We're not sure how it is currently being used.</li> <li>• <u>Horse trails:</u> We oppose the establishment of horse trails on public trust lands. Allow private business to conduct private business and profit off their own land.</li> <li>• <u>In-holdings:</u> Future Unit plans should include the elimination of private in-holdings within the public trust unit.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Canoe/Small boat launch/Campsites:</u> The Final Plan does not recommend any additional canoe/boat launches. It does recommend establishing some additional water access campsites, with the expectation that this area will increasingly be popular as the start of the Penobscot River Corridor trip, and will attract those seeking a lakeside remote camping experience.<br/><u>Horse Trails:</u> The Bureau manages its lands for a wide range of public recreational opportunities including horseback riding, where it does not conflict with other allowed uses. This Unit may be uniquely situated, with the stable facilities available at Pittston Farm, to provide a backcountry horseback riding opportunity. This opportunity, which depends on a public-private partnership, is uncommon in the region and does not exist elsewhere on state reserved lands. The Bureau anticipates these trails will be multi-use trails (especially in the winter), and will work out a collaborative arrangement with Pittston Farm for the cost and maintenance of these trails. It is our view that collaborations of this kind will increase, not diminish the value of the public lands for public recreation, and will, at the same time, support the local economy.</li> <li>• <u>In-holdings:</u> There are very few in-holdings in the Seboomook Unit. They include seven small camplots on Seboomook Lake, three small camplots on Canada Falls Lake, the dam lots retained by Great Lakes Hydro America, a number of small camplots on Moosehead Lake, and a commercial campground on Seboomook Lake which is leased. The Bureau intends to acquire the</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Kings High Landing</u>: The current number of campsites at Kings Landing is more than sufficient. It is not a good site to designate for group camping. It absolutely should not be considered as a dedicated camping area for ATV groups. It is a wildlife sensitive area, especially known for waterfowl and eagles. Large group camping would negatively impact the wildlife by its proximity to high/loud human use. We use this area every year, at different times of the seasons, so have observed the kind of human and animal traffic this area receives. Each time, we have either been the sole people there or there have been perhaps two campsites being used. To date, the number of campsites are very suitable to the amount of use and requires no change. The sites are also well appointed and well maintained. It is an excellent spot to promote a remote camping experience. Designated group sites would fare better located close to or at already established busy sites, such as at Canada Falls, Seboomook and Roll Dams. Kings Landing would be better suited to be managed with some protection and the continued wise use of its natural resources.</li> <li>• We very much appreciate the thoughtful manner by which the Seboomook Unit vision is being treated. It is, and hopefully will continue to be, quite an unencumbered area, a prime part of traditional Maine.</li> </ul>	<p>lands associated with the Seboomook Campground lease; the Bureau's approach to small in-holdings is to consider them on a case-by-case basis; and to acquire only if the property contains significant public values and there is a willing seller.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Kings High Landing</u>: The Bureau respects the views expressed about the potential impacts to wildlife from any expansion of the camping area, and its present low use. It already includes six campsites; we will monitor use and consider carefully whether this is an appropriate site for more drive-to campsites. The Plan has been amended to more generally recommend that any additional drive-to campsites be located in proximity to existing drive-to campsites.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Diano Circo, Natural Resources Council of Maine (Oct 31, 2005)</b></p>	
<p>The Natural Resources Council of Maine (Council) supports many of the recommendations and prescriptions proposed in the draft Plan. There are some areas where we would like to clarify our support and offer additional comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council supports the draft proposal's management recommendations for the Big Spencer Mountain Parcel. Specifically, we strongly support discontinuing the snowmobile trail up Big Spencer Mountain and the removal of the warden's cabin. As was mentioned at the Advisory Committee meeting, motorized use of this trail is not in keeping with the spirit of Spencer Mountain's Ecological Reserve status.</li> <li>• We are also supportive of the recommendation to pursue a ban on personal watercraft for Seboomook Lake and Canada Falls Lake. Considering the specific emphasis on loon protection we think is also makes sense to pursue a personal watercraft ban on Baker Lake. Baker is relatively easily accessible by road and an important starting point for the St. John paddle trip. In time Baker could see increased pressure from personal watercraft. Pursuing a ban now may prevent future conflicts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response to this issue in Part I of this appendix.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends that the Bureau pursue a ban on personal watercraft on Baker, Seboomook, and Canada Falls lakes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Alexandra Conover, Guide, Willimantic (Nov 4, 2005)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Seboomook Unit can be readily managed through default (whatever happens, happens, and we'll manage the Unit accordingly) or through careful considered thoughts as to what we want Seboomook to be 50 years from now. Will Seboomook be more like Baxter Park (People powered access and high quality wilderness experience) or more like the lower (below Rip Dam) West</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau has articulated a Vision for the Seboomook Unit that retains it remote character along the waterways and provides a wide range of recreational opportunities elsewhere. This vision has been carefully considered and debated in a thorough, public process, in keeping with the publicly-owned character of these lands.</li> </ul>

<p>Branch Project (motor accessible and roadside, theme park feeling)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maine, and in particular, this Seboomook region, is one of the last places in this part of the world with a relatively wild area that can currently support multi-day water/woods based adventure tourism.</li> <li>• If we let Seboomook go the way of most of the other 34 state parks and 29 public reserved lands, we will continue to manage for everyone and therefore no one. Use of remoter parcels such as this one will continue to fall off.</li> <li>• To increase use of an area we have to have something clearly defined to the market of users. Is this a hunting game park? A remote flyfishing paradise? A family friendly remote North Woods heritage camping destination? An ATV theme park? If we encourage all of the above, Seboomook will never be known for anything in particular and therefore marketing the Unit will be difficult.</li> <li>• As a wilderness guide, having brought people canoeing and snowshoeing in the Maine woods for over thirty years, I cannot fail to notice that our guests have sought out Maine as a destination precisely because of its remote woodlands and waterways, not because of easy access to these places. Why? Because the world, not just New England or the lower 48 states, is rapidly running out of this globally valued commodity. And so is Maine.</li> <li>• <u>Recommendation</u>: Manage the Seboomook Unit waterways for quiet and heritage-based recreation: wildlife viewing, whitewater sports, kayaking, canoeing, fishing, hunting, trapping, snowshoeing, etc. This would mean no motorized vehicles on any of the waterways (frozen or open) within the unit: no ATVs, snowmobiles, boats, vehicles, jet skis, etc. <u>Reasoning</u>: We need Seboomook to stand out from all other state managed units. Right now it has the capacity to be unique in its remoteness and undeveloped character. For much of the year it can presently deliver to eco-tourists. However, nearly every other state managed unit in Maine can only deliver motorized or road-edge camping. Another reason for managing Seboomook for people-powered eco-tourism activities is we wilderness guides do not have even one multi-day use area free of motors for our guests. People-powered recreation and motorized waterway recreation do not mix.</li> <li>• I believe we have a golden opportunity to respond to the global eco-tourism market. This would put Seboomook in the forefront of what could become the first of many backcountry remote units managed for family heritage camping and remote heritage hunting, trapping, and fishing activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple-use does not mean all uses, for everyone, on all acres. Rather, it implies an allocation of uses best suited to each land area. See the Integrated Resource Policy.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends that the Bureau pursue a motor-size limit on Seboomook Lake, and on Canada Falls Lake if other landowners are in agreement. The Bureau chose not pursue a ban on all motors, since use of small motors on these lakes has had a long tradition that is compatible with a remote experience. This Unit has remote qualities that are significant and important to protect; but it is not a wilderness. See also the response provided to comments provided by Alexandra Conover dated July 27, 2005, suggesting the Seboomook Road be discontinued.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Tim Obrey, Regional Fisheries Biologist, IF&amp;W Greenville (Dec 2, 2005)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IF&amp;W supports the draft plan and vision distributed by DOC in 9/05. We support the concept (and legislative mandate) of managing State lands for multiple use recreation.</li> <li>• IF&amp;W would oppose making Seboomook and Canada Falls a non-motorized zone in the summer. These are large lakes that can sustain both motorized and non-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan does not call for a ban on motors on these lakes; it does recommend a motor size limit, however.</li> </ul>

<p>motorized recreation. In the next several years we expect that GLHA will improve the existing boat launch facilities at the dam site on Canada Falls Lake and at Kings High Landing and the dam site on Seboomook as part of the relicensing agreement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The concept of making the South Branch/Canada Falls area a non-motorized zone in the winter months makes good sense. This will not impact existing, traditional uses as long as the snowmobile trail can be relocated.</li> <li>• IF&amp;W would like to maintain 2wd vehicle access to Kings High Landing, Seboomook Dam, Roll Dam, and the Burbank Campsites. The West Branch below Seboomook Dam has a very important wild salmon and trout fishery. Access has traditionally been via walk-in trails from the Seboomook Rd (section above Roll Dam) and drive to campsites at Roll Dam and Burbank. Blocking access to these sites would virtually eliminate fishing opportunity. It is unrealistic to expect recreational anglers to paddle from Seboomook Dam downstream to fishing sites through this very rugged/steep section. Roll Dam is also a put-in location for canoers who prefer flat water paddling and are traveling down the West Branch to Chesuncook Lake. Roll Dam is also a take-out for recreational whitewater canoers/ kayakers who prefer the upper reaches of the river. Anglers also motor up to the Burbank area from Lobster Trip and from the Foxhole during the fall to fish.</li> <li>• The road along the south side of the river has been in rough shape for the passed few years. This represents lost opportunities for recreational use in the Unit and it should be rectified as funds become available.</li> <li>• I would also like to express our support for the concept of a multi-use trail (motorized and non-motorized) that could possibly connect Greenville -Kokadjo-Seboomook-Rockwood. Clearly, there is a current demand for this type of opportunity in this region.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau will work with the snowmobile community to implement the remote non-motorized zone along the South Branch and at Canada Falls Lake during the winter.</li> <li>• The Plan calls for continued drive-to access to these campsites.</li> <li>• The Roll-Dam Road has been a priority for Bureau road improvements over the last two years and is now much improved.</li> </ul>
---	--

**From: Dan Legere, Guide, Greenville (Dec 16, 2005)**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Regarding the letter from Sandra Neily dated Sept 29, 2005) I have to disagree with shutting down the road to Seboomook because of very possible negative effects it might have on the (Seboomook Wilderness) campground. I as well as anyone appreciate the need to protect remote areas, but I could only support the closing of the road if Seboomook Campground supported it. These points are valid but not at someone else's expense. That access has been there since I was a kid in the 60's if not before. Being a business person myself I find it hard to swallow efforts of people who want my life to change because they think they know what is best for me. If they want things to be their way let them buy it and run it the way they think it should be.</li> <li>• The Conover letter (Nov 4, 2005) also has great merit and a wonderful vision but I too use the West Branch Waterway quite a bit, especially in the fall during the spawning run of salmon. In my lifetime small motors have been very much a part of tradition. As in the Allagash, the canoe with a small motor has allowed outfitters to get people and gear in and out in a timely fashion. There are many folks who are not physically able</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau will not close the Seboomook Road. See previous response to Alexandra Conover comments of July 27, 2005.</li> <li>• The Bureau agrees that small motors are part of the fishing tradition in this area, and will propose a limit on motor size for Seboomook and Canada Falls Lakes, but not the West Branch.</li> </ul>
---	--

<p>to paddle long distances. If all the folks who motor in and out for the traditional fall salmon fishery below Lobster Lake in September had to paddle in and out it would end the trip for most who have been going there their entire lives. They would be crushed. These people are having their ashes spread there. I have been doing trips there for 22 years and the canoe with a small motor is as much a tradition as the paddle and pole. I understand the Lobster Lake issue and have always supported a limited horsepower on the waterway. There are camps on Lobster who need boats and motors to get provisions and gear in to their places. The decision was made not to change things because of hardships it would cause. It is unfortunate that everyone is not as courteous as they should or could be.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I guess all of my feelings in regards to these issues stem from my belief of not intentionally depriving folks of ways of life they have become custom to. If there are real environmental issues that's different. This is about the people of the State of Maine, many of which may not agree with the wishes of special interests who believe their ways are the best for everyone. In the total package there is a lot of land set aside for people power that has been traditionally remote and desires to stay that way.</li> </ul>	
---	--

**From: Kevin Bernier, Great Lakes Hydro – Brookfield Power (May 24, 2006)**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to ownership of the dam lots and retention of flowage rights, in general GLHA owns the islands, lake beds, and a 10-foot shoreline area above the high water mark at both Seboomook and Canada Falls lakes. Although GLHA agrees that these lands should be described within the Plan (since they are embedded within the Seboomook Unit), these areas are subject to state (LURC) and federal (FERC) regulation, and thus, should not be included as areas to be managed by the Plan. For example, GLHA does not believe that the Plan can prevent boat launch construction (on GLHA land) if it is within a certain distance of a loon nest (which would also be on GLHA land). Such restrictions should only pertain to the State's Seboomook Unit land.</li> <li>• GLHA has retained, through deeded rights, perpetual access easements for passage over and across all roads and paths as they currently exist (or as they may exist) within the Seboomook Unit. Management of the Seboomook Unit must recognize these deeded access rights.</li> <li>• North Maine Woods has operated and maintained GLHA's campgrounds within and near the Seboomook Unit for a number of years at no cost to GLHA. Should the State take over this campground oversight, GLHA would request a similar agreement.</li> <li>• Since Canada Falls and Seboomook are regulated by FERC, public access must be retained to the projects.</li> <li>• Boat launches and portage trail upgrades embedded within the Seboomook Unit are currently being designed as required by the Storage Project FERC license. Any</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan has been amended to clarify the issues raised concerning GLHA ownership of the 10-foot shoreline and islands.</li> <li>• The Bureau recognizes the deeded rights that GLHA has to access its dams and hydropower-related lands and facilities located within the unit.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends that the Bureau pursue a cooperative agreement with Great Lakes Hydro America for the maintenance and management of the existing drive-to campsites located on GLHA lands. The Bureau will pursue this after it resolves the NMW issues (See Part V of this appendix).</li> <li>• The Plan assures public access across Bureau roads to GLHA's project (Seboomook Lake, West Branch). Public access rights are also assured across the South Branch Road to Canada Falls Lake through a public access easement granted to the Bureau.</li> <li>• The Plan states the Bureau's objective of keeping boat access facilities appropriate to a remote waters experience. The Bureau has also offered its comments</li> </ul>
--	--



<p>comments or revisions to these designs must be made through the appropriate FERC approval and LURC permitting processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subject to the comments provided above, GLHA supports the vision, goals, and recommendations for the Seboomook Unit.</li> </ul>	<p>in writing to GLHA on the specific design for these facilities as part of the FERC licensing process.</p>
--	--

**From: Sandra Neily, Greenville (June 1, 2006)**

<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on what is already fine work: more detailed and thoughtful recreation planning compared to previous management plans. I'm sure that reflects the increased demands on our public lands and your willingness to respond to this challenge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly we need to plan in detail for ski and backcountry people-powered areas, and I want to highlight what you told me after the meeting as it made everything very clear to me and suggested the direction we might pursue. You said that the planning for parks (re; signage, trail use, detailed designations of various recreation areas) has always reflected intense use in a smaller area. Planning for larger public lands parcels has not, in the past, been subject to this kind of planning but it may be time to do just that on this parcel. In other words, use your department's expertise on park recreation and management and apply it to this plan, clearly designating (and creating signage) for various defined uses. Perhaps some public lands units coming into the system need to be managed like parks. This is a good time to think of this region as a large park and manage it as such as it does sustain (and will attract) significant use</li> <li>• Dave mentioned that few skiers used the area now and that without that demand we might just see what develops. I explained that (especially for winter use) skiers would not venture into areas already staked out by current and intense snowmobile use. (Bob Guethlen spoke up and also supported that observation.) Once you designate areas that will be reserved only for people powered use and sign (and protect) these areas appropriately (as in current Park management), skiing and snowshoeing users will find and use these areas. It really is a chicken and egg thing; you make room and "quiet space" for these activities and users will use them. Backcountry users will not seek out and push their way into an area already staked out by machine users and then ask for special consideration. And in the spirit of balanced opportunity (not numbers), even if only several hundred skiers or snowshoe users are counted on these trails in a season, that would not be enough rationale to exclude their trail needs from the planning process.</li> <li>• I repeat my request to have Parks and Land work out a cooperative road agreement with the landowner of the Canada Falls road so that access to the lake can be reserved for people powered use in the winter (except when the landowner needs to plow the road for timber operations). This road use should be signed at all access locations, notifying users that the road is reserved for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan defines an approach to recreation management for this Unit that is a blend of the "Parks" and "Reserved Lands" traditional approaches. It recognizes that this area is likely to become more actively used in all seasons; that it has enough land base to provide a range of experiences from water-access remote to drive-to camping and fishing; and envisions a more active Bureau presence on the Unit than on traditional reserved lands. Because the use is still low relative to the facilities and opportunities available, the Plan spells out the vision in some detail, but specifies how we get there in less concrete terms in order to allow the Bureau to develop approaches that grow with the need.</li> <li>• BPL will designate the waterways and manage the shorelands within the Seboomook and Canada Falls parcels as part of the Penobscot River Corridor, which is a Parks unit. As budget allows, a PRC ranger may be assigned to the Unit. The Bureau will work with the various user groups, including the snowmobile clubs, to increase awareness and acceptance of areas set aside for winter remote non-motorized uses (BPL encourages cross-country ski/snowshoeing interests to organize and work with BPL as well). The Plan calls for the development of an informational brochure. The Bureau will work to distribute this at the NMW gate, at Pittston Farm and Seboomook Campground, and other recreation-related businesses and organizations in the region. As at other Parks and Reserved Lands, any parking areas or trailheads developed would include an information kiosk or signboard displaying maps showing the recreation areas defined by the allocations, and posting Bureau policies for recreational uses. Brochures would also be available here. These measures will be evaluated over time to see if additional approaches are needed. Signage will also be provided at the Baker Lake drive-to campsite and boat access area.</li> <li>• The Bureau will work to ensure that the road is not groomed for snowmobiles, and otherwise will take a soft approach to managing the uses, as described above.</li> </ul>
---	---

<p>people powered use. Skiers should be able to ski from Pittston Farm to Canada Falls without sled traffic, ruts (road is not groomed), and noise. Sled traffic can easily access the lake at other points. It may be time to get creative and create signs that are not negative, like “Road (Trail) Reserved for Quiet Winter Sports of Skiing and Snowshoeing. Snowmobiles, Please Use Alternative Routes. Thank you for Supporting Various Uses of Our Public Lands.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This same kind of signage should be used for the St. John Ponds...but add hiking to create an all season sign. Please create summer and winter parking at the St. John trail head and block the road with boulders or other barriers so that it is clearly not accessible to sled traffic.</li> <li>• I also suggest that the network of woods roads and trails directly across the river confluence and east from Pittston Farm be reserved for people powered use. Access and parking can be just north of the bridge that crosses the North Branch. (Unofficially, people can cross the ice to find the trails.) This is a fine network of trails and could easily be signed from the current access points at the bridge, Golden Road and at the lake where sleds now access the trails.</li> <li>• What other areas should receive the same degree of careful management? How can we use the woods roads designation process to also support these recreational activities...rather than just let the scene up there evolve? I would like to see the same careful consideration given to people powered recreation that I see in the thoughtful consideration to the snowmobile community. I am suggesting that planning here be very cognizant of how market driven motorized use is and how that creates an imbalance of focus and planning resources. With attention, designation and signage, we can easily respond to the needs of people powered users.</li> <li>• I also wish to support Diano Circo’s suggestion that we create a time limit for continuing to allow sleds on the Spencer Mountain reserve.</li> <li>• The west shore of Moosehead could use hand carry boat access but we should be very careful that it is extremely limited (to small boats and small impact) and that it does not introduce new uses to the area, increase traffic substantially, or create a situation that can be used as a rationale to extend development further into lands adjacent to the Seboomook parcel. Please work with the Northern Forest Canoe Trail and other stakeholders to locate this kind of opportunity so that it does not degrade the current remote feeling qualities of this area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses at the St. Johns Ponds parcel will be monitored to determine appropriate measures. This area is set aside as the least developed of all the parcels in this Unit, with no trails or facilities provided. The Bureau will evaluate whether signs would be appropriate in this area. The road is already gated near the Golden Road.</li> <li>• Much of the area adjacent to the North Branch is a designated deer wintering area and would not be appropriate for skiers and snowshoers. The Plan does not designate this area for Remote Recreation. However, the area of the lake opposite Pittston Farm is designated for Remote Recreation. The Bureau encourages the skiers and other non-motorized winter sports interests to develop proposals for the Bureau to consider for parking and trailhead areas that would access this area.</li> <li>• As above, the Bureau encourages the skiers and other non-motorized winter sports interests to develop proposals for the Bureau to consider as part of the woods roads designation process.</li> </ul> <p>• See response in Part I of this appendix.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan recommends that the Bureau investigate possible locations for a boat launch facility on the western shore of Moosehead lake via Carry Brook or through a public-private partnership with Seboomook Campground.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Bob and Diane Guethlen, Rockwood (August 3, 2006)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are deeply concerned with the possible snowmobile trail that will be allowed in the Big Spencer Mountain ecological reserve from the perimeter road up to the warden’s cabin. The language in the current draft (4.28/06, page 25) leaves too much ambiguity about when, if ever, and how the trail would be disallowed in the future. We feel that the DOC should not allow this snowmobile trail at all. The cabin should be removed and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See the response to this issue in Part I of this appendix.</li> </ul>

<p>the trail rebuilt to a hiking trail standard, one that is compatible with the ecological reserve standards. If an ecological reserve is to have the highest protection, then this precedent for a temporary trail will start us down the road to a permanent trail that will become impossible to remove at a future date. The prudent course is to disallow it now. The motor vs non-motor debate will continue. It is important that DOC delineate which uses are appropriate for each use. As you know all places are not appropriate for all uses.</p>	
<p><b>From: Paul Napolitano, North Yarmouth (May 12, 2006)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the overall Seboomook plan, generally I think you have a good plan in place. With a little fine tuning, the plan will work for the majority of the Maine people.</li> <li>• On the remote sites, basically I think they will take care of themselves as long as there are no facilities for people to get gas and food. The parcels are so remote that people will not be able to get to them without motors.</li> <li>• On the Spencer Mountain parcel, particularly the rangers cabin and snowmobile trail, I understand that in an eco reserve there can be no motorized vehicles and buildings. I attended the very first meeting between the Forest Society of Maine and invited guests. At that time, Alan Hutchinson's representative expressed their views to keep the cabin and the snowmobile trail as it is today. I know saving the cabin is a high priority for Alan and I would recommend removing a small parcel from the eco reserve so that this could happen. This would allow the snowmobilers and the hikers to rebuild a suitable trail to the cabin and allow the Forest Society of Maine to rebuild the ranger's cabin.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau appreciates the support.</li> <li>• The Plan was designed to create a wide range of remote to semi-remote experiences. In some cases, as pointed out, ease of access will limit use and maintain the remote experience for those who are able to get to these lands.</li> <li>• The Plan allows a two-year window for the Forest Society or another organization to find the funds and remove the cabin to another location. The Bureau has determined that the cabin is not compatible with the purposes of the reserve. An interpretive panel will be prepared to be placed at the trailhead to the Mountain, however, to acknowledge the history of this mountain as an important fire watch station.</li> </ul>

**IV. Summary of Written Comments  
from Scoping Sessions and Issue Focus Meetings**

(AUGUST 31, 2004, OCTOBER 12, 2004, DECEMBER 6, 2004, MARCH 23, 2005)

(Not including comments related to the North Maine Woods Gate and Gate Fees; see part V. for these.)  
(Comments excerpted or summarized. Typographical, grammatical, or formatting errors have been corrected where possible.)

Comment	Response
<b>From: Gary and Joyce Day, Pittston Academy Grant</b> (August 20, September 8, November 22, 2004)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would be an area to restrict ATVs. Please don't let this area go the way the Spring Lake-Dead River area did years ago. My parents used to go there but soon the rowdiness and lack of respect took over and that is why we are in this lovely region.</li> <li>• I live on the east end of the Cut-Off Road. This road has a history of bad washouts every spring. I think your money could be better spent maintaining the Seboomook Road and Roll Dam Road through to Northeast Carry. It was mentioned that the intersection of the 20-Mile Road and the South Seboomook Road is unsafe, especially if there is any wood being hauled on these roads. I'm sure the corner could be widened cheaper than maintaining the Cut-Off Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response to this concern in Part I of this Appendix.</li> <li>• Improvement of this road is not a high priority except in association with Bureau forest management.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Norm Poirier, Ragged Riders Snowmobile Club</b> (Sept. 16, 2004)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has come to the attention of the snowmobile club that the Spencer Mountain area has recently been designated as an ecological sanctuary, with the possibility of snowmobile access being denied. We must stress that the Spencer Mountain trail system is a very crucial link to everyone who snowmobiles anywhere in the surrounding area, from Kokadjo to Pittston Farms, Northeast Carry, Chesuncook, and Caribou Lakes. Campowners, cross country skiers as well as snowmobiles use these trails to gain access to otherwise inaccessible areas.</li> <li>• The old ranger's cabin on the mountain is often a fun destination for families wanting to share the history and beauty with their children. Our club has expressed an interest in helping to maintain the historical cabin and keep the trail open for everyone to enjoy year round. We are therefore requesting that the State of Maine not refuse access to a very crucial part of the State, and let it remain open to all types of recreation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only trail that will be discontinued is the spur trail up the mountain; others that may cross over a portion of the reserve would be relocated if feasible, but not discontinued. See also our response to this issue in Part I of this Appendix.</li> <li>• The Plan allows a two-year window for the Forest Society or another organization to find the funds and remove the cabin to another location. The Bureau has determined that the cabin is not compatible with the purposes of the reserve. An interpretive panel will be prepared to be placed at the trailhead to the Mountain, however, to acknowledge the history of this mountain as an important fire watch station.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Shirley A. Raymond, Raymond's Store, North East Carry</b> (Oct.15, 2004)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The old original road between North East Carry and Seboomook needs maintenance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau made significant improvements to this road in 2005 and 2006.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Rick and Jeanine Sylvester, Seboomook Wilderness Campground and Store</b> (Oct.12, 2004)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If one of the goals of the Department of Conservation is to promote people coming to the Seboomook Unit, then the roads must be kept up.</li> <li>• The Short Cut Road was closed two years ago because of poor maintenance. This short cut road has been the main mode of travel for customers and camp owners to Seboomook for over 40 years. For short term planning we urge the Department to give this road a high priority.</li> <li>• Also for the short term, meaning before freeze up this fall, it is imperative that some work be done on the Seboomook Road. There are about a dozen culverts that</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau has made significant improvements to the roads in the Seboomook parcel during 2005 and 2006, and will continue to upgrade the roads over time to Bureau standards.</li> <li>• Improvement of this road is not a high priority except in association with Bureau forest management. Access is available using the 20-Mile Road and the Seboomook Road.</li> </ul>

<p>are not working and must be replaced before winter. If they are not replaced, next spring the road will disappear costing the Department and taxpayers dearly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gate on the Gulliver Brook Road I'm told is 5 or 6 miles from the resource protection area it is supposed to protect. One can only assume it was put there for the convenience of the landowner. This gate is now part of the Seboomook Unit and should be removed and put closer to the area it is supposed to protect. Maine people have paid dearly for this Seboomook Unit and close attention should be paid to ensure their access is not restricted in any way.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We understand that this gate was installed many years ago to create a backcountry area that was not easily accessed by car. The St. John Ponds parcel, now designated as an ecological reserve, can be accessed from the west to within one-half mile of Upper First St. John Pond. The Plan recommends investigating the feasibility of moving the gate on the Gulliver Brook Road and providing a parking area on or near to the parcel boundary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Greg Shute, Chewonki Foundation (Dec. 7, 2004)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to Chewonki, Outward Bound also regularly travels through Seboomook. Currently all the campsites have road access and although they are wonderful sites they don't work well from the perspective of the canoe tripper who is seeking a more remote experience. The North Branch of the Penobscot is another place that water access campsites might be explored from Big Bog to Seboomook. Currently all the campsites in that area are road access.</li> <li>• Chewonki's whitewater kayaking groups that are based at our Big Eddy Campground during the summer regularly visit the Seboomook rapids below the lake and beginning next summer will spend time on the South Branch of the Penobscot on the recreational whitewater releases from Canada Falls Dam. Again I think that some campsites on the South Branch might be interesting to consider.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan calls for additional water access campsites on the North Branch, Seboomook Lake, Canada Falls Lake, and the West Branch.</li> <li>• Because of the technical nature of the South Branch, and its limited length, we are not recommending water access sites on this river. There are presently 22 drive-to campsites at the Canada Falls Dam and along the South Branch.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Bob and Diane Guethlen, Rockwood (Mar 7, 2005)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding recreational uses of these lands, it is important to reach a fair balance of uses.</li> <li>• All uses are not compatible on all lands. Areas should be set aside for people powered trails.</li> <li>• I suggest a pamphlet be generated by the state that identifies rare plants and gives general information on them. This will enhance the knowledge of locals and visitors alike, and will help enhance softer tourism.</li> <li>• The Maine Natural Areas biologist should coordinate with the snowmobile coordinator to ensure trails (particularly the Carry Brook Trail) do not adversely impact the health of these plants.</li> <li>• Access to First and Second St. John Ponds, being in an ecological reserve, should be by foot only, with parking areas located off-site.</li> <li>• Build or improve on fishing trails to create a path along the South Branch, from Canada Falls to Pittston Farm, and the West Branch, from Seboomook Dam to Roll Dam campsite.</li> <li>• We suggest that the existing trail (up Big Spencer Mountain) from the logging road be maintained (or rebuilt if necessary) as a hiking trail to the cabin. A parking area should be located at the bottom of the trail for car parking in the summer and snowmobile parking in the winter. From this parking area people could hike in the summer and snowshoe in the winter to the cabin or mountain top.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan strives to achieve this.</li> <li>• The Plan designates a number of areas for remote recreation, which is an allocation that is intended primarily for non-motorized uses.</li> <li>• The Plan calls for an information packet to be prepared for the Unit. This could include information about the natural resources of the Unit, including rare plants.</li> <li>• The Bureau will consider impacts to rare plants in siting any trails on the Unit. The Special Protection area defined for wetlands along Carry Brook is not presently crossed by the snowmobile trail.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends letting existing roads on the St. John parcel revert back to forest, and roads leading to the parcel are by law required to be gated to limit vehicular access within ¼ mile.</li> <li>• The plan incorporates this suggestion.</li> <li>• The Plan calls for closing the trail to snowmobiles and stabilizing or relocating the trail as a hiking only trail. A parking area at the trailhead is also recommended. The cabin is to be removed.</li> </ul>

<b>From: Sandra Neily, Greenville (March 25 and 29, 2005)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been an imbalance for many years (I and many others feel this way) with thousands of roads changing the interior character of the forest, shorelines being developed, snowsleds and ATVs and jetskis able to go everywhere. We need to address the past gaps in planning and have some catch-up with people powered backcountry recreation as an officially planned for sector.</li> <li>• It's important to hear the Conovers when they testify that they have to take clients to Canada to find trips where they can pursue traditional environments that are motor free. They also can witness this gradual but serious loss of experience over time....and it is a loss. We have to really look for places to have quiet recreation where the sounds and smells...the experience ....are not affected by motors.</li> <li>• In the case of ATVs it is not just the experience, but also the resources, that are being damaged. Unregulated but market driven ATV use can totally destroy a recreation resource (example cited Roach River).</li> <li>• Since snowsleds are encountered everywhere in this area, not just on groomed trails, there will have to be marked and signed people powered areas (trails and old roads) reserved for skiing and snowshoeing, just as there will need to be areas like that in the summer.</li> <li>• Perhaps the St. John Ponds area and the north end of the North Branch below the bridge and the north side of the lake and Seboomook Lake itself could be people powered. Seboomook Lake should be snowsled free as the noise affects the skiing on the north side. One could ski from Pittston (or the bridge over the North Branch) all over the lands and shores on the north side of the lake.</li> <li>• There needs to be winter parking off the Golden Road for skiers to access the St. Johns pond.</li> <li>• The St. John Ponds area could be ungroomed, but other trails could be groomed. The regular trail groomer up there could easily groom out some ski trails, don't need "set" tracks for that to work. Would be ski skate heaven I'm sure.</li> <li>• On Canada Falls, in the winter machines could have the west shore, the road up to the campground could be people powered, and the lake itself could be open to all use. That's a great ski up from Pittston but it is now a sled highway.</li> <li>• In summer Seboomook Lake is an ideal canoe and recreational kayak haven. Perfect for that as the lake is mostly inhospitable to motors of any size. Remote campsites could also be on the north shore, not just on islands near the west end that have more road noise. Put in off the road right across from Nulhedus Stream. Hand carry only, please.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan includes significant areas designated for Remote Recreation, an allocation that is primarily for non-motorized recreation.</li> <li>• See response to Alexandra Conover's comments of July 27, 2005 and November 4, 2005 (Part III of this Appendix).</li> <li>• See response to this issue in Part I of this Appendix.</li> <li>• See response to June 1, 2006 comments from Sandra Neily (Part III of this Appendix).</li> <li>• The Plan designates much of the shorelands surrounding Seboomook Lake as Remote Recreation, an allocation intended primarily for non-motorized recreation. The Bureau will work with the snowmobiling community to establish trails and backcountry snowmobiling opportunities that do not utilize the lakes on the Unit.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends investigating the need and feasibility of establishing one or more parking areas serving potential walk-in routes to the St. John Ponds parcel.</li> <li>• The Plan envisions back-country skiing rather than groomed trails. However, if there is enough interest, and funds and resources could be generated to cover the costs, the Bureau would support having some trails enhanced for skiers.</li> <li>• The South Branch and the Canada Falls Lake parcel are designated as Remote Recreation areas for the winter. The Bureau will work with the snowmobiling community to establish trails and backcountry snowmobiling opportunities that do not utilize the lakes on the Unit.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends pursuing a motor-size limit for Seboomook Lake, and establishing water access campsites.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Roger and Suzanne AuClair, Rockwood (March 31, 2005)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would like to see continuation of traditional Maine recreational uses at Seboomook, including small, discrete campsites for camping, hunting, fishing, canoeing, hiking,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan includes this same vision, except that it recognizes the need for one or more group campsites, with increased use of the West Branch by groups such as</li> </ul>

<p>and wildlife watching.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Unit may need more water access.</li> <li>• In general, we want to see the Seboomook reserve remain simple, quiet and natural for all persons to enjoy, as well as to conserve the important natural wildlife habitat and high quality of the resources.</li> <li>• We do not want to see ATVs, personal watercraft, increased signage and “groomed” landscape, proliferation of large, motorized sport vehicles and motor homes (RVs), more services, such as attendants and long parking areas, bicycles, or more, wider, or paved roads.</li> <li>• We are opposed to the introduction of ATV use because ATVs are destructive to land, waters and habitat; create loud noise and pollution; erode trails and create high maintenance needs; and will throw off the balance between motorized and non-motorized use of the woods. The constant whine of machines will occur at the busiest times of the year, when the reserve is being used by the highest number of people. Wide use/groups of ATV users will disrupt wildlife, especially in summer, when young are being raised and wildlife are roaming territory. It may result in young being separated from adults, becoming vulnerable to predation. In general, in the spring, summer and fall the woods are more fully used by more people and more animal activity than in the winter. If bands of ATVs are allowed in the public reserve, it will cost exponentially – in erosion, maintenance, balance, use, wildlife and plant habitat, quality of experience, the numbers of people who come to use the reserve, and financially.</li> </ul>	<p>Outward Bound, Chewonki, and others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan recommends establishing a boat access on the western shore of Moosehead Lake, perhaps in collaboration with Seboomook Campground.</li> <li>• The Vision statement for the Unit is consistent with this view, as expressed in this statement : “The recreation and wildlife values of the Unit are maintained with a minimum of trails, roads or improvements, such as parking areas. Any recreational improvements are located in proximity to existing roads and facilities, or in areas that minimize impacts to wildlife and other sensitive resources.”</li> <li>• See previous response and the response to ATV use provided in Part I of this Appendix. While we have no intention of paving roads, they will be improved to Bureau standards to provide adequate drainage. Overall Bureau roads are designed to minimize width such that two cars may pass each other safely with due care (i.e.at slow speed). The Bureau has concluded that the Unit is large enough to accommodate a range of uses, including bicycling and ATVs on designated roads and trails, without degrading the environment or backwoods experience.</li> </ul>
--	--

**From: Christopher Silsbee, Caribou (Mar 29, 2005)**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I’m a firm believer of the multi-use concept for managing lands. Recreation has changed dramatically and will continue to do so. We as a state need to supply the demand of what the people are looking for.</li> <li>• Seboomook Lake and down to Canada Falls should be added on to the PRC.</li> <li>• Campsites should be provided on Seboomook Lake.</li> <li>• Hiking trails should be made to allow people to walk along the South Branch. In the winter months the same trail could be used for cross-country skiers.</li> <li>• There should be a trail system created that will accommodate cross-country skiers in the winter and hikers/bikers in the summer months.</li> <li>• It would be a good idea to create one ATV trail through the Seboomook Unit to connect Rockwood, Kokadjo, and Greenville. Campsites should be designed along this trail for these users.</li> <li>• To help enforce rules and regulations on this stretch of the PRC a ranger should be added to this area, stationed right</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Bureau is mandated to manage for multiple uses, as stated and reflected in the Plan.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends that all waterways in the Canada Falls and Seboomook Parcels, which are part of the Penobscot River drainage, be added to the PRC.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends additional water access campsites on Seboomok, as well as additional campsites on the West Branch to meet a growing need arising from increased flows on the West Branch and a new interest in this area for whitewater boating.</li> <li>• The Plan envisions trails along the rivers, and use of woods roads to serve these needs.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends accommodating an ATV trail as an extension of a regional ATV touring network, and providing camping opportunities to support a multi-day ATV touring trip.</li> <li>• The Bureau will provide staff resources to manage the Unit in response to need and as budget and staff</li> </ul>
--	--

<p>at Seboomook Lake, and work year round to help maintain a presence for the state, groom trails for winter use, educate users, and assist where problems arise.</p>	<p>resources allow.</p>
<p><b>From: Paul A. Fichtner, Penobscot Lake Lodge (April 1, 2005)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If ATVs are allowed in these woods, there will be consequences. I am a motor sports dealer in Greenville. I gave up selling Arctic Cat ATVs years ago because of the sensitive ecological areas of this region. In the Seboomook Unit, there is a tremendous amount of wetland that will be permanently altered if access by ATV is allowed. I have never known any operator of an ATV to stay on a designated trail. They will travel off to explore and the very nature of these machines is destructive to sensitive soils and vegetation. I fly over this country almost every day in the non-winter months and can tell you with a large degree of certainty that there is standing water covering the majority of earth all over the region. Snowmobiles are a different story. They travel off trail and if behaved, clues of their presence are few.</li> <li>• I feel strongly that given the state of the State, we don't have the funds to develop ATV trails and then be in a position to enforce the regulations. If the gates are opened and ATVs are allowed, the face of the area will be changed forever.</li> <li>• In closing, I would opt for extremely restricted use of ATVs, if at all, and the continuation of the gates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response to this issue in Part I of this Appendix.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Sherwin and Carolyn Start, Sanford (April 21 and 24 2005)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are very much in favor of keeping ATVs out of the area completely. ATVs have and are continuing to cause catastrophic destruction to ALL land in S.W. Maine. In doing so they've managed to close 95% of all privately owned land TO ALL USERS. Even though a new law went into effect last year, the destruction continues unabated. Please do not let this happen to any of our state lands.</li> <li>• We would like to see a year-round BPL Officer stationed in the area to enforce all state regulations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response to this issue in Part I of this Appendix.</li> <li>• The Bureau will provide staff resources to manage the Unit in response to need and as budget and staff resources allow.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: William Barker, Presque Isle (April 21, 2005)</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be honest I'm not sure if it would be good or bad to allow the use of ATVs. One thing you need to look at is how ATV use is affecting other public lands where there is permitted use. Seboomook is fairly remote and it would be hard to regulate where ATVs are going, and there is no way to keep them off private lands surrounding the unit. Even if the Unit is removed from North Maine Woods (which I am 100% against) ATVs could still access the private roads adjacent to the unit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response to this issue in Part I of this Appendix.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Ralph Cleale, Limington (April 29, 2005)</b></p>	
<p>The following comments are from me and my partners, land and campowners on Seboomook Lake and longstanding leaseholders since the mid-1940's. Our camp is almost entirely used for hunting and some fishing and snowsledding, and little canoeing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATVs are a nuisance and they do damage. We oppose them. You can't control them as they are made to go around obstacles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response to this issue in Part I of this Appendix.</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Snowmobiles do little if any harm. We support the continued use by snowmobiles.</li> <li>• We encourage more areas to be accessible by snowmobile, including Spencer and Seboomook mountains.</li> <li>• Traditional access for hunting is of utmost importance, except in areas of active harvesting.</li> <li>• Preservation of deer wintering areas is crucial. Moose can survive in clearcuts, deer cannot.</li> <li>• We want the Seboomook South Shore Road, the Dam Road, the Roll Dam Road, and others that now exist to be kept passable to pickups. We are not interested in having new roads, but we'd also like to see some of the woods roads left open, like the new road off 7-Mile Hill to the south side of Carry Brook and the Gulliver Brook Road to Seboomook Mountain and Third St. John Pond for hunting and fishing. It's too far to hike in or drag a deer out.</li> <li>• We don't object to the South Shore Road being used as a snowsled trail so long as the (Seboomook) Campground is accessible from the dam side.</li> <li>• The spring near the former Forest Service camp and the Seboomook Ledge camping spot by the dam is vital to us. It is the sole source of potable water since the spring at 7-Mile Hill's camping spot was allowed to deteriorate. I've used this water since 1945.</li> <li>• We suggest that a way to portage around the ledges and the bridge on the North Branch be cleared. I am 70 this year and cannot climb the bank dragging a canoe even with help and it's not safe to run the canoe down the river at this spot even in good conditions.</li> <li>• If harvesting will be going on we'd like to know when and where it will happen, perhaps by checking a map on a computer web site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan supports continued use snowmobiles on the existing trails and in designated areas. The accommodate non-motorized winter sports, some areas of the Unit are defined as Remote Recreation areas where snowmobiles are not allowed.</li> <li>• The State does not own Seboomook Mountain. See Part I of this Appendix for a response to the Big Spencer Mountain snowmobile trail issue.</li> <li>• Hunting is allowed in all areas subject to restrictions for safety reasons (such as near campsites).</li> <li>• The Plan recognizes the need for additional deer wintering areas in the region; the Bureau will work with IF&amp;W to manage and expand these.</li> <li>• The Seboomook South Shore Road, the Dam Road, and the Roll Dam Road will be kept as vehicle access roads. The Plan calls for development of a detailed use plan for the woods road network on the Unit, which will determine which of these roads will be open to vehicular use and when. This plan is to be completed within 2 years of the adoption of the Management Plan. On an interim basis, any road on the Unit that is possible is open to vehicular use.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends relocating this trail off the Seboomook Road to avoid conflicts with use of the road for timber management and to reduce heaving of culverts caused by snow compaction.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends evaluating this spring and protecting it from contamination.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends exploring a new carry-in boat access to the North Branch below the ledges at the bridge crossing near Leadbetter Falls, and pursuing agreements with Wagner/Merriweather to create a portage trail around the ledges.</li> </ul>
---	--

**From: Jym St. Pierre, RESTORE ( May 1, 2005)**

<p>I support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating a category (in the Integrated Management Policy allocation system) for high value areas apart from ecological reserves.</li> <li>• Constructing a hiking trail along the South and West Branches of the Penobscot.</li> <li>• Developing trailhead parking for Big Spencer Mountain, and limiting the Big Spencer Mountain trail to pedestrian use.</li> <li>• Keeping parking out of the St. John Ponds area.</li> <li>• Preparing a brochure for the Seboomook Unit/Penobscot Corridor with information about rare plants.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This requires amending the IRP, which is a separate planning process from this management plan.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends evaluating the feasibility and cost of a nature trail along the rivers, and pursuing this as resources allow.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends developing a trailhead parking area for Big Spencer Mountain, discontinuing use of the old jeep trail by snowmobiles, and stabilizing the trail as for hiking and snowshoeing use only.</li> <li>• The Plan recommends looking into the feasibility of moving the gate and providing a parking area on or closer to the parcel.</li> <li>• The Plan calls for an information packet to be prepared for the Unit. This could include information about the natural resources of the Unit, including rare plants.</li> </ul>
--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designating separate winter areas for non-motorized and motorized uses.</li> <li>• Restricting ATV use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan creates a significant area for Remote Recreation which is intended primarily for non-motorized uses.</li> <li>• ATV use on the Unit will be limited to designated trails.</li> </ul>
<p><b>From: Stanley Hallett, Windsor (May 2, 2005)</b></p>	
<p>I have been a lessee and now a landowner on Seboomook Lake for 38 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although I know that Seboomook campground is not part of the Seboomook Unit, some arrangement should be made for public use of the launch facilities that have existed there since Moosehead Lake was invented. It is the only launch site on Moosehead Lake on that side of the lake between Rockwood and Northeast Carry. After paying the gate fee at 20 mile and then to get charged a daily fee by Seboomook Campground is unacceptable. It has always been available to the public until 5 years ago. This has been brought by several people to the attention of the Department of Conservation, IF&amp;W, and Wagner Forest Management. For some unknown reason no one wants to discuss the issue. It is a shame and something should be done for the public to have access to Moosehead Lake.</li> <li>• The new minimum flows at Seboomook dam will be a disaster for landowners on Seboomook Lake. This will severely limit launching a boat on Seboomook Lake.</li> <li>• Traditional existing North Wood uses should continue as is. No ATVs should ever be allowed. The so called loop trail around Moosehead lake goes within 300 yards of my camp and I can see them coming down my driveway if they are allowed. There is simply no way you can restrict them to a given trail. It would not happen. It would just be another problem for campowners with break-ins and vandalism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan recommends that the Bureau investigate possible locations for a motorized boat launch facility on the western shore of Moosehead Lake via Carry Brook or through a public-private partnership at Seboomook Campground; and that it implement this access as resources allow.</li> <li>• The Bureau does not control water management on Seboomook Lake or the West Branch. Great Lakes Hydro America owns and operates the dams, which are regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.</li> <li>• See response to the ATV issue in Part I of this Appendix.</li> </ul>

**V. Summary of Written Comments  
Related to the North Maine Woods Gate, Rules, and Fees  
(August 31, 2004 – November 3, 2006)**

(Comments excerpted or summarized. Typographical, grammatical, or formatting errors have been corrected where possible.)

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>This section provides a synthesis of all the comments received, which are provided in the following section.</p>	<p>These responses cover the range of individual written comments listed following this section.</p>
<p><b>Concerns about User Fees:</b> Many people were concerned about the level of fees charged by NMW and stated they are a deterrent to visits to the NMW and Seboomook lands. Some objected to paying for use of State lands, while others believed the users ought to pay the full cost of their use of the public lands.</p> <p><b>Support for the NMW Checkpoint Gate:</b> Many of the comments below express concern that some sort of gated checkpoint system be maintained, whether operated by NMW or the State. A few thought a gate was unnecessary.</p> <p><b>Interest in Recreational Activities Not Allowed in the NMW System:</b> There is interest and public support for use of the Seboomook lands for mountain biking and bicycling, horseback riding, and ATV riding, activities that are not allowed within the NMW system. However, apart from the issue of NMW rules, many people wrote to argue against allowing ATVs in the Unit (see Section I of these comments). In addition, some people were not in favor of allowing horseback riding trails on public lands (see Sections II and III).</p>	<p><b>Concerns about User Fees:</b> The Bureau agrees that fees charged by the NMW system have become a deterrent to visits to the NMW system and the Seboomook lands. Consistent with the Bureau’s statutory directives, over the course of the 2-year planning process, the Bureau negotiated with the NMW Administrative Committee to provide free day use to the Seboomook Unit. Discussions were far-ranging, and several specific proposals were reviewed. The Bureau sought to cover the costs of the NMW gate system for visitors to the Seboomook lands with revenues it receives from timber management, as it does on its other public reserved lands. The Bureau’s proposals aimed to secure NMW’s present income stream from day use fees at the Unit, in return for allowing free day use to Seboomook visitors. Unfortunately, despite these good faith discussions and considerable detailed work, the North Maine Woods Board voted, in its March 2006 annual meeting, not to accept the proposal the Bureau had worked out with the NMW Administrative Committee, but instead, to continue the status quo. However, it directed its Executive Committee and a representative from Wagner Paper to continue to work with the Bureau to arrive at a resolution to addresses NMW concerns related to administrative changes and potential leakage of revenues from abuse of a free day use policy for the Seboomook lands. The Bureau will continue to explore options with North Maine Woods to allow the Bureau to cover the day use costs for visitors to the Unit. In addition, the Bureau will designate waters within the Seboomook and Canada Falls parcels as an extension of the Penobscot River Corridor (PRC), which is subject to lower fees under the current NMW fee schedule. The Bureau values its relationship with North Maine Woods very highly, and is seeking to develop a partnership with North Maine Woods that would enable it to manage the Seboomook lands in accordance with the Bureau’s mission and statutory mandates, and continue to be part of the North Maine Woods system. However, the Bureau will be examining all alternatives, including withdrawing from the NMW system if necessary to achieve flexibility it needs to fulfill its mission and mandates, including free day use and reasonable camping fees.</p> <p><b>Support for the NMW Checkpoint Gate:</b> The Bureau agrees that a gate provides not only security but also is important for informing visitors about the Seboomook Unit and the North Maine Woods System. The Bureau will be exploring ways to work cooperatively with NMW to take advantage of technological advances and to provide gate services that support both NMW’s and the Bureau’s objectives.</p> <p><b>Interest in Recreational Activities Not Allowed in the NMW System:</b> The Seboomook Unit is positioned to provide a wide range of high quality recreation opportunities, several of which are unusual or unique in the Moosehead region, and even the</p>

	<p>state. These include opportunities for horseback riding in a backcountry area with Historic Pittston Farm providing the support facilities;  an extended ATV touring and camping opportunity with refueling and other services available at Historic Pittston Farm; and mountain biking as an adjunct activity to camping, and potentially connecting to a broader regional multi-purpose trail. These activities are not normally allowed within the North Maine Woods system. However, NMW has already agreed to allow horse trailers into Pittston Farm, and the Bureau will be negotiating with NMW to allow an exception for horses, ATVs and bicycles for use on its Seboomook lands.</p>
--	--

**From: Gary and Joyce Day, Pittston Academy Grant** (August 20, September 8, November 22, 2004)

- This is such a large area and could still be called one of the last frontiers; we would love to see it remain as much a wilderness as it is today. One way to help accomplish this is to maintain some form of a checkpoint system, and require a persons name, address, and license plate number to control vandalism.
- To maintain the many campsites and picnic areas that are available costs many dollars. Let the people who enjoy it pay for maintaining it.
- Please don't let this area go the way the Spring Lake-Dead River area did years ago. My parents used to go there but soon the rowdiness and lack of respect took over and that is why we are in this lovely region.
- NMW has plenty of experience maintaining campsites and overseeing the check gate system; let them continue. I'm sure they can maintain these services much more economically than the State. Please remember that there are still many of us who are very happy with the present operations.

**From: Paul Fichtner, Penobscot Lake Lodge** (September 17, 2004)

As a landowner behind the gates, I am very interested in finding a suitable resolution to the NMW gate issue, which is a very hot item.

**From: Bruce Pratt, Eddington** (October 12, 2004)

- Maine has a historical (social) contract with all of our citizens regarding access to state owned lands. Or those lands over which the state has been granted easements. What is the state doing charging a toll, actually a head tax, for access to the West Branch Region? Why must I pay to get to my own property when passing over state lands? Fees have discouraged my brother and many like him from coming to Maine to visit us. Maine loses tourism dollars as a result. This is costing our state real revenue.

**From: Bruce Marcoux** (October 12, 2004)

- Each year I pay 7% tax of \$87.50 to the State of Maine for my rental site at Seboomook Campground. I feel this tax is more than enough for me and my family and guests to have to pay for the right to cross, hunt, fish or recreate on State owned land.  
Pay gates should have no place on land of participating tree growth landowners. I ask the Department of Conservation to be a leader in this access issue and help Maine people gain access they are already paying for.

**From: Rick and Jeanine Sylvester, Seboomook Wilderness Campground and Store** (Oct.12, 2004)

- If there are to be checkpoints at the entrances to the Seboomook Unit then the Department of Conservation should be the gatekeepers.
- There should be no fee for landowners, their guests, and customers visiting the businesses within the Seboomook Unit. The present system treats the businesses and small landowners within the Seboomook Unit unfairly.
- Fewer people are coming (to our business) each year because of NMW's high fees. Their response is to raise prices every year. This cannot be sustained.
- Not only are the fees unfair but the service at the gates is confused and inconsistent due to a high turnover of gate attendants. People are overcharged, and gate attendants give out wrong information about our business, such as saying we are closed when we are not.
- There are only two businesses within the Seboomook Unit, and we provide numerous services that are vital to the region. Most cell phones won't work in the region, so we installed special Yagi antennas for our cell phones that enable us to call 911 when there are emergencies. Seboomook and Pittston have both helped people needing emergency assistance in the past and will continue to do so. When people visiting or living in the region are in need of supplies or if their vehicles break down, they come to our businesses for help. We provide gas, propane, ice, food, lodging, groceries, some hardware, automotive, plumbing and electrical supplies, etc. Given the fact that our two businesses provide these needed services, it is crucial that the 20 mile gate and all the negativity it projects be removed.
- There are many policies of the North Maine Woods that need to be addressed. Some are bicycles, ATVs, so-called over

length campers, horses, to name a few. How many times have you seen a camper or motorhome with a bicycle or two strapped to it? At the (NMW) gate they confiscate them or refuse our customers entry. This is old paper company policy and has no place in the West Branch Project or Seboomook Unit. Horses are another issue. We see no reason why horses should not be allowed. Horses were an important part of history throughout the North Maine Woods. The Seboomook Unit would be a great place for folks to come and enjoy riding.

**From: Paul Johnson, (retired) IF&W Regional Fisheries Biologist, Greenville (Oct 13, 2004)**

- I am an advocate for gates at the access points to the Seboomook Unit as a means to manage recreation. The cost issue can be worked out.

**From: Sandra Neily, Greenville (Oct 12 and 19, 2004)**

- NMW is a failing business by any business measure, despite their good intentions and hard work. It's losing money, suppressing demand (and therefore reducing its income stream), and cannot fulfill all the traditional and especially the newly developing functions needed for this region.
- Because it is suppressing demand (and fees are preventing access to public lands....and to public water and the public's wildlife) the current system does not serve Maine people well. People come and go without learning how to behave in the backcountry, fully appreciate private landowners' needs, resources, and contributions, and they certainly come and go ignorant of Maine's unique conservation lands and how they as users can support that process in the future.
- And there are further costs; the current gate and fee system is, at best, a public relations void (missed opportunities to "tell the story") and, at worst, a public relations disaster for land owners and now potentially, for the state. The quality of a visitor's experience will be as much determined by his or her reception and education as it will be by the actual experience itself. This entire function is missing from the current gate and access system.
- NMW is however, a wonderful model of a cooperative landowner process that has strong value. Its most successful functions are its value for collecting, organizing and educating new landowners as lands continue to change hands here and become even more fragmented (and I think we should support that process in every way that we can.) I am suggesting that this landowner model work in partnership with gateway communities that surround the entire NMW partnership territory. Enlarge the partnership.
- Gateway communities could provide the information and recreation management function (with the state) while at the same time being good locations for people to get fire permits, have boats checked for invasives, get licenses, get information on campsites, destinations, local recreation providers and businesses. For this to work it will need a professional recreation manager (s) who is in charge of hiring the staff for gateway welcome centers and gates, designing the training courses and on-site followups and supervision of welcome staffers, and working with towns on welcome center functions and information systems.
- We might be able to have a vastly simplified gate system, managed very cheaply.... and still have permits sold in the gateway communities. We could even come up with a Transpass kind of system that reduces the need to have multiple workers at remote gates. NMW could have fewer "minders" of the system and permit numbers could still be logged into a system so we know where folks are any given time.

Users should pay by car and there needs to be a careful process to evaluate how access fees combine with camping fees to make some trips unaffordable for many people.

**From: John Banks, Bangor (October 19, 2004)**

- It is clear to me, especially after the meeting on Tues., that the concerns go beyond just the fees. Many are concerned about the hassle of the check-in and check-out process and the attitude of the gatekeepers. My experiences of passing through the gates many, many times are consistent with these concerns.
- As a seasonal resident of Seboomook campground I would gladly pay \$ 50 or even \$100 a year to pass thru the gates in a manner that is as least disruptive as possible to my use and enjoyment of the region.
- A solution to the problem as it relates to Seboomook( and perhaps Pittston Farm ) may be to have a sticker system which authorizes unencumbered passage thru the gates. Stickers, like the ones needed to go to the town dump, could be purchased by seasonal residents and other campowners in the region and displayed on one's vehicle, thereby saving a lot of hassle and lots of paperwork as well.
- I would love to see the gates gone. I do not think they are necessary.

**From: William Barker, Presque Isle (February 22, 2005)**

- I've traveled that area since I was a teenager and I'm happy with the checkpoint where it is. I know the argument of the people who want free access is "my tax dollars are paying for this, and I shouldn't have to pay to use the land." My argument is "my tax dollars are paying for the land, and even more of my tax dollars are paying to allow free use of the land." I feel the tax burden in this state would be less if more fees were charged on the state owned lands.

**From: Ralph Cleale, Limington (April 29, 2005)**

I have never understood why horses are banned. I would like to be able to truck our ponies to camp so my wife and I could drive our carts there.

<b>From: Christopher Silsbee, Caribou (Mar 29, 2005)</b>
There should be a gate system at 20 mile but be controlled by the park system and use park receptionists to collect fees, record users and educate users coming in during peak season. Fees should be collected as they are for any park systems in the state.
<b>From: Paul Fichtner, Penobscot Lake Lodge (April 1, 2005)</b>
I am very interested in keeping gates. I have lived in the woods since 1975 and have seen it both ways, with and without gates. Please keep the gates. Move them and adjust the fees if necessary, but please do not remove the gates. There is accountability when someone passes through the gates.
<b>From: William Barker, Presque Isle (April 21, 2005)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am 100% against removing the Unit from NMW.</li> </ul> ATV use should be discussed with North Maine Woods to see what could be arranged. Suggested an approach where we allow ATVs to enter the Unit on designated trails, but not allow them to be brought onto the Unit in a vehicle over the roads. Then people could not haul an ATV through the Unit into surrounding NMW territory.
<b>From: Sherwin Start, Sanford (June 14, 2005)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although In principle agree with them (NMW) in trying to control the number of people on their lands with gates and by using fees, this system isn't going to work for the general publics right of access to state lands, unless you classify these lands as State Parks.</li> <li>This is a problem that will have to either worked out or call upon the State Legislature/Governor to resolve it. It looks to me that NMW and others have pretty much priced out the lower, middle and retired class of the population, and their lands are reserved for the very wealthiest of the population.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Jeff Bagley, IF&amp;W Greenville (June 20, 2005)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would recommend that reasonable access fees be put in place, which will not deter or restrict anglers from fishing waters in the Seboomook Unit.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Rick Sylvester, Seboomook Wilderness Campground (May 10, 2006)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am very pleased with the Department's Vision statement and also the revised management recommendations for the Seboomook Unit. The only major problem left to deal with is access. I feel that the NMW is going to move their 20-mile checkpoint to a point north of the Canada Falls access road. If they choose to do this they must take into consideration two other access roads traditionally used by visitors to the Seboomook Unit. The Seboomook Dam road and Seboomook Road from the dam to the easterly border of the Seboomook Unit and on to Northeast Carry. These two roads must not be blocked off. If checkpoints must be installed on these two essential access points then so be it. Thousands of people access these roads each year. Businesses located at both ends in an out of the Unit depend on customers being able to get to them on these roads. Visitors to Roll Dam coming from the Millinocket, Baxter Park area would have to travel about 40 additional miles to get there. Visitors traveling out of the Unit to Lobster Lake area would have to travel an even greater distance. Blocking off these two access roads would make no sense and would be very detrimental to the overall accessibility and to the management of the Seboomook Unit. If access is to be managed on these tow roads, then it is my feeling that it must be accomplished with manned checkpoints or at the very least some kind of solar powered entrance system that would let people in and out as long as they have the proper codes or passes.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Sherwin Start (June 14, 2005)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>User Fees:</u> Just like the US Forest Service does, charge a fee for overnight use of primitive camp sites i.e. \$5.00 per person or so. That will raise a little revenue. Have a universal State Lands Access fee much like that of the State Park System and/ or a Yearly Pass.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Dan Legere, Guide, Greenville (Oct 8, 2005)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although I was in favor of the North Maine Woods gate being moved beyond the Pittston Farm, (one of my main concerns was free and easy access for the public to the unit), I believe the proposed arrangement you outlined allowing free access to the unit is great and keeping the North Maine Woods gate at 20 mile could work very well. The voucher system will be a good way to inform the public they are getting something for their tax dollars. It would appear that the concerns from the private businesses have been taken into account. They should be pleased.</li> </ul>
<b>From: Dawn Sipos (Nov 1, 2006)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think the 20 mile gate is a must. It's nice to feel like there is some security. Fees for owners and there guest could be lower.</li> </ul>
<b>From: John Rust, Vice President, Maine Professional Guides Association (November 3, 2006)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>NMW Gate System:</u> MPGA supports retaining the existing NMW gate on the Twenty Mile Road. The NMW gate system provides a significant level of security and safety, while allowing the State to share operating costs for monitoring visitors and collecting user fees.</li> </ul>

## **Appendix D**

### **Deed Restrictions and Agreements**

1. Deed restriction for Big Spencer Mountain Ecological Reserve
2. Deed restriction for all shorelines related to loon nest sites
3. Letter from The Nature Conservancy (12/11/2003) agreeing to provide funds for acquisition of the St. John Ponds parcel and Baker Lake parcel subject to management requirements.

## **Appendix D-1**

### **Deed Restrictions on Big Spencer Mountain**

1. Portions of a Quitclaim Deed from Great Northwoods, LLC to the State of Maine, including the Spencer Mountain parcel; and including Exhibit D in which the State agrees to be bound by the terms of an easement granted to the Forest Society of Maine requiring the parcel to be managed as an ecological reserve.
2. Portions of the Conservation Easement granted by Great Northwoods, LLC to the Forest Society of Maine requiring the parcel to be managed as an ecological reserve.



## **Appendix D-2**

### **Deed Restrictions for Loon Nest Protections**

Quitclaim Deed from Merriweather, LLC to the State of Maine for the Seboomook Unit parcels including lands around Seboomook and Canada Falls lakes, Baker Lake, and the St. John Ponds, with Exhibit D of that Deed related to loon protections, and Exhibit A of Exhibit D providing specific management standards.

**Appendix D-3**

**Management Agreement between  
the Nature Conservancy and the Bureau of Parks and Lands  
related to**

**Baker Lake and the St. John Ponds Parcels**

## **Appendix E**

### **Guiding Statutes**

### **MRSA Title 12**

#### **§1846. Access to public reserved lands**

**1. Legislative policy.** The Legislature declares that it is the policy of the State to keep the public reserved lands as a public trust and that full and free public access to the public reserved lands to the extent permitted by law, together with the right to reasonable use of those lands, is the privilege of every citizen of the State. The Legislature further declares that it recognizes that such free and reasonable public access may be restricted to ensure the optimum value of such lands as a public trust but that such restrictions, if and when imposed, must be in strict accordance with the requirements set out in this section. [1997, c. 678, §13 (new).]

**2. Establishment of restrictions on public access.** [2001, c. 604, §10 (rp).]

**3. Unlawful entry onto public reserved lands.** [2001, c. 604, §10 (rp).]

**4. Development of public facilities.** The bureau may construct and maintain overnight campsites and other camping and recreation facilities. [1997, c. 678, §13 (new).]

**5. User fees.** The bureau may charge reasonable fees to defray the cost of constructing and maintaining overnight campsites and other camping and recreation facilities. [1997, c. 678, §13 (new).]

## §1847. Management of public reserved lands

**1. Purpose.** The Legislature declares that it is in the public interest and for the general benefit of the people of this State that title, possession and the responsibility for the management of the public reserved lands be vested and established in the bureau acting on behalf of the people of the State, that the public reserved lands be managed under the principles of multiple use to produce a sustained yield of products and services by the use of prudent business practices and the principles of sound planning and that the public reserved lands be managed to demonstrate exemplary land management practices, including silvicultural, wildlife and recreation management practices, as a demonstration of state policies governing management of forested and related types of lands. [1997, c. 678, §13 (new).]

**2. Management plans.** The director shall prepare, revise from time to time and maintain a comprehensive management plan for the management of the public reserved lands in accordance with the guidelines in this subchapter. The plan must provide for a flexible and practical approach to the coordinated management of the public reserved lands. In preparing, revising and maintaining such a management plan the director, to the extent practicable, shall compile and maintain an adequate inventory of the public reserved lands, including not only the timber on those lands but also the other multiple use values for which the public reserved lands are managed. In addition, the director shall consider all criteria listed in section 1858 for the location of public reserved lands in developing the management plan. The director is entitled to the full cooperation of the Bureau of Geology and Natural Areas, the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission and the State Planning Office in compiling and maintaining the inventory of the public reserved lands. The director shall consult with those agencies as well as other appropriate state agencies in the preparation and maintenance of the comprehensive management plan for the public reserved lands. The plan must provide for the demonstration of appropriate management practices that will enhance the timber, wildlife, recreation, economic and other values of the lands. All management of the public reserved lands, to the extent practicable, must be in accordance with this management plan when prepared.

Within the context of the comprehensive management plan, the commissioner, after adequate opportunity for public review and comment, shall adopt a specific action plan for each unit of the public reserved lands system. Each action plan must include consideration of the related systems of silviculture and regeneration of forest resources and must provide for outdoor recreation including remote, undeveloped areas, timber, watershed protection, wildlife and fish. The commissioner shall provide adequate opportunity for public review and comment on any substantial revision of an action plan. Management of the public reserved lands before the action plans are completed must be in accordance with all other provisions of this section. [1999, c. 556, §19 (amd).]

## Appendix F

### Glossary

**“Age Class”:** the biological age of a stand of timber; in single-aged stands, age classes are generally separated by 10-year intervals.

**“ATV Trails”:** designated trails of varying length with a variety of trail surfaces and grades, designed primarily for the use of all-terrain vehicles.

**“All-Terrain Vehicles”:** motor driven, off-road recreational vehicles capable of cross-country travel on land, snow, ice, marsh, swampland, or other natural terrain. For the purposes of this document an all-terrain vehicle includes a multi-track, multi-wheel or low pressure tire vehicle; a motorcycle or related 2-wheel vehicle; and 3- or 4-wheel or belt-driven vehicles. It does not include an automobile or motor truck; a snowmobile; an airmobile; a construction or logging vehicle used in performance of its common functions; a farm vehicle used for farming purposes; or a vehicle used exclusively for emergency, military, law enforcement, or fire control purposes (Title 12, Chapter 715, Section 7851.2).

**“Bicycling/ Recreation Biking Trails”:** designated trails of short to moderate length located on hard-packed or paved trail surfaces with slight to moderate grades, designed primarily for the use of groups or individuals seeking a more leisurely experience.

**“Boat Access - Improved”:** vehicle-accessible hard-surfaced launch sites with gravel or hard-surface parking areas. May also contain one or more picnic tables, an outhouse, and floats or docks.

**“Boat Access - Unimproved”:** vehicle-accessible launch sites with dirt or gravel ramps to the water and parking areas, and where no other facilities are normally provided.

**“Campgrounds”:** areas designed for transient occupancy by camping in tents, camp trailers, travel trailers, motor homes, or similar facilities or vehicles designed for temporary shelter. Developed campgrounds usually provide toilet buildings, drinking water, picnic tables, and fireplaces, and may provide disposal areas for RVs, showers, boat access to water, walking trails, and swimming opportunities.

**“Carry-In Boat Access”:** dirt or gravel launch sites accessible by foot over a short to moderate length trail, that generally accommodates the use of only small watercraft. Includes a trailhead with parking and a designated trail to the access site.

**“Clear-cut”:** an single-age harvesting method in which all trees or all merchantable trees are removed from a site in a single operation.

**“Commercial Forest Land”:** the portion of the landbase that is both available and capable of producing at least 20 cubic feet of wood or fiber per acre per year.

**“Commercial Harvest”**: any harvest from which forest products are sold. By contrast, in a pre-commercial harvest, no products are sold, and it is designed principally to improve stand quality and conditions.

**“Community”**: an assemblage of interacting plants and animals and their common environment, recurring across the landscape, in which the effects of recent human intervention are minimal (“Natural Landscapes Of Maine: A Classification Of Ecosystems and Natural Communities” Maine Natural Heritage Program. April, 1991).

**“Cross-Country Ski Trails”**: designated winter-use trails primarily available for the activity of cross-country skiing. Trails may be short to long for day or overnight use.

**“Ecosystem Type”**: a group of communities and their environment, occurring together over a particular portion of the landscape, and held together by some common physical or biotic feature. (“Natural Landscapes Of Maine: A Classification Of Ecosystems and Natural Communities.” Maine Natural Heritage Program, April, 1991).

**“Foliate Site”**: areas where thick mats of organic matter overlay bedrock, commonly found at high elevations.

**“Forest Certification”**: A process in which a third party “independent” entity audits the policies and practices of a forest management organization against a set of standards or principles related to sustainable management. It may be limited to either land/forest management or product chain-of-custody, or may include both.

**“Forest Condition (or condition of the forest)”**: the state of the forest, including the age, size, height, species, and spatial arrangement of plants, and the functioning as an ecosystem of the combined plant and animal life of the forest.

**“Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Certification”**: A third-party sustainable forestry certification program that was developed by the Forest Stewardship Council, an independent, non-profit, non-governmental organization founded in 1993. The FSC is comprised of representatives from environmental and conservation groups, the timber industry, the forestry profession, indigenous peoples’ organizations, community forestry groups, and forest product certification organizations from 25 countries. For information about FSC standards see [http://www.fscus.org/standards\\_criteria/](http://www.fscus.org/standards_criteria/) and [www.fsc.org](http://www.fsc.org).

**“Forest Type”**: a descriptive title for an area of forest growth based on similarities of species and size characteristics.

**“Group Camping Areas”**: vehicle or foot-accessible areas designated for overnight camping by large groups. These may include one or more outhouses, several fire rings or fire grills, a minimum of one water source, and several picnic tables.

**“Horseback Ride/Pack Stock Trails”**: generally moderate to long-distance trails designated for use by horses, other ride, or pack stock.

**“Invasive Species”**: generally nonnative species which invade native ecosystems and successfully compete with and displace native species due to the absence of natural controls. Examples are purple loosestrife and the zebra mussel.

**“Late successional”**: The condition in the natural progression of forest ecosystems where long-lived tree species dominate, large stems or trunks are common, and the rate of ecosystem change becomes much more gradual. Late successional forest are also mature forests that, because of their age and stand characteristics, harbor certain habitat not found elsewhere in the landscape.

**“Log Landings”**: areas, generally close to haul roads, where forest products may be hauled to and stored prior to being trucked to markets.

**“Management Roads”**: roads designed for timber management and/or administrative use that may be used by the public as long as they remain in service. Management roads may be closed in areas containing special resources, where there are issues of public safety or environmental protection.

**“Mature Tree”**: a tree which has reached the age at which its height growth has significantly slowed or ceased, though its diameter growth may still be substantial. When its annual growth no longer exceeds its internal decay and/or crown loss (net growth is negative), the tree is over-mature.

**“Motorized”**: a mode of travel across the landbase which utilizes internal combustion or electric powered conveyances; which in itself constitutes a recreational activity, or facilitates participation in a recreational activity.

**“Mountain Bike Trails”**: designated trails generally located on rough trail surfaces with moderate to steep grades, designed primarily for the use of mountain bicycles with all-terrain tires by individuals seeking a challenging experience.

**“Multi-aged Management”**: management which is designed to retain two or more age classes and canopy layers at all times. Its harvest methods imitate natural disturbance regimes which cause partial stand replacement (shelterwood with reserves) or small gap disturbances (selection).

**“Natural Resource Values”**: described in Maine’s Natural Resource Protection Act to include coastal sand dunes, coastal wetlands, significant wildlife habitat, fragile mountain areas, freshwater wetlands, great ponds and rivers, streams, and brooks. For the purposes of this plan they also include unique or unusual plant communities.

**“Non-motorized”**: a mode of travel across the landbase which does not utilize internal combustion, or electric powered conveyances; which in itself constitutes a recreational activity, or facilitates participation in a recreational activity.

**“Non-native (Exotic)”**: a species that enters or is deliberately introduced into an ecosystem beyond its historic range, except through natural expansion, including organisms transferred from other countries into the state, unnaturally occurring hybrids, cultivars, genetically altered or engineered species or strains, or species or subspecies with nonnative genetic lineage.

**“Old Growth Stand”**: a stand in which the majority of the main crown canopy consists of long-lived or late successional species usually 150 to 200 years old or older, often with characteristics such as large snags, large downed woody material, and multiple age classes, and in which evidence of human-caused disturbance is absent or old and faint.

**“Old Growth Tree”**: for the purposes of this document, a tree which is in the latter stages of maturity or is over-mature.

**“Pesticide”**: a chemical agent or substance employed to kill or suppress pests (such as insects, weeds, fungi, rodents, nematodes, or other organism) or intended for use as a plant regulator, defoliant, or desiccant. (from LURC Regulations, Ch. 10)

**“Primitive Campsites”**: campsites that are rustic in nature, have one outhouse, and may include tent pads, Adirondack-type shelters, and rustic picnic tables. Campsites may be accessed by vehicle, foot, or water.

**“Public Road or Roadway”**: any roadway which is owned, leased, or otherwise operated by a government body or public entity. (from LURC Regulations, Ch. 10)

**“Public Use Roads”**: all-weather gravel or paved roads designed for two-way travel to facilitate both public and administrative access to recreation facilities. Includes parking facilities provided for the public. Management will include roadside aesthetic values normally associated with travel influenced zones.

**“Recreation Values”**: the values associated with participation in outdoor recreation activities.

**“Regeneration”**: both the process of establishing new growth and the new growth itself, occurring naturally through seeding or sprouting, and artificially by planting seeds or seedlings.

**“Remote Ponds”**: As defined by the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission: ponds having no existing road access by two-wheel drive motor vehicles during summer months within ½ mile of the normal high water mark of the body of water with no more than one noncommercial remote camp and its accessory structures within ½ mile of the normal high water mark of the body of water, that support cold water game fisheries.

**“Riparian”**: an area of land or water that includes stream channels, lakes, floodplains and wetlands, and their adjacent upland ecosystems.

**“Salvage”**: a harvest operation designed to remove dead and dying timber in order to remove whatever value the stand may have before it becomes unmerchantable.



**“Selection”:** related to multi-aged management, the cutting of individual or small groups of trees; generally limited in area to patches of one acre or less.

**“Service Roads”:** summer or winter roads located to provide access to Bureau-owned lodging, maintenance structures, and utilities. Some service roads will be gated or plugged to prevent public access for safety, security, and other management objectives.

**“Silviculture”:** the branch of forestry which deals with the application of forest management principles to achieve specific objectives with respect to the production of forest products and services.

**“Single-aged Management”:** management which is designed to manage single age, single canopy layer stands. Its harvest methods imitate natural disturbance regimes which result in full stand replacement. A simple two-step (seed cut/removal cut) shelterwood is an example of a single-aged system.

**“Snowmobile Trails”:** designated winter-use trails of varying length located on a groomed trail surfaces with flat to moderate grades, designed primarily for the use of snowmobiles.

**“Stand”:** a group of trees, the characteristics of which are sufficiently alike to allow uniform classification.

**“Succession/ successional”:** progressive changes in species composition and forest community structure caused by natural processes over time.

**“Sustainable Forestry/ Harvest”:** that level of timber harvesting, expressed as treated acres and/or volume removals, which can be conducted on a perpetual basis while providing for non-forest values. Ideally this harvest level would be “even-flow,” that is, the same quantity each year. In practice, the current condition of the different properties under Bureau timber management, and the ever-changing situation in markets, will dictate a somewhat cyclical harvest which will approach even-flow only over time periods of a decade or more.

**“Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)”:** A third party sustainable forestry certification program that was developed in 1994 by the American Forest and Paper Association, which defines its program as “a comprehensive system of principles, objectives and performance measures that integrates the perpetual growing and harvesting of trees with the protection of wildlife, plants, soil and water quality.” To review SFI standards see [http://www.afandpa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/Environment\\_and\\_Recycling/SFI/The\\_SFI\\_Standard/The\\_SFI\\_Standard.htm](http://www.afandpa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/Environment_and_Recycling/SFI/The_SFI_Standard/The_SFI_Standard.htm).

## Appendix G References

- Clark, James, Edward Moore, and Richard Will. 1998. Results of Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Storage Project (FERC No. 2634). For Great Northern Paper, Company. On file at the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, Augusta, ME.
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. December 22, 2004. Order on Offer of Settlement and Issuing New License, Great Lakes Hydro America, LLC, Project No. 2634. 109 FERC ¶ 62,230 (2004).
- Fermata, Inc. 2005. Executive Summary, Strategic Plan for Implementing the Maine Nature Tourism Initiative. For the Maine Department of Community and Economic Development, Augusta, ME. At <http://www.fermatainc.com/maine/>
- Forest Fire Lookout Association (FFLA) Maine Chapter. 2006. Maine Fire Tower Trivia.
- Forest Society of Maine. 2002. Big Spencer Mountain Conservation Easement Baseline Documentation Report. For, Maine Department of Conservation, Augusta, Maine.
- Framatome ANP DE&S, Inc. 2002. Great Lakes Hydro America Storage Project FERC No. 2634, Settlement Conference Whitewater Boating Study for Downstream Reaches of Canada Falls & Seboomook Impoundments. For Great Lakes Hydro America, Millinocket, Maine.
- Great Northern Paper, Inc. 1998. Final License Application. Storage Project FERC No. 2634. Three volumes. Great Northern Paper Company, Millinocket, ME.
- Hanlon, Greg and Sue Hanlon. 1999. Steep Creeks of New England, a Paddler's Guide. 29 Class V Runs for the Experienced Whitewater Enthusiast. New England Cartographics, Amherst, MA.
- Maine Department of Conservation, Bureau of Parks and Lands. 2000. Integrated Resource Policy for Public Reserved and Nonreserved Lands, State Parks, and State Historic Sites. MDOC, Augusta, ME.
- Maine Department of Conservation, Bureau of Parks and Lands. 2003. Maine State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, 2003-2008. MDOC, Augusta, ME.
- Maine Department of Conservation and U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service. 1982. Maine Rivers Study. MDOC, Augusta, ME.
- Maine Department of Conservation, Land Use Regulation Commission. 1999. Land Use Guidance Maps - Seboomook Township, Plymouth Township, Pittson Academy Grant, Soldiertown Township, West Middlesex Canal Grant, Big W Township, Little W Township, Comstock Township (the Seboomook and Canada Falls Parcels), T7R17

WELS (Baker Lake Parcel); T4R17 WELS (St. John Ponds Parcel); and TXR14 WELS and T2R13 WELS (Big Spencer Mountain).

Maine Department of Conservation, Land Use Regulation Commission. 2005. Chapter 10, Land Use Districts and Standards for areas within the Jurisdiction of the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission. MDOC, Augusta, ME.

Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. On-line description of Wildlife Management Districts at <http://www.maine.gov/ifw/wmd/wmd4.htm> and <http://www.maine.gov/ifw/wmd/wmd9.htm>.

North Maine Woods. 2005. North Maine Woods Annual Report for the Fiscal Year 2004-2005 and Update on Operations for 2005-2006. North Maine Woods, Ashland, ME.

Plum Creek. 2006. Concept Plan for Plum Creek's Lands in the Moosehead Lake Region. Submitted to the Land Use Regulation Commission. At <http://www.maine.gov/doc/lurc/reference/resourceplans/moosehead.html>.

Reilly, Catherine J, and Charles Morris. 2004. Nature-Based and Cultural-Heritage Tourism in Piscataquis County, Survey Analysis. Margaret Chase Smith Center for Public Policy, University of Maine, Orono. At [www.umaine.edu/mcsc/Research/EcoDev\\_menu.htm](http://www.umaine.edu/mcsc/Research/EcoDev_menu.htm)

Spiess, Arthur. 2004. West Branch Project: Review of Archaeological Sites. Maine Historic Preservation Commission, Augusta, ME.

Spiess, A., and D. Putnam. 2006. West Branch Purchase Continued Archaeological Survey 2004 and 2005; Report to Land for Maine's Future Board and Forest Society of Maine. Maine Historic Preservation Commission, Augusta, ME.

Wilkerson, Brooke. 2005. Natural Resource Inventory of the Bureau of Parks and Lands Seboomook Unit. Maine Natural Areas Program, Department of Conservation, Augusta, ME.

Will, Richard T. 2005. Phase I Archaeological Survey of the South Branch of the Penobscot River between Canada Falls Lake and Seboomook Lake, Somerset County, Maine. For the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, Augusta, ME.

Yates, D., D.C. Evers, W. Goodale, and W. MacCabe. 2005. Monitoring of breeding Common Loons: West Branch of the Penobscot River area – 2004. Report BRI 2005-10. BioDiversity Research Institute, Gorham, ME.