

# **Upper Kennebec Region Management Plan**

**Adopted June, 2019**

## **Appendices**

- A. Public Consultation Process**
  - **Advisory Committee Members**
  - **Public Consultation Summary**
  - **Written Public Comments and Bureau Responses**
  
- B. Guiding Statutes and Agreements**
  - **MRSA Title 12**
  - **Cold Stream Forest Reciprocal Easement Agreement and Map**
  - **Cold Stream Forest Fisheries Habitat Management Agreement**
  - **Cold Stream Forest Deer Wintering Habitat Management Agreement**
  - **Conservation Easement on Moose River/#5 Bog (Holeb Unit)**
  
- C. Summary of BPL's Resource Allocation System**
  
- D. Upper Kennebec Plan Area Forest Stocking and Sustainable Harvest Levels**
  
- E. Glossary**
  
- F. References**



## ***Appendix A: Public Consultation Process***

- ***Advisory Committee Members***
- ***Public Consultation Summary***
- ***Written Public Comments and Bureau Responses***

### **Upper Kennebec Region Advisory Committee Members:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization/Affiliation and Title</b>
Clarence Begin	Forester, Weyerhaeuser Company
Mitchell Berkowitz	Interim Manager, Town of Jackman
Pam Christopher	Exec. Director, The Forks Area Chamber of Commerce
Thomas Coleman	District Forester, LandVest
Lance Demond	President, Lake Moxie ATV Riders
Dan Grenier	Maine Preserves Manager, The Nature Conservancy
Chad Grignon	State Representative - House District 118
Suzanne Hockmeyer	Owner, Northern Outdoors, Inc.
Kristen Hoffmann	Forestland Steward, Forest Society of Maine
Joe Kruse	President, Coburn Summit Riders
Michelle Newman	Treasurer, Border Riders Sportman's Club
Annie Nielsen	Jackman-Moose River Reg. Chamber of Commerce
Tim Obrey	Fisheries Biologist, MDIF&W Region E
Claire Polfus	Maine Conservation Resources Manager, Appalachian Trail Conservancy
Noah Pollock	Stewardship Director, Northern Forest Canoe Trail
Jeff Reardon	Maine Brook Trout Project Director, Trout Unlimited
Kelly Rogers	President, Coburn Mountain ATV Riders
Wolfe Tone	State Director, Trust for Public Lands
Rodney L. Whittemore	State Senator - Senate District 3

**Public Consultation Summary:**

<b>Plan Phase/Date</b>	<b>Action/Meeting Focus</b>	<b>Attendance/Responses</b>
<b>Public Scoping</b>		
Jan. 30, 2015	Email notice of Public Scoping Meeting to AC members; notice in papers.	
Oct. 5, 2015	Press Release on Upper Kennebec public reserved lands and planning process and upcoming Public Scoping Meeting approved by DACF Communications Director.	
Oct. 19, 2016	<b>Public Scoping Meeting</b> at Quimby Middle School, Bingham: presented public lands covered in the Plan and the process for planning; received public input on issues of concern, Q and A on public lands addressed and plan process.	30 AC members and the general public, plus BPL staff, attended.
Nov. 11, 2016	End of Public Scoping Comment Period	Written comments were submitted by 6 individuals.
<b>Preliminary Planning</b>		
Oct. 18, 2016	Field visit to Cold Stream Unit to view and discuss access and road system, recreation facilities, forest conditions, etc.	6 BPL staff
Oct. 27, 2016	Email notice of AC Meeting to AC members and other interest parties	
Nov. 14, 2016	Region Issues, Needs and Opportunities developed during scoping and subsequent BPL staff discussions sent via email to AC members in advance of first AC meeting.	
Nov. 17, 2016	<b>Advisory Committee Meeting</b> at Quimby Middle School, Bingham: review of Upper Kennebec Region Issues, Needs and Opportunities. Comment deadline of December 9 given to attendees.	10 AC members plus several members of the public and BPL staff
Dec. 9, 2016	Deadline for additional comments from AC members.	No additional comments were submitted.
<b>Draft Plan</b>		
May 31, 2018	Draft Plan made available online and sent via email to AC members with notice of second AC meeting.	
June 20, 2018	<b>Advisory Committee Meeting</b> at Quimby Middle School, Bingham: review of Draft Plan. Comment deadline of July 11 given to attendees.	3 AC members plus BPL staff and about 15 members of the public

<b>Plan Phase/Date</b>	<b>Action/Meeting Focus</b>	<b>Attendance/Responses</b>
July 11, 2018	End of comment period.	5 comments received by email, 4 with attached comment letter. (1 AC member commented via email prior to the meeting; 2 of the 5 comment letters were received after the comment period closed.)
<b>Final Draft Plan</b>		
January 16, 2019	Final Draft Plan made available online and mailed to AC members (if requested). Public Meeting scheduled for February 7 in Bingham, with comment period ending February 28, 2019.	
January 15 & 26, 2019	Notice of Public Meeting posted in papers.	
January 17, 2019	Press Release on Upper Kennebec public reserved lands and planning process and upcoming Public Meeting approved by DACF Acting Communications Director.	
February 7, 2019	<b>Public Meeting</b> held, Quimby Middle School Gym, Bingham, 6-8 pm: presented Final Draft Plan	Two AC members and about 10 members of public attended, plus BPL staff.
February 28, 2019	End of Comment Period.	1 comment email received, with attached comment letter (see below).

#### Comments received on the Draft Plan

<b>Comment source</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Form received</b>
Dick Darling	6/27/18	email with attached letter
Kristen Hoffmann, Forest Society of Maine	6/27/18	email
Steve Brooke	7/12/18	email with attached letter
Jeffrey Reardon, Trout Unlimited	7/18/18	email with attached letter
Emily Bastain, Native Fish Coalition	8/8/18	email with attached letter

#### Comments received on the Final Draft Plan

<b>Comment source</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Form received</b>
Jeffrey Reardon, Trout Unlimited	2/28/19	email with attached letter

**Summary of Written Public Comment with Bureau Responses:**

<b>Comments on the Draft Upper Kennebec Region Management Plan (May 31, 2018)</b> (Comment Period: June 20, 2018 – July 11, 2018) Some comments have been excerpted, and introductory or background statements deleted.	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Topic: Forest Society of Maine Easements at and Adjacent to Holeb Unit</b>	
<b>From: Kristen Hoffmann, Forest Society of Maine</b>	
<p>Page 11 – second paragraph: FSM does not provide hiking trails on the property. The easement only protects the Portage Trail.</p> <p>Page 26 – The Portage Trail is <u>entirely</u> on FSM’s easement – let me know if you need any maps or the CE itself.</p>	<p>The Plan has been revised to correct the errors or lack of clarity regarding the easements, as appropriate.</p>
<b>Topic: Holeb Unit Resource Allocations and Attean Landing Issues</b>	
<b>From: Kristen Hoffmann, Forest Society of Maine</b>	
<p>All of the allocations look good and appropriate, and I hope that the issues surrounding Attean Landing can be resolved swiftly and peacefully</p>	<p>As specified in the Plan recommendations, the Bureau will work to resolve the long-standing issues with shared public and commercial use of the landing, including development of a new lease for the commercial use by Attean Lodge.</p>
<b>Topic: Vision and Management Focus at Cold Stream Forest Unit</b>	
<b>From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited</b>	
<p>Page 18. We note the overall “General Management Focus” on “practices that protect resources from overuse, avoid conflicting use, control exotic species, and continually add value to the resource base and visitor’s “back woods” experience” and on offering new opportunities only “where appropriate and compatible with the emphasis on more remote, dispersed, less-developed activities.” This focus is important on the Cold Stream Forest property and will require careful implementation to achieve given current high use, relatively easy access from paved roads, and the degree to which use, especially camping, is highly focused on one area.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Page 56, Vision for the Cold Stream Unit. We believe the first paragraph should include language similar to what is on page 44 to reflect that the unit was acquired with “the primary goal of protecting wild native brook trout habitat and deer wintering habitat.” This focus should be at the forefront of every management decision, and the Management Plan needs to make that clear.</p>	<p>This language has been added to the first paragraph of the Vision statement. Note that paragraph three of the statement reads: “The wild brook trout and deer wintering habitats that were the primary purposes of the State’s acquisition of the property will be further protected and enhanced....”</p>

Topic: Timber Management at the Cold Stream Forest Unit	
From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited	
Page 18. The [forested and regulated acres] table at the bottom of Page 18 needs to be completed for the Cold Stream Forest unit.	Regulated acres data for Cold Stream Forest will be added, if available. Field work is currently underway to collect detailed forest stand data for the Unit.
<p>Page 44. The Cold Stream Forest property was acquired “with the primary goal of protecting wild native brook trout habitat, and deer wintering habitat”, and was “accomplished with both Forest Legacy Program and Land for Maine’s Future funds”. We believe you should add a reference to past commitments to maintain intact, forested buffers in riparian areas by BPL and other project partners. In applications for Forest Legacy and Land for Maine’s Future funds, the project partners, including BPL, indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “The Bureau of Parks and Lands already has management protocols that exceed state requirements for riparian areas, and understands that, as will be specified in the Habitat Management Agreement for these lands, <u>even more protective measures will be designed given the significance of the fisheries resource.</u>” (LMF Project Application, 2014. Emphasis added); and</li> </ul> <p>“The partners envision a <u>100-foot no-cut buffer along the ponds and streams</u> to protect the significant aquatic resources, but the remainder of the property would be open to harvesting.” (Letter to Maine Forest Legacy Scoring Committee, 8/12/12. Emphasis added.)</p>	<p>Reference to the habitat protection commitments described in the LMF application has been added to the Plan. It should be noted that the BPL standard management practice is to maintain intact forested buffers in wooded riparian areas.</p> <p>The Cold Stream Forest Fisheries Habitat Management Agreement developed by BPL and MDIF&amp;W (included in the Plan appendices) contains the additional protective measures referenced in the LMF Project Application. By mutual agreement, the Bureau and IF&amp;W determined that the 100 foot no-cut buffer in riparian areas was not necessary to include among the HMA protective measures. However, the HMA directs that within 75 feet of streams, the riparian zone will be managed using individual tree selection, permitting light removals while maintaining shading and travel opportunities and reducing siltation. In contrast, a no-cut regime would prevent management designed to enhance the fisheries resource by maintaining healthy trees in the buffer areas, resistant to climate change, disease, and insects like budworm, and which will continue to provide shading, large woody debris, and other benefits.</p>
From: Emily Bastain, Native Fish Coalition	
We feel strongly that a “no-cut” buffer of 100 feet along ponds and streams is not enough to preserve the ecological, aesthetic and recreational integrity of the resource and property. This is especially true since most cuts experience at least some level of additional tree loss after the fact due to wind. A buffer of at least 200 feet would be prudent when we consider what is at risk.	See preceding response regarding maintenance of intact forested buffers in riparian areas, and BPL and MDIF&W’s determination regarding no-cut buffers.
Topic: Non-Motorized Trails at Cold Stream Forest	
From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited	
Page 48. It is not clear to us what distinguishes “walk in trails” to Lang and Big Berry ponds from “informal angler trails” into Snake and Fernald	The “informal angler trails” have been better defined in the Plan to differentiate them from the Lang and Big Berry Pond trails.

<p>Pond and along Cold Stream. Is this distinction based on level of maintenance or use? Is it appropriate to maintain this distinction for future planning, or would it be more appropriate to treat all of these trails in the same manner? We note that the map on page 50 appears to show only some of these trails.</p>	<p>The Draft plan treated the well-used and defined trails into Lang and Big Berry Pond differently than other pond access trails, with the recommendation to upgrade and mark those trails to BPL standards and protect them with Remote Recreation buffers. Those trails would also be shown on future maps and guides for the Unit. In contrast, the other trails would be left as is and continue to be treated as informal trails, with no special protections, in order to preserve the more primitive and lower-use type of experience. Some Cold Stream Forest anglers have stated their preference that the informal trails to the more remote ponds not be improved. For the Final Draft Plan, the Bureau proposes to treat trails to all walk-in fishing ponds in the same manner, with similar improvements as needed in problem areas, and similar protections. Existing informal trails into Fernald Pond and any such trails that may exist into Cold Stream (all of which may not have been found by the Bureau, given the many potential access points), other than the hiking trail to the falls, will not be maintained.</p>
<p>Page 61, Trail Maintenance. The plan is not clear about which trails will be marked and maintained and which will remain in their current state. There was considerable public discussion of this at the recent public meeting, and the Final Draft Plan should clarify what is proposed, what the maintenance standard will be, and which trails will be affected.</p>	<p>The recommendation has been revised to clarify which pond access trails that will be maintained, by naming the ponds accessed. Existing trails to Lang, Big Berry (2) and Snake (2) Ponds will be maintained to Bureau standards, as will the trail to Cold Stream Falls.</p>
<p>From: Emily Bastain, Native Fish Coalition</p>	
<p>We are concerned that a “walk-in trail” to Lang and Big Berry ponds would degrade the “backcountry” experience while putting the ponds at risk of angler exploitation due to a higher level of usage and no offsetting regulatory change. We would prefer to see the existing “informal angler trails” maintained, or some stricter fishing regulations that would offset the additional usage.</p>	<p>As stated above, the existing trails to Lang, Big Berry (2) and Snake (2) Ponds will be maintained to Bureau standards. Although there may be some ancillary increase in use, that is not the Bureau’s purpose in designating and maintaining the trails; the purpose is to protect the resource and ensure a safe and enjoyable experience for trail users. However, they will remain primitive pedestrian trails.</p>
<p>Topic: Pending Management Guidance from MDIF&amp;W Heritage Fish Working Group</p>	
<p>From: Steve Brooke, MDIF&amp;W Heritage Fish Working Group</p>	
<p>In 2017 the Legislative Joint Standing Committee on Inland Fisheries and Wildlife asked the</p>	<p>The Bureau will incorporate into the Plan, as appropriate, any relevant new policy guidance</p>



<p>Department to create a Heritage Fish Working Group to address concerns about Maine’s Heritage Fish. This Working Group is in the process of working with IFW fisheries staff to help define the goals and objectives for management of Maine’s Heritage Fish, emphasizing the unique resource this represents and working to draft policy that will protect this increasingly rare resource for future generations. The Working Group is currently finalizing a Statement of Purpose for Maine Heritage Fish that includes specific management objectives. This policy guidance should be ready to share with you and other managers to help with management planning very soon. In summary this document lays out specific steps to help to proactively protect and conserve Maine’s Heritage Fish Waters as a valuable and unique public resource for current and future generations.</p>	<p>developed by the Heritage Fish Working Group available before the Plan is finalized, in consultation with MDIF&amp;W. Note that the Cold Stream Forest Fisheries Habitat Management Agreement referenced in the Plan provides goals, objectives and guidelines for management of wild brook trout fisheries resources in the Unit. The HMA will serve as the basis of all management activities within the HMA area while the agreement remains in effect.</p>
<p><b>Topic: Identification and Management Guidance for Heritage Fish Waters</b></p>	
<p><b>From: Steve Brooke, MDIF&amp;W Heritage Fish Working Group</b></p>	
<p>As you are reviewing resources in areas covered by management planning, please be careful to check for the presence of Heritage Waters and apply the current policy and guidance for management objectives for these special waters.</p>	<p>The Heritage Fish Waters are identified for each relevant Unit in the Plan, based on the current MDIF&amp;W list. As noted above, the Cold Stream Forest Fisheries HMA provides goals, objectives and guidelines for management of wild brook trout fisheries resources in the Unit. The HMA, which established new riparian zone management and public access guidelines specific to Cold Stream Forest, above the riparian zone standards employed on other BPL Units and MDIF&amp;Ws Forest Management Recommendations for Brook Trout, will serve as the basis of all management activities within the HMA area while the agreement remains in effect.</p>
<p><b>From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited</b></p>	
<p>Page 11—last paragraph. This paragraph references the state’s designated “State Heritage Fish Waters.” Several comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The references to “A list” and “B list” waters should be removed; they no longer apply. The former “A list” and “B list” waters have been merged into a single list of “State Heritage Fish Waters.” (SHFW’s) (Note: correct this reference throughout the document.)</li> <li>• The draft plan states that “Special regulations to protect the self-sustaining populations of brook trout have been enacted for these waters.” We would add, “By statute, all designated SHFW</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All references in the Plan to “A List” and “B List” waters have been replaced by “State Heritage Fish Waters.”</li> <li>• The suggested sentence has been added to the Plan.</li> </ul>

<p>must have regulations that ban the use of live fish as bait to avoid introductions of bait fish species that may prey on or compete with native brook trout.”</p>	
<p>Page 22. Reference to “A list” and “B list” waters in last paragraph. Replace with “SHFW’s” as discussed above, and provide information on these in the table on page 23, indicating which ponds are “SHFW”. The most recent version of the list of State Heritage Fish Waters should be used, as it changes annually.</p>	<p>Revised as noted above. The most recent SHFW list was consulted.</p>
<p>Page 46. As noted above for the Holeb Unit, references to “native” and “wild” Heritage Brook Trout Ponds should be replaced with a reference to the most recent list of SHFW. If there is a desire to distinguish between ponds with a history of stocking and those without, the linked reference above provides information on most recent stocking dates. (NRS designates ponds that have never been stocked.) Of note is the fact that no stream or pond in the Cold Stream watershed has been stocked since 1954, and no stocking has occurred on the Cold Stream Forest unit since 1941. The reference to “eight of nine ponds in the northern part of the unit” appears to be a mistake. It should be seven of nine ponds: Lang, Little Lang, Snake, Durgin, Lone Jack, Berry, and Little Berry.</p>	<p>As noted above, “native” and “wild” references have been replaced with SHFW reference. The lack of recent stocking of the Cold Stream Ponds has also been added to the text. Based on the current SHFW list, the count of designated ponds has been corrected (Fernald Pond had formerly been designated a “wild” brook trout water).</p>
<p>Page 47. Update table at top of page to remove references to “native” and “wild” designations and replace them with SHFW status. Also, the reference to a principal fishery for brook trout in Fernald appears to be in error. Campstove Pond should be added to this list of waters. Is there any information on physical or biological characteristics of Campstove Pond?</p>	<p>As noted above, “native” and “wild” references have been replaced with SHFW reference. The reference for Fernald Pond fishery has been corrected, based on its absence from the current SHFW list.</p> <p>Although there is no known fishery present, Campstove Pond has been added to the table. The only available data on Campstove Pond, from a 1995 MDIF&amp;W survey, indicate that no fish were observed in the pond and that its shallow depth (max. 4 feet) and warm temperatures (&gt;80 F) made it unsuitable for brook trout habitat.</p>
<p>Page 88, Bald Mountain Lot. The Management Plan should indicate that Bald Mountain Pond is habitat for landlocked arctic charr, a state species of special concern.</p>	<p>The Draft Plan mentions that the primary fisheries for Bald Mountain Pond include arctic charr; the species of special concern information has been added to the text.</p>

From: Emily Bastain, Native Fish Coalition	
There are several obsolete references pertaining to State Heritage Fish (SHF) waters. There is no longer an “A” and “B” list, all SHF waters have been merged into a single list.	See response above.
Topic: Potential Fisheries Restoration Projects at Cold Stream Forest	
Page 53-54. In addition to interest by TU and others in projects to add large woody debris, other fisheries restoration projects, particularly projects to address impacts of old log driving dams, and bulldozed or otherwise altered stream channels should be allowed. The outlet of Little Berry Pond/Lone Jack Road crossing is a prime example, but many other opportunities exist on Cold Stream. Considerable work has already occurred at a site in the southern portion of Cold Stream near an old bridge.	A mention of the completed project at the former bridge site, as an example for potential future fisheries restoration projects, has been added to text. Any such projects, in addition to the large woody debris (LWD) projects specifically authorized by the Cold Stream Forest Fisheries HMA, would need to conform to the HMA and be planned and conducted with the involvement and oversight of MDIF&W.
Topic: ATV and Snowmobile Routes in the Plan Area and at Cold Stream Forest	
From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited	
Page 13-14, Map of ATV trails. This map should show all state-designated ATV trails as of the date of the management plan. The current text states that it shows “major ATV routes in the region.” There may be no difference, but for planning purposes, BPL should focus on opportunities on state-designated trails only. This is important on the Cold Stream unit, as discussed below in more detail.	The regional ATV route map is a portion of the most recent (2018) state-wide map distributed by the Bureau’s ORV Program, and depicts state-authorized trails only. (Other portions of the original map, not shown on the Plan map, also depict ORV Club trails, open only to Club members.)
Page 50, comments on [Cold Stream Forest – North Section] map. The map shows no designated ATV trails on the North Section. Is this accurate? If so, we strongly encourage maintaining that status in the future.	The map is accurate; there are no designated ATV trails on the North Section. No additional ATV trails are proposed for the Cold Stream Forest Unit.
Page 51, comments on [Cold Stream Forest – South Section] map. The map shows a single designated ATV trail that crosses the Cold Stream Forest unit. This appears to a critical link to get ATV’s from the Forks to points north. Another trail is shown running on the western boundary of the unit for ~2 miles. TU supports maintaining these two trails, assuming they are existing designated ATV trails, but does not support expansion of ATV use on the southern portion of the property.	As depicted on the map, the only designated ATV trail on the unit is the trail at the south end, following Tower Road, with a short connector trail to the ballfield at The Forks. The trail on the western boundary follows a road owned by Plum Creek (Jerry’s Way), forming part of a loop on the adjacent Plum Creek lands. No new ATV trails or expansion of ATV use are proposed on the Cold Stream Forest Unit.

<p>Page 55: Signage: Signage to identify designated ATV routes and to prevent ATV use on non-designated routes is also needed.</p>	<p>The designated ATV routes on the southern end of the Unit have appropriate signage. Based on recent input from Cold Stream visitors and others, the ORV program has recently worked to post roads closed to ATV use, particularly in the area around the north end of the Unit, where ATV riders may have strayed from authorized routes near Parlin Pond.</p>
<p>Page 61, Motorized Recreation. The draft plan states: “Continue to allow ATV’s to use the management roads on the southern end of the Unit, near the Forks, to maintain important trail connections.” This should be clarified to indicate it applies only to existing designated trails, and that ATV use of management roads north of the Capital Road is not appropriate. As noted above, these trails (and existing designated snowmobile trails) should be clearly shown in the Final Draft Plan.</p>	<p>The recommendation has been revised to underscore that only existing ATV routes (all at the southern end of the Unit) will continue. All existing designated snowmobile and ATV trails on and in the vicinity of the Cold Stream Unit are shown on Map Figures 8a and 8b.</p>
<p>From: Emily Bastain, Native Fish Coalition</p>	
<p>NFC does not support the addition of new ATV trails due to erosion, access, litter and noise pollution.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
<p><b>Topic: Inclusion of Relevant Background and Reference Documents in the Management Plan</b></p>	
<p>From: Steve Brooke, MDIF&amp;W Heritage Fish Working Group</p>	
<p>One of the primary goals of management documents like the Upper Kennebec Management Plan is to assemble all relevant documents and references into one single, easy to access package. I urge you to use footnotes and/or appendixes to reference all the background documents for the lands that are covered in this management document. If errors are discovered during this current effort, they should be referenced and corrected in the new Management Plan.</p>	<p>The relevant documents and references are included in Appendix B of the Plan, and are noted in the text. (An error noted by the commenter in the Cold Stream Fisheries HMA will be corrected, or noted in the Plan Appendix.)</p>
<p>From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited</p>	
<p>Page 47. The Cold Stream Forest Fisheries and Deer Wintering Area HMA’s should be attached to the management plan. As noted above, the Fisheries HMA does not include 100 foot no-cut buffers that were envisioned by project partners during the planning phase.</p>	<p>The HMAs are provided in Plan Appendix B; this reference has been added to the text. See response above under the topic Timber Management at the Cold Stream Forest Unit.</p>

Topic: Rehabilitation/Relocation of Campsites and Associated Facilities at Cold Stream Forest	
From: Dick Darling, Cold Stream Forest Angler and Camper	
[Commenter provided several suggestions regarding fire rings, picnic tables and privies at Lone Jack campground]	The Bureau has begun rehabilitation of the campground with several new tables installed and will also address the fire rings and privies, as resources allow, as described in the Plan recommendations.
From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited	
Page 48. The description of recreational resources should note, where applicable, whether the listed recreation sites meet existing BPL and LUPC standards with respect to set backs from water resources, particularly for outhouses where they exist. We believe a more detailed “accounting” of campsites “in scattered locations” should be provided, along with information about whether these sites have privies, fire rings, picnic tables, or other amenities, and whether they are “Primitive Campsites” or “Primitive Group Campsites” as designated on the map on page 50. (Is this a difference that matters? Are there standards for these designations?)	<p>The Recreation Resources issues discussion in the Draft Plan (p. 54) notes the need for an inventory of campsite amenities for possible improvement, and the potential relocation of campsites that do not meet LUPC standards. The Plan has been revised to add privies to the inventory, and the scattered campsites to those that may be relocated. The Draft Plan recommendations include evaluation and possible relocation of campsites, and have been revised to include privies. All of the campsites are shown on the Cold Stream infrastructure and recreation maps (Map Figures 8a and 8b).</p> <p>There are no primitive group campsites on the Cold Stream Unit (that designation appears in the map legend, as it is relevant to other Units in the Plan area, and the map legend is shared among the several base maps).</p>
Page 54. TU supports efforts to move campsites at Lone Jack campground and Durgin Pond into compliance with LUPC rules. As discussed with BPL staff, this should be done carefully so as not to suddenly reduce availability of campsites. Necessary changes at the Lone Jack site can probably be made with little or no impact or reduction in the number of sites, but the sites at Durgin Pond may need to be moved to a different site to be compliant. Those sites, which are frequently occupied, have significant impacts on Durgin Pond from run-off and erosion, make public use of Durgin Pond by non-campers awkward, and have a high potential, given lack of signage regarding fishing rules, to allow introduction of non-native baitfish into Durgin Pond. We believe a plan to move those sites into compliance—or, failing that, to provide measures that limit their impacts on Durgin Pond and Cold Stream—should be implemented relatively quickly. Adequacy of outhouses is a major issue with all of these sites.	<p>As contained in the Plan recommendations for Cold Stream Forest, the Bureau will evaluate the Lone Jack and Durgin Pond campsites located within pond or stream riparian zones, and determine whether to relocate certain campsites to reduce or eliminate impacts on aquatic resources.</p> <p>The Draft Plan recommendations also call for addressing the condition and location of privies at these campsites, and replacing and/or relocating privies as needed. The recommendation has been amended to include the possible addition of privies at sites where none are currently provided.</p>

<p>There are none at Durgin Pond or Little Berry Pond. The outhouses at Lone Jack are too close to water resources. Providing appropriate facilities for human waste—or moving campsites that see heavy use if this cannot be done—is essential.</p>	
<p>From: Emily Bastain, Native Fish Coalition</p>	
<p>NFC has some concerns regarding the location of the campsites on Durgin Pond. They not only block the view of the pond, impede day-use access and parking, and cause erosion and run-off, but have the potential to result in wastewater being released into the pond.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
<p>The lack of outhouses in CSF is a concern to NFC, especially with increased usage as will most likely happen as access is improved and the property is promoted. In order to control human waste under increased usage it will be necessary to add some toilet facilities (Durgin/Lang area and Cold Stream itself come to mind) and improve those at Lone Jack campground.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>
<p>NFC would like to see more “tent-friendly” campsites. Most of the sites in CSF are reclaimed gravel pits that tend to puddle up during rain, do not drain well, and are hard to drive tent and tarp stakes into. Blocking these sites to vehicle access would help reduce damage and erosion caused by trucks and trailers.</p>	<p>The Bureau does not intend to increase the number of campsites within the Unit at this time. However, we will consider formalizing certain informal roadside campsites that appear to be well used, where appropriate. There may also be opportunities to create new campsites if the evaluation of existing sites lead to closure of sites. The need for “tent-friendly” sites will be considered as part of the evaluation of facilities.</p>
<p>Topic: Storage of Boats at Ponds at Cold Stream Forest</p>	
<p>From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited</p>	
<p>Page 54-55. Storage of boats at ponds. This is a huge issue on several ponds on the property, and significant resources will need to be mobilized to address it. Some users may be unwilling to put their names on boats, and even if they do, there is no way to distinguish boats with names that are still in use from those that have been abandoned. We believe some kind of annual registration sticker might be a better strategy.</p>	<p>The Bureau appreciates the suggestion to implement a registration system for stored boats. However, as expressed in the Plan, the storage problem must be addressed within the confines of the existing policy contained in the IRP, which does not include a requirement for annual registration. There may be an opportunity for the Bureau to consider a boat registration system in a future review and update of the IRP, subject to public review and comment. In the meantime, the Plan recommendations call for a carefully implemented, staged approach to reducing stored boats, within current policy.</p>

From: Emily Bastain, Native Fish Coalition	
While we support the continued storage of private boats at the ponds in CSF, there is a major problem with disabled and abandoned watercraft, especially on Lang Pond. These boats should be removed for aesthetic and environmental reasons. A good way to address this would be to remove the obvious problem boats and attach reply cards to the remaining boats to ascertain ownership and use. A registration system could help fund the removal and NFC would support such.	The Plan recommendations include a phased approach to addressing the issue of large numbers of boats stored at the ponds. See the response above in regard to a boat registration system.
Topic: Road and Bridge Maintenance at Cold Stream Forest, Access Planning	
From: Dick Darling, Cold Stream Forest Angler and Camper	
<p>The stone structures built on the north and south sides of the bridge over the outlet of Little Berry Pond will probably be very helpful to prevent erosion of the road during the spring runoff. That said, they are poorly constructed with approach and departure angles that are too steep.</p> <p>The reconstruction of Lone Jack Road was not done well. The road was not crowned and deep ruts have developed. As a result, during and rainstorm, water channels through the ruts, causing erosion of the road material. Water ponds in low areas causing pot holes. The road should be properly crowned and compacted after grading to ensure that the paving gravel stays in place.</p>	<p>The Bureau is aware of concerns about some vehicles (particularly RVs) crossing the rock swales built into Lone Jack Road in the Fall of 2017, as part of the road and bridge work designed to improve flow out of Little Berry Pond and to prevent beavers from flooding the road. Additional work on the road is planned to help ameliorate the problem.</p> <p>This additional work will also include adding material to the road surface and crowning the road to improve drainage.</p>
From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited	
<p>Page 55. Access and Maintenance. The Cold Stream Forest unit has a relatively large number of roads, and needs a plan that prioritizes access for the public to key areas while also protecting sensitive resources. We suggest BPL identify key access routes that will be priorities for investments in road infrastructure and maintenance, and consider whether other roads can be closed, maintained only for administrative purposes, or receive a lower level of maintenance. Several specific concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road between Durgin Pond and Lone Jack campground is a prime access route. BPL provided some road upgrades here last fall, but additional work is likely needed. In particular, the two stream crossings at the outlet of Little Berry Pond are both difficult for vehicle passage in their current condition and problematic for fish passage and habitat. This site is highly altered by a historic log driving</li> </ul>	<p>The Plan recommendations include development of a road plan, which will prioritize access routes for investments in improvements and maintenance. Note that several of the roads used for access to the Unit are partly or entirely outside the BPL fee ownership and are covered by the easements contained in the Reciprocal Easement Agreement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional work is planned for this section of Lone Jack Road, to improve vehicle passage (particularly for those towing RVs). The new bridge structure at this site provides improved stream flow and fish passage at the outlet of Little Berry Pond, and the bridge and road work reduces sedimentation into Cold Stream. The initial road work was designed and planned by the Bureau's Senior Forest Engineer with the oversight and</li> </ul>

<p>dam, by the construction of the road, and by road maintenance activities over the years, all of which took place in a wetland area. We suggest this site be a priority for a project designed to address these impacts in a way that improves access to the Lone Jack campground and also restores fish habitat. This will require significant engineering and habitat assessment to come up with an appropriate design. TU would be willing to help raise site-specific funds to address this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road from Long Jack campground south along Lone Jack Pond and Cold Stream to the snowmobile bridge over Cold Stream has multiple problematic crossings of small streams. Repairing this road, providing appropriate stream crossings, and upgrading the bridge over Cold Stream for automobile use will be expensive. BPL should consider whether this road is appropriate for year-round public use, particularly during wet seasons. The route appears to be critical for snowmobile use in winter. One option might be to maintain the road for snowmobile and administrative use only, with temporary snowmobile bridges rather than culverts at the stream crossings. This would significantly reduce impacts of the road on tributaries to Cold Stream.</li> </ul>	<p>assistance of MDIF&amp;W biologists, and any future road work will be similarly conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of this section of road, including the snowmobile bridge over Cold Stream, will occur during development of the overall road plan for the Unit called for in the Plan recommendations. Note that the roads leading from Capital Road to the snowmobile bridge (Mountain Brook Road and Cold Stream Mountain Road) provide the most direct route into the north section of the Unit from Capital Road, while also providing access to the Cold Stream Falls trail, road side campsites, and informal access points to Cold Stream along the Unit boundary, which these roads follow for nearly their entire length.</li> </ul>
<p>Page 61, Public Access and Management Roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As discussed above, we believe some immediate attention is needed on the Durgin Pond to Lone Jack road, and that dedicated resources for engineering, road construction, and habitat restoration at this site should be a priority. We will work with BPL and DIFW to raise those funds, if necessary.</li> <li>• The draft puts off developing a formal road plan to future years. However, considerable road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As noted above, additional work is planned for this section of Lone Jack Road, to improve vehicle passage, with the continued involvement of the Bureau's Senior Forest Engineer and with the assistance of MDIF&amp;W biologists. As described above, cooperation with MDIF&amp;W will be necessary in the planning and implementation of any potential additional habitat restoration at Cold Stream Forest. Trout Unlimited is encouraged to communicate with MDIF&amp;W regarding proposals for habitat restoration projects on the Unit. BPL will support MDIF&amp;W in the implementation of any such project the Department determines are necessary to meet the goals and objectives of the Cold Stream Forest Fisheries HMA.</li> <li>• Due to the availability of time-sensitive funding, priority road work was initiated in</li> </ul>



<p>work is needed now. We believe the Final Draft Plan should indicate which roads are “primary access routes”, and identify those in need of immediate work. Without this planning, road work—which has already started—may not reflect these priorities. Consideration should be given to whether the snowmobile bridge over Cold Stream is appropriate for snowmobiles, and whether some problematic road segments should be considered for retirement or reduced use and maintenance.</p>	<p>2017 (particularly at Lone Jack Road, identified as a priority in the scoping phase for the Plan). Other substantial road or bridge work will not begin until the recommended road plan designates the primary access routes, which will be prioritized for funding.</p>
<p><b>From: Emily Bastain, Native Fish Coalition</b></p>	
<p>NFC does not believe roads that have been used for generations need to be improved to allow unlimited and unrestricted access. Doing so will increase usage and wear-and-tear on the resources and infrastructure, while requiring costly annual maintenance. In fact, some of the smaller roads could be blocked to vehicular access without any great hardship to users.</p>	<p>Current and future road work on the Cold Stream Forest Unit roads and access roads covered by the road easement is directed at repair of roads to bring them to public access road standards, and to protect water quality by ensuring proper drainage. The objective is not “unlimited and unrestricted access.” As described above, all road work in the Unit will continue to be conducted with the assistance of MDIF&amp;W.</p> <p>The roads plan called for in the Plan recommendations will help determine primary access routes where resources will be prioritized, and may recommend closure of some roads.</p>
<p><b>Topic: Fishing Regulations/Laws, Signage and Enforcement at Cold Stream Forest</b></p>	
<p><b>From: Dick Darling, Cold Stream Forest Angler and Camper</b></p>	
<p>When I first started fishing in the Cold Stream area, every point of entrance to every pond was signed “Fly Fishing Only” with a citation to the applicable section of the Maine Revised Statutes, Annotated. Since the early 2000’s, I have seen no such signs on any ponds in the area. I have seen spinning poles being carried and sitting on tables at campsites near several ponds. While “ignorance of the law is no excuse...” I believe that proper signage at all of the Ponds that are fly fishing only stating that fact and including any special laws that apply to the pond, might deter some bait fishing and would be helpful to the fly fishermen who might be unfamiliar with a given pond. I know that there is limited warden availability in the area, but perhaps a few citations might deter others from using worms or other non-FFO fishing techniques.</p>	<p>These comments have been passed on to MDIF&amp;W, the agency with responsibility for both fishing law signage and enforcement.</p>

From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited	
<p>Page 46. It should be noted that Campstove Pond is the only pond on the Cold Stream Forest property that allows legal use of live fish as bait. This represents a risk of baitfish introductions into Campstove that could drop downstream to Berry Pond and other ponds in the Cold Stream watershed. There are currently no known occurrences of non-native fish species on the Cold Stream Forest property, and maintaining this status should be a management priority, consistent with the General Management Focus to “control exotic species”.</p>	<p>Preventing introduction of non-native fish species is indeed a management priority at Cold Stream. Angling regulations, however, are the purview of MDIF&amp;W and will not be addressed in the management plan, other than to cite current regulations. Requests for changes to fishing regulations should be directed to MDIF&amp;W.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Cold Stream Forest LMF application states that Campstove Pond is fishless, based on information from MDIF&amp;W. Also, recent observations by BPL indicated foot access to the pond is poor, with no clear trails and a mostly boggy shoreline. Nevertheless, we recognize that individuals may attempt to fish the pond.</p>
<p>Page 55, Signage. We see two critical signage issues. First, given the risk and potential damage of bait fish introductions, we would like to see signage that indicates at least “No Live Fish as Bait” regulations on the ponds where that regulation applies. The Native Fish Coalition has developed signage to that effect and offered to install it at all SHFW’s, but BPL has not been willing to have those signs installed. Another option might be specific signs for these waters, all of which have “Fly-fishing Only” regulations. This option would ensure the public knew the regulations.</p>	<p>As noted above, all fisheries regulation signage is under the purview of MDIF&amp;W. BPL will discuss posting of fishing regulations at the Cold Stream Forest Unit with MDIF&amp;W.</p>
From: Emily Bastain, Native Fish Coalition	
<p>In order to protect the Cold Stream watershed from invasive non-native minnows, a “no live fish as bait” restriction should be placed on Campstove Pond, the only pond in CSF where it is currently legal to use such. Resistance to this change would be low due to the small size of the water and the fact that it is very lightly fished.</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>
<p>There is a dangerous lack of signage as it pertains to fishing in CSF, especially the use of live fish as bait. NFC has undertaken an important SHF informational sign project to make people aware of the location of these waters, status, threats and the laws in place to protect them. Although co-sponsored by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (IFW) and partially funded by Maine</p>	<p>See responses above.</p>

<p>Outdoor Heritage Fund, BPL has refused to allow these signs to be posted in CSF. We would like to revisit this and would be willing to make whatever changes are necessary to get these important signs posted.</p>	
<p>Topic: Water Level on Little Berry Pond at Cold Stream Forest</p>	
<p>From: Dick Darling, Cold Stream Forest Angler and Camper</p>	
<p>The water level on Little Berry pond is significantly lower now than when I first fished the area in the late 1960's. We routinely paddled canoes up the "neck" of Little Berry and walked a short distance through the woods to the lower landing on Big Berry. The survey maps on the IF&amp;W site show 2 feet of water throughout the "neck", but since the early 2000's, you can't get a canoe up there. If there is 6" of water in that area now, I would be surprised. Little Berry had two "holes" that are, I believe, spring fed so that trout can survive even the warmest summers. If the water level in the pond was raised to its historic level, there would be a better chance for the fishery to maintain and improve.</p>	<p>These comments have been passed on to MDIF&amp;W, the agency with responsibility for fisheries management.</p>
<p>Topic: Resource Allocations at Cold Stream Forest</p>	
<p>From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited</p>	
<p>Page 56-60, Resource Allocations. There are several issues to consider here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the focus on protecting wild native brook habitat, we believe resource allocations should include 330 foot "Wildlife Management Areas" on all stream corridors and pond shorelines.</li> <li>Given the presence of multiple LUPC-designated remote ponds, difficult access to many portions of Cold Stream within steep gorge sections, and focus in the Fisheries HMA on maintaining "remote wilderness character", we think the amount of the property allocated to "Remote Recreation" should be increased. We would suggest this allocation around Lang, Little Lang, Snake, Fernald, and Big Berry Ponds; along both banks of Cold Stream from the snowmobile bridge downstream to the Cold Stream Falls trailhead; along the portion of Mountain Brook from its confluence with Cold Stream to the boundary; along Cold Stream from the Capital Road to the confluence with the Kennebec; and along those portions of Tomhegan Stream within the unit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Cold Stream Forest Fisheries HMA (page 3) states that riparian management practices will be applied within 330 feet of ponds and non-forested wetlands and Cold Stream and within 75 feet of all other permanent streams. The Draft Plan applied these buffers with the Wildlife dominant resource allocation. At BPL's request, MDIF&amp;W subsequently reviewed those buffers and did not recommend additional buffers be designated.</li> <li>The Draft Plan applies the Remote Recreation dominant resource allocation only to trail corridors outside Wildlife Management zones. Note that the areas around the ponds and along Cold Stream listed in the comment are already protected by the Wildlife allocation, which is a higher level of protection in the hierarchy of the BPL Resource Allocation System. Note also that all of those areas also have a Remote Recreation secondary allocation (not shown</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No proposal for Visual Consideration allocations has been provided. We suggest that in addition to those areas around roads and campsites, areas around all ponds on the unit and within the gorge sections of Cold Stream should be Visual Class 1—where direct enjoyment of visitors will be affected. Viewsheds from the ponds on the property are important to most users.</li> <li>The maps do not show the designated ATV and snowmobile trail corridors allocated as “Developed Recreation Class 1”. These should be designated now and shown on the maps.</li> </ul>	<p>on the Plan maps, but described in the Plan text and recorded in the Allocation Summary on page 58).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Final Plan includes acreage figures for Visual Consideration allocations, based on additional input on specific areas to be protected from Bureau staff familiar with the lands. These include areas surrounding the ponds and Cold Stream.</li> <li>The Draft Plan (p. 57) specifies that all roads or trails designated for public motor vehicle use, snowmobile use or ATV use are given a Developed Recreation Class 1 allocation. The roads are shown as such on Map Figures 9a and b, but this is not easily visible at the size the maps are presented in the Plan document. The short segments of motorized trail off management roads have also been added to the maps.</li> </ul>
<p>From: Emily Bastain, Native Fish Coalition</p>	
<p>NFC would like to see more area dedicated to “Remote Recreation,” especially near the walk-in ponds and Cold Stream itself. One area of concern is the old “trestle bridge” site on Cold Stream. The drive-in campsite at the end of the road, and within 100’ of the stream, is a source of litter, congestion and poaching as evidenced by discarded worm containers on what is artificial lures only water. We believe it would be prudent to block the road to vehicle access at the top of the hill.</p>	<p>As described above, the areas around the ponds and along Cold Stream protected by the Wildlife allocation, which is a higher level of protection in the hierarchy of the allocation system, and all of those areas also have a Remote Recreation secondary allocation (not shown on the Plan maps, but described in the Plan text and recorded in the Allocation Summary on page 58).</p> <p>As part of the evaluation of campsites, the Bureau will consider whether vehicle access should be blocked at certain sites.</p>
<p>Topic: Johnson Mountain and West Forks Lots</p>	
<p>From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited</p>	
<p>Page 80, Johnson Mountain and West Forks Lots. We had suggested in earlier comments that management plans for these lots should be incorporated with the Cold Stream Forest unit, because they are contiguous, because they are hydrologically and ecologically connected, and because the units share access routes and users. BPL has chosen not to do that, but at minimum these connections should be noted in the management plans for each unit. A few specific concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information about Wilson Hill Pond and Little Wilson Pond appears to be out of date. Both</li> </ul>	<p>The Bureau has chosen not to combine the two original public lots with the Cold Stream Unit for several reasons, including: differences in harvesting schedules, differences in availability of forest stand data between these lots managed by the Bureau for many years as compared to the newly acquired Cold Stream parcels, and the fact that the two lots are not within the Habitat Management Areas addressed in the two signed Cold Stream Forest HMAs, and so are not managed with the same primary objectives or under the same constraints.</p>

<p>ponds are designated as SHFW's and support brook trout fisheries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tomhegan Stream, a tributary to Cold Stream, crosses these two lots. Tomhegan Stream supports a brook trout fishery and telemetry studies indicate that some Kennebec River brook trout ascend Cold Stream and continue into Tomhegan Stream for thermal refuge and spawning.</li> </ul>	<p>The Plan has been revised to note that the two ponds are now on the SHFW list due to native brook trout fisheries. The fisheries information for Tomhegan Stream has also been added.</p>
<p><b>Topic: Suggestions for Cold Stream Forest – Final Draft Plan (multiple topics)</b></p>	
<p>From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited</p>	
<p>1. Make “protecting wild native brook trout habitat” a primary focus of the management plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Incorporate this language into the vision statement.</li> <li>b. Include brook trout habitat considerations as a primary driver of management decisions, including resource allocations, recreation and trails plans, plans for road maintenance and repair, signage and timber management plans.</li> <li>c. Reconsider “100 foot no cut buffers.” At a minimum, acknowledge that this goal of the project partners has not been fulfilled, and can be considered with the HMA's are updated.</li> </ol> <p>2. Be more specific in both resource allocations and in proposed management activities about protecting designated remote pond and the remote character of many portions of the unit. For example, the Fisheries Habitat HMA's statement on Public Access states that “public access should emphasize maintaining the remote, wilderness character of the</p>	<p>1. Focus on protecting wild native brook trout habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response above, on Vision for Cold Stream Unit. Also, language has been added to the Management Issues section to underscore that protection of brook trout habitat will take precedence at Cold Stream Forest.</li> <li>• The resource allocations – in particular, the Wildlife allocation applied to all pond and stream riparian zones -- as directed by the fisheries HMA, represent the protection of brook trout habitat as a primary management consideration. Likewise, the recommended inventory and assessment of recreation facilities is largely directed at habitat protection. Road maintenance and repair will continue to be focused on water resource protection and will continue to be conducted with the assistance of MDIF&amp;W. Timber management plans will be guided by the management and harvest strategies contained in the Fisheries HMA.</li> <li>• As noted above, the riparian buffer protections provided for in the Fisheries HMA and in the Plan's resource allocations are a primary means of protecting brook trout habitat, while allowing for active management aimed at maintaining healthy trees that will provide many benefits over time.</li> </ul> <p>2. Protecting designated remote ponds and remote character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan maintains the remote character of the ponds and the Cold Stream corridor, with no new trails or other facilities proposed, and walk-in only access maintained where now present. All of these areas have a Wildlife</li> </ul>

<p>Cold Stream riparian corridor and headwater ponds.” This should be reflected more clearly in the Final Draft Management Plan.</p> <p>3. Signage. There is a need for signage that emphasizes the sensitivity of the fishery to use of live fish as bait and informs the public of existing fishing rules to prevent its use on most ponds on the unit.</p> <p>4. Campsites. Providing privies at designated campsites—and perhaps at some other sites not currently designated that receive heavy use and where camping is an appropriate use—is a priority. This includes sites beyond the cluster of campsites at Lone Jack and Durgin.</p> <p>5. Roads</p> <p>a. When designating primary access routes, consider impacts of construction and maintenance on stream and pond habitat.</p> <p>b. Consider retiring or limiting use on some road segments, particularly between Lone Jack campground and the Cold Stream snowmobile bridge.</p> <p>c. An engineered solution to both the road corridor and habitat degradation is needed at the “two bridges” that cross the outlet of Little Berry Pond—and potentially at other sites on the unit.</p> <p>d. Consider whether automobile use of the snowmobile bridge over Cold Stream is appropriate or necessary.</p> <p>6. Be specific about designated ATV trails.</p> <p>a. Limit use to existing designated trails only south of the Capital Road, where the one trail on the unit provides a critical link between the Forks and Jackman.</p> <p>b. Do not allow expanded use onto other roads on the unit south of the Capital Road.</p> <p>c. Keep ATV’s off roads on the unit north of the Capital Road.</p>	<p>dominant resource allocation and Remote Recreation secondary allocation. As stated in the Vision: “...the remote ponds will continue to be managed for remote recreation experiences, with walk-in access only.” It should be noted that several of the headwater ponds and portions of the Cold Stream corridor cannot be described as having “remote, wilderness character” given the proximity of roads, recent timber harvests with skid trails, etc.</p> <p>3. Fishing regulations signage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPL will coordinate with MDIF&amp;W on placement of fishing regulation signage at kiosks and potentially at other sites.</li> </ul> <p>4. Campsites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan recommendations have been expanded to include evaluation of condition or need for privies at scattered campsites.</li> </ul> <p>5. Roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roads plan will have among its primary considerations the protection of stream and pond habitat.</li> <li>• Road segments that are not deemed necessary for public access may be gated or retired.</li> <li>• As noted above, engineering input will continue in support of additional road work at the Little Berry Pond outlet areas and other sites.</li> </ul> <p>6. ATV trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan recommendation has been clarified to underscore that only existing ATV routes will continue.</li> </ul>
--	---

<p>7. Consider outreach to other key groups as you develop the Final Draft Management Plan for public comment. If there is a way to engage the ground of anglers/campsite caretakers who regularly use the Lone Jack site, that would be ideal.</p>	<p>7. Outreach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPL will continue to reach out individually to Cold Stream anglers and others who have provided us contact information and requested to be included in the contact list for the Plan.</li> </ul>
---	---

<p align="center"><b>Comments on the Final Draft Upper Kennebec Region Management Plan (January 15, 2019)</b> (Comment Period: February 7, 2019 – February 28, 2019) Some comments have been excerpted, and introductory or background statements deleted.</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Comment</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Response</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>Topic: Cold Stream Forest Brook Trout HMA and Forest Management in Riparian Zones</b></p>	
<p>From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited</p>	
<p>We understand that BPL staff believe the Habitat Management Agreement for brook trout habitat overrides the ability to consider some management options that were the original intent of TU, TPL and BPL and IFW staff who planned the project. We disagree. Nothing in that agreement prevents consideration of measures that provide <u>better</u> protection to fisheries resources than the HMA requires. We again ask you to consider the following improvements that would help fulfill the stated management goal of protecting brook trout as the primary management objective on the Cold Stream Unit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smaller streams—which, if anything are more biologically important for brook trout than the mainstem of Cold Stream, and which provide all the cold-water inputs that are critical to keeping Cold Stream as suitable habitat, should receive the same 330-foot wildlife buffers as smaller streams. The proposed 75-foot corridors are not sufficient to fully protect these values.</li> <li>Within the buffer area, we again repeat our request for 100-foot no-cut buffers adjacent to all perennial streams and on all lakes and ponds. (Limited cutting of trees for wildlife for fisheries habitat management or enhancement should be allowed after consultation with MDIFW fisheries staff.) We believe much of the disagreement over this issue may relate to different views on these issues between foresters and fisheries biologists about the value of dead wood. For fisheries, we WANT trees to get old and fall into the stream. In the long term, this</li> </ul>	<p>Before addressing the specific concerns, it should be noted that the goals and objectives of the Cold Stream Forest Fisheries HMA include establishment of riparian management standards that <u>exceed</u> minimum standards currently employed on other BPL units, and the application of riparian management practices that are consistent with current BPL standards while <u>enhancing riparian management</u> adjacent to Cold Stream, ponds and wetlands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MDIF&amp;W reviewed the riparian buffers established in the Draft Plan for Cold Stream Forest (designated and mapped as Wildlife Dominant resource allocation), and requested no changes.</li> <li>As noted in response to the similar comments on the Draft Final Plan, by mutual agreement, the Bureau and IF&amp;W determined that a 100 foot no-cut buffer in riparian areas was not necessary to include among the HMA protective measures. However, the HMA directs that within 75 feet of streams, the riparian zone will be managed using individual tree selection, permitting light removals while maintaining shading and travel opportunities and reducing siltation. One objective of management in the riparian</li> </ul>

<p>kind of management will get us out of the need for “chop and drop” and other projects to enhance habitat with wood additions that compensate for the current deficit of natural wood recruitment. For now, this is a largely academic concern. It does not look like there will be any imminent timber harvest. The current HMA will be revisited every 5 years— i.e. late in 2021—and we request that BPL and DIFW revisit this issue at that time. We would respectfully request that any planning for major timber harvest within riparian areas covered by the HMA be deferred until then.</p>	<p>zones is to provide a source of large woody debris to the ponds and streams. To meet that objective, large dead and dying trees near ponds and streams will be left standing (a standard practice for the Bureau), so that they will provide input of LWD to the system as they decay and fall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More specific aspects of riparian management that will be implemented include promoting the longest-lived species to provide shade and cover as long as possible, while creating the space (through light harvesting) to grow recruits to replace the trees that remain so there is adequate shade for the future. Targeted for removal are high-risk trees that are relatively short-lived (e.g., balsam fir, aspen) and that are likely to die before the next harvest cycle. Some legacy trees are left and are never harvested.</li> <li>• Although preparatory data collection to inform prescriptions is ongoing, the Bureau is not likely to conduct harvests within riparian areas on the Unit before 2021. However, it is the Bureau’s belief that harvesting in riparian areas as outlined above will provide the opportunity to assess impacts (if any) on the HMA fisheries habitat.</li> </ul>
---	---

**Topic: Road Planning at Cold Stream Forest**

**From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited**

<p><u>Road Planning</u>. We continue to think a long-term plan for roads is important, and it should consider road retirement or conversion to winter road only or gated management road only for some areas. TNC and AMC have taken this approach on some of their land units. Our general concern is culverts, crossings, and road impacts on tributary streams. Upgrading all of the roads on the property to meet “Stream Smart” standards is a big undertaking and can only occur gradually and over time. We do have two areas of concern that we believe are priorities and should be addressed soon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The road from Lone Jack campsite to the bridge at Upper Cold Stream Falls</u>. This is the current ITS snowmobile trail and provides a critical link. It needs an appropriate roadbed for winter use. However, this road has multiple stream crossings, culverts, and beaver issues in the short length of road between Lone Jack Pond and the Cold Stream crossing. In the long term</li> </ul>	<p>The roads plan called for in the Plan recommendations will consider retirement, conversion to winter use only, and gating of certain roads on the Unit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The long-term management of this section of road will be addressed in the roads plan. Work conducted on this stretch of road in the past two years, including drainage of the beaver flowage that had flooded the road west of the Cold Stream bridge and installation of culverts, has made it passable by vehicles year-round. As alluded to in the</li> </ul>
---	--



<p>this will be expensive to maintain and keep open. And as long as it remains open, it will be used from both ends, particularly during wet periods in the spring when anglers want access to fishing spots nearby. We believe BPL should consider the following as potential future options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retire the road and reroute the ITS trail. This would need careful planning and long lead time.</li> <li>▪ Convert to winter road only with abutments and annual installation/removal of winter bridges at the stream crossings and wet areas that are currently problems.</li> <li>▪ Upgrade to appropriately sized culverts or bridges, for the crossings, but gate the road during wet periods. It's only a mile from Lone Jack to the falls at the Cold Stream crossing, and this would make a nice hiking/anglers trail.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The Little Berry Pond Outlet remains a problem.</u> This is a complicated site with multiple disturbances—an old log driving dam, two stream crossings, fill placed in in wetland area long ago to construct the road. Work last year to improve these crossings helped, but problems remain. This summer we placed a temperature data logger at the site and documents very warm water temps—at a site that used to see rising trout even mid-summer when it was impounded by beavers. In addition, complaints continue about getting trailered vehicles over the two crossings, and there are concerns about water levels in Little Berry Pond and their relation to the old log driving dam and perhaps also to past, higher placement of the culverts. We believe this site needs a detailed analysis and design for a long-term solution that better meets natural resource and access/recreational needs. TU will commit to working with BPL and DIFW to seek funding from the Indian Pond Enhancement Fund to partially fund the assessment, design</li> </ul>	<p>comment, the road is an important part of a major north-south snowmobile route. The Bureau also considers this segment of road particularly important for non-winter access, as it is the northernmost section of the route extending south to one of the primary entrances to the Unit at Capital Road. This route provides access to the ponds and campsites in the north part of the Unit, as well as to the Cold Stream Falls trail and numerous informal access points as it parallels Cold Stream along the west boundary of the Unit for most of its length. Other routes into the north part of the Unit cross through abutting landowners' commercial forest land. The Bureau expects that maintenance of those roads in the near term would largely fall on the Bureau, due to timber harvesting patterns in the area. Also, they do not provide access to the Cold Stream corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding continued work to upgrade roads in the Unit, the Bureau intends to develop a contract for this service at Cold Stream and other management units in the region, with work to be performed in summer 2019.</li> <li>• The Bureau intends to monitor and potentially conduct additional work on the recently rebuilt road and stream crossings at the Little Berry Pond outlet, as needed for safe vehicular access, including trailers. The Bureau will continue to work closely with MDIF&amp;W to ensure that fisheries resources are protected at this site. The Bureau is supportive of any additional analysis and design work that MDIF&amp;W may recommend to guide potential future work on the road and bridges, and any modifications to the current flow regime in the vicinity that MDIF&amp;W may also recommend.</li> </ul>
--	---

<p>and construction of an appropriate long-term solution.</p>	
<p><b>Topic: Fisheries Signage at Cold Stream Forest</b></p>	
<p><b>From: Jeff Reardon, Trout Unlimited</b></p>	
<p>We request that BPL work with DIFW on fisheries signage issues. These include letting visitors know about special regulations on the project waters and considering placement of the “State Heritage Fish Waters” signs that the Native Fish Coalition has partnered with DIFW. We share the concerns that some BPL staff and users have expressed about “sign sprawl” and understand the need for a more comprehensive plan for signage, but these are important issues related to the primary management focus.</p>	<p>The Bureau will discuss placement of the “State Heritage Fish Waters” signs at Cold Stream Forest with MDIF&amp;W, including potential placement at Heritage Fish ponds. This will occur in the context of a broader effort to plan for placement of kiosks, signage and other public information at the Unit.</p>