

**MAINE LAKES STUDY:
METHODS FOR WILDLIFE**

Participants

Gary Donovan, Director of Wildlife Division - oversight
Mark Stadler, Regional Management Supervisor - oversight
George Matula, Resource Assessment Supervisor - oversight
Alan Clark - Wildlife Resource Planner - coordination
Regional Wildlife Biologists - lake assessors
Resource Assessment Biologists - lake assessors

Category Description

For the purposes of this assessment, "wildlife" refers to lake-related game and non-game species. Species may be associated with wetland, riparian, or upland habitats. In general, the assessment will consider wildlife found within 250 feet of a lake. Wildlife usually found in habitats that are a greater distance from the lake may be included if directly associated with the lake by means of feeding, loafing, shelter, or migration.

Information Sources

MDIFW Regional Office files
MDIFW research reports and maps
MDIFW Endangered and Nongame Project files
Critical Areas Program files
The Nature Conservancy data base
Maine Audubon Society files

Minimum Standards

To be included in the wildlife assessment, a lake must meet prescribed minimum standards. The first of these standards, common to all resource categories, is that a lake must be at least 10 acres in size and be located entirely within Maine's organized areas. (Lakes that are totally or partially within the unorganized areas have previously been assessed.) Beyond this general standard, a number of standards that are specific to wildlife have been identified. In combination, these standards identify lakes which are deemed to be the most important to DIF&W's overall wildlife management program.

A lake should meet one or more of the following minimum standards:

1. The lake possesses significant wetland habitat (identified in the Maine Wetland Inventory as having large or otherwise highly valued shallow or deep fresh marsh),

2. The lake provides habitat for colonial nesting species,
3. The lake provides significant habitat for critical species (recognized as rare, threatened, or endangered on federal or state lists),
4. The lake is closely associated with big game species (e.g., deer wintering areas) or supports unusually high concentrations of other wildlife species, and
5. The lake appears to have suitable habitat for the above species but has not been properly inventoried.

Note: Lakes of a size less than a Great Pond that are judged to provide "unique" or "critical" habitat may be added to the master list of lakes. These should be chosen judiciously.

Evaluation Criteria

Two primary criteria will be used to assess wildlife significance: "Species Value" and "Habitat Value." "Public Use" of lake related wildlife will also be assessed. Each criterion includes a series of specific factors. These factors and the measures by which they will be assessed are as follows:

1. Species

a. Abundance

High significance = Unusually high number of individuals (one or more species) compared to other lakes in the region.

Medium = Average number of individuals.

Low = Below average number of individuals.

b. Diversity

High = Unusual spectrum of wildlife species present.

Medium = Typical species mix.

Low = Low species diversity.

c. Rarity

High = Presence of critical species (known federal or state rare, threatened, or endangered species).

Medium = Suspected presence of federal or state rare, threatened, or endangered species. Presence of one or more species which are highly unusual within a region.

Low = No rare species.

2. Habitat

a. Wetlands (shallow or deep water)

High = Exceptional waterfowl production or staging areas, highest quality wooded/shrub swamps and shallow marshes.

Medium = Typical wetland habitat.

Low = Limited, disturbed, or otherwise low quality wetland habitat.

b. Riparian Areas (shorelands transition zones)

High = Exceptional habitat diversity, i.e., variety of ecosystem types due to shoreline configuration, edge cover, old growth overstory, etc.

Medium = Typical shoreline habitat.

Low = Disturbed or otherwise sub-par shoreline habitat.

c. Uplands (within 250 feet of the lake or otherwise closely associated with the lake)

High = Critical nesting sites for birds of prey or colonial birds, critical shelter area (including deer wintering areas).

Medium = Typical upland habitat.

Low = Sub-par habitat (disturbed or limited by physiography).

3. Public Use

a. Hunting

High = Highest priority areas for hunters of lake related wildlife.

Medium = Typical hunting use.

Low = Little or no lake-related hunting.

b. Trapping

High = Highest priority for trapping.

Medium = Moderate use for trapping.

Low = Little or no trapping.

c. Wildlife Viewing

High = Exceptional opportunity to view lake-related wildlife (including moose, loons, waterfowl, etc.)

Medium = Typical wildlife viewing opportunity.

Low = Limited opportunity for viewing wildlife.

Evaluation Process

1. **Field Evaluation.** A response form consisting of the master list of lakes and a series of data entry columns will be supplied to regional wildlife biologists in each MDIFW region. Biologists will be asked to: (1) identify lakes meeting the study's minimum standards, and (2) rate the habitat, species, and public use value of each lake meeting minimum standards.

To simplify this process, biologists may wish to initially scan the list of lakes, checking off the lakes that they feel are worthy of detailed evaluation. No set number of lakes must meet minimum standards. If the LURC lake assessment serves as an indicator many lakes will not be evaluated due to not meeting minimum levels of significance or insufficient information.

Lakes meeting minimum standards are to be rated for each criterion using the high (H), medium (M), or low (L) designations detailed above. All criteria need not be evaluated for any one lake. A blank for any criterion will indicate that the criterion is not a major factor or that there is insufficient information to make a judgement.

The response form includes space for comments. This may be used to clarify a rating or to highlight noteworthy species or other factors. Comments need not be provided for each lake.

2. **Resource Assessment Biologist Input and Review.** Completed field evaluation forms will be given to resource assessment biologists. While they are encouraged to review all input given by field biologists, they are specifically requested to ensure that critical species information is complete and accurate. Resource biologists may wish to contact field biologists on certain items.

3. **Encoding and Analysis.** After forms are returned information will be entered into the computer. MDIFW State level staff will analyze data and give tentative ratings to lakes based on data supplied by regional and assessment biologists. Lakes will be rated as "outstanding" or "significant".

The following will serve as guidelines for this process:

- a. Lakes with critical species will automatically receive a rating of "outstanding".
 - b. On all other lakes a combination of species and habitat values will be the major determinants of the rating.
 - c. Public use will be recognized as a secondary factor except for unique circumstances.
 - d. In most instances all lakes meeting minimum standards will receive a rating of at least "significant".
 - e. "Outstanding" designations will be reserved for those lakes found to possess the highest overall wildlife values. Substantially more lakes will receive a "significant" rating. A lake need not receive a high (H) for each criterion to receive an overall rating of "outstanding".
4. **Final Review.** The Sportsmen's Alliance of Maine and the State's Critical Areas Program will be asked to review findings. Preliminary findings will then be circulated to field and assessment biologists for concurrence. Changes will be made as appropriate.

Data Entries

Response forms include the following entries:

1. Lake identifiers.
2. Species:
 - abundance
 - diversity
 - rarity
3. Habitat:
 - wetlands
 - riparian areas
 - uplands

4. Public Use:

- hunting
- trapping
- viewing

5. Undeveloped lakes.

6. Comments.

**MAINE LAKES STUDY:
METHODS FOR GEOLOGIC FEATURES**

Participants

Tom Weddle, Geology Coordinator
Maine Geological Survey

Category Description

The lake related geological features to be included in this category are as follows:

- 1) significant fossil localities
- 2) relic shorelines
- 3) significant bedrock outcrops
- 4) sand beaches
- 5) cliffs
- 6) caves
- 7) waterfalls
- 8) reverse deltas
- 9) significant glacial features such as moraines, kettleholes, boulder trains
- 10) miscellaneous hydrogeologic features that are unusual or unique

Geologic features will be included which are (1) within the lake, (2) within a 250 foot land area surrounding a lake, or (3) a dominant feature in the landscape as viewed from a lake.

Information Sources

Geologists who have conducted field work for the Maine Geological Survey will serve as the principal source of information. Published sources of information will include reports, studies, bulletins and maps published by the Maine Critical Areas Program, the Maine Geological Survey and the United States Geological Survey.

Minimum Standards

To be included in the assessment for this category, a lake will be required to be on the master list of lakes and to have at least one of the identified geological features that is found to be scientifically significant according to the evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Criteria

Geological features of outstanding or significant value will be identified for their scientific significance by virtue of being (1) a type locality or rare occurrence, (2) critical to the

interpretation and understanding of the geology of a region, or (3) an outstanding example of a particular feature.

Each of these criteria is of equal value and the significance of any particular feature will be determined by resource expert opinion.

Evaluation Process

The data collection and evaluation method for this category will rely mainly on responses to a survey that will be distributed to resource experts including geologists contracted by Maine Geologic Survey (MGS) for mapping, members of the Geological Society of Maine and the Maine Mineral Resources Association. Each participant will be requested to respond to lakes and lake related areas that they are familiar with, listing the significant physical features that exist and explaining the scientific significance of those features using the standards and criteria listed above.

In other cases, personal interviews will be conducted with resource experts to identify features of scientific significance and to discuss the feature's value in this assessment process.

Information discussed during these interviews will be recorded on a data entry form similar to that distributed with the mailed survey.

**MAINE LAKES STUDY:
METHODS FOR HYDROLOGIC FEATURES**

Participants

Jeff Dennis, Hydrology Coordinator
Maine Department of Environmental Protection

Category Description

Hydrologic features to be included are as follows:

- 1) exceptional depth
- 2) exceptional water clarity
- 3) unusual water chemistry
- 4) springs

Information Sources

Information will be derived from the Department of Environmental Protection's Lakes Division and may include files, computer data bases and personal knowledge.

Minimum Standards

To be included in the assessment for this category, a lake will be required to be on the master list of lakes and to have at least one of the identified geological features that is found to be scientifically significant according to the evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Criteria

Hydrological features of outstanding or significant value will be identified for their scientific significance by virtue of being (1) a rare occurrence, (2) critical to the interpretation and understanding of the hydrology of a region, or (3) an outstanding example of a particular feature.

Each of these criteria is of equal value and the significance of any particular feature will be determined by resource expert opinion.

Evaluation Process

Lake depth will be assessed using a depth to surface area ratio. Significant depth will be determined independently for small (less than 100 acres), medium sized (100 to 1000 acres), and larger lakes. The analysis will be conducted using the Department of Environmental Protection computer. Other hydrological features will be identified by DEP lake experts.

**MAINE LAKES STUDY:
METHODS FOR BOTANIC FEATURES**

Participants

Hank Tyler, Coordinator
Critical Areas Program
State Planning Office
The Nature Conservancy and individual experts as appropriate.

Category Description

The lake-related botanical features to be included in this category are:

- 1) Unusual or unique vascular plants
- 2) Rare, threatened or endangered vascular plants
- 3) Unusual, unique, endangered, or rare declining plant communities such as natural old growth forest stands, peatlands, freshwater wetlands, and jack pine stands.

Only features that are directly related to the lake ecosystem will be included.

Information Sources

Published sources of information include: Rare Vascular Plants of Maine - 1985, Jack Pine in Maine, Peat Resources of Maine, and Natural Old-Growth Forest Stands in Maine - 1983, published by the Maine State Office of Planning. Other sources of information include the Nature Conservancy's Heritage Data Base, the Critical Area Program's Register of Critical AREAs and aerial photographs, field observation, and topographic maps. Resource experts will be consulted as necessary.

Minimum Standards

For a lake to be included in the assessment for this category, it will be required to be on the master list of lakes and to have at least one of the identified botanic features that is found to be significant according to the evaluation criteria. Lakes will be included in this assessment if the botanic features are within 250 feet of a lake shore, associated with a lacustrine environment or if their inclusion is appropriate according to a resource expert.

Evaluation Criteria

Botanic species that have been identified in the draft official list of Maine's plants that are endangered, threatened, of special concern, or that belong on a watch list will be included in the evaluation process. lakes that contain endangered and

threatened plant species will be automatically rated outstanding. Lakes that contain special concern or watch list plant species will be considered significant. Lakes with a natural old-growth forest will be rated significant. Individual peatland habitats will be evaluated by resource experts to determine their significance.

Endangered plant species are represented in Maine by one documented recent (within the last 20 years) occurrence. This category also includes federally endangered plants. Threatened plant species are represented in Maine by two to four documented recent occurrences, or they are federally threatened. Exceptions to these categories include populations that are small, confined to a small geographic area, or that are clearly and imminently jeopardized.

Special concern plant species are represented in Maine by five to ten documented recent occurrences. This group includes plants that could in the foreseeable future become threatened. Watch list plant species are represented in Maine by more than ten documented recent occurrences, but their population's stability is of concern for a number of reasons.

The criteria for inclusion of a natural old growth forest stand is that (1) the stand contain a significant number of trees that are 100 years or older, (2) the stand must contain long-lived species characteristic of a sub-climax or climax forest, (3) the old-growth component be a stand, a group of stands or be growing in association with a stand, and (4) the stand must appear to be undisturbed by man.

Plants associated with wetlands and peatlands will be identified by field observation, topographic maps, aerial photographs, and Peat Resources of Maine. The significance of such habitats will be evaluated by resource experts.

The Maine Critical Areas Program recognizes the ecological importance of the jack pine (*Pinus banksiana* Lamb) because of their scattered distribution in the state, which is considered the southern limit of its range. The Critical Areas Program evaluates natural jack pine areas according to criteria that include (1) population size, (2) purity, (3) age, (4) variety of values (e.g., jack pine stands associated with other rare plants or trees), (5) lack of disturbance, (6) habitat uniqueness, and (7) geographic distribution.

Evaluation Process

Lake-related botanic features will be identified from data files and reports published by the Critical Areas Program of the Maine State Office of Planning, from the Nature Conservancy's Heritage Data Base, and from topographic maps and aerial photographs.

**MAINE LAKES STUDY:
METHODS FOR SCENIC VALUES**

Participants

Hank Tyler, coordinator
State Planning Office
Critical Areas Program

Field Survey:
Drew Parkin
John Lortie

Category Description

Evaluating the scenery of lakes may be approached in one of the following ways: (1) as the place where adjacent landscapes are viewed, or (2) the focal point of a view as seen from a distance and evaluated as part of the larger landscape. While both of these perspectives are important, this study addresses only the former objective by evaluating scenery as seen from the edge or surface of a lake. Although countless views exist on any one lake, the criteria for this study were developed to assess the scenery on a lake as a whole, rather than single views at specific locations around the lake.

Another aspect of evaluating scenery around lakes is the lake's size. Large lakes (e.g., 1000+ acres) offer very different experiences and opportunities than small lakes (e.g., 100 acres). Such differences in lake character need to be taken into account during the evaluation process. The following three size classes were defined:

1. 1000 acres or more
2. 500-999 acres
3. 10-499 acres

Information Sources

There currently exists no base of consistent published or unpublished information on Maine's lake scenic values.

Minimum Standards

The first task was to define a category or subset of the lakes that were potentially scenic, based on existing data. Although many attributes add to the scenery of a lake, relief was identified as the single most important and readily measurable quality for discerning the scenic value of a lake. Studies by Chenowith, Zube (1974), and Wargo and Weisman (1978) all indicate that changes in relief (i.e., presence of bluffs, mountains, or contrast in land height) are essential for evaluating scenery.

An initial list of potentially scenic lakes will be developed by visually inspecting topographical maps for areas of high relief. Any peaks in the foreground (within 0.5 miles from water edge) or background (0.5-7.0 miles from water edge) will be measured. Distance from the waters edge, and height above the lake were recorded for each peak. Minimum standards for including a lake of any size were (1) a 300 foot change in relief in the foreground, or (2) a 700 foot change in relief in the background.

The project budget will likely allow time to visit approximately 200 lakes by float plane. Lakes to be visited will be separated into three standards applied as indicated below:

1. Large lakes (>1000 acres) - must have at least 4 areas of significant relief and an edge index of 1.5 or more.
2. Medium lakes (500 to 999 acres) - must have at least 3 areas of significant relief and an edge index of 1.5 or more.
3. Small lakes (10 to 499 acres) - must have at least 2 areas of significant relief and an edge index of 1.5 or more.
4. All lakes (>10 acres) - A lake could still be added to the field list even if it did not meet the above criteria if it had significant relief that was exceptionally close (1 mile or less) or high (1000+ feet).

Evaluation Criteria

Once a preliminary list of scenic lakes is generated, the following 6 criteria will be used to further evaluate each lake:

1. Exceptional relief - distribution and complexity.
2. Physical features such as islands, beaches or cliffs.
3. Shoreline configuration.
4. Vegetation diversity.
5. Special features such as presence of wildlife, water clarity, or fall foliage.
6. Inharmonious development.

Points will be assigned on the basis of each category's relative significance for adding to, or detracting from (as in # 6), a lake's scenery. A total of 100 points is possible.

Evaluation Process

Only lakes that have met the minimum standards will be evaluated in the field. Each lake will be evaluated by visiting the lakes in a float plane. Information from DEP data files will be used to evaluate shoreline configuration prior to float plane visits. Information on relief, physical features, vegetation diversity, special features, and inharmonious development will be collected in the field. Photographs will be taken at each lake to document its scenic features.

1. Exceptional Relief (30 points)

Complexity of relief is a measure of the layering of relief within a view (Fig. 1). Complexity will be evaluated as high, medium or low during site visits, and the percent coverage that each category covers will be estimated.

Presence of dramatic relief will be recorded. Dramatic relief is defined as steep slopes within close range (e.g., 1 mile) of a lake. A lake's rating for relief will be based on the distribution and complexity of the relief features, and whether or not there is dramatic relief.

2. Physical Features (25 points)

The number and distribution of islands will be determined from visual inspection of topographic maps. Other special features such as cliffs, beaches, rockslides, dams and bouldered shores will be determined from aerial flight visits. A large number, or a few dominant physical features, will result in a higher rating.

3. Shoreline Configuration (20 points)

The minimum possible shoreline for any lake is a circle. Therefore, any deviation from the minimum can be mathematically compared with the formula for a circle to develop an index of configuration. For example, a relatively circular lake would have an index value close to 1, whereas a lake with twice the amount of shoreline of similarly sized circular lake would have an index value 2. Examples of indices are shown in Fig. 2. Higher ratings will be given to lakes with greater shoreline configuration based on this index.

4. Vegetation Diversity (15 points)

The diversity of vegetation gives the viewer a sense of variety. The following vegetation communities will be identified from aerial site visits: hardwood, softwood, mixed forest of hardwood and softwood, pine, wetland, field, etc. The presence of unusual growth forms (i.e., windswept trees) or superstory trees will also be recorded. The presence of a diversity of vegetation

communities, or unusual forms of vegetation will result in a higher rating.

5. Special Features (10 points)

Aerial flight visits will confirm the presence of extreme water clarity or hardwoods that are visible during the fall foliage season. The presence of observable wildlife species will be identified by questionnaires given to regional wildlife biologists from Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. Higher ratings will be given to lakes that have these features.

6. Inharmonious Development (-10 points)

Development does not necessarily detract from a lake's scenic character, but certain land uses or their placement on a lake can be inharmonious. For example, rows of camps lining the edge of a lake detracts from the scenic character because there is nothing to screen the camps from view. The same landscape may have camps positioned so they fit well within their surroundings by having a natural buffer of trees acting as a screen (Fig. 3). The camps with screening have little effect on the scenic character.

Other examples of inharmonious development include power lines or roads that are sited straight up over a hillside, shorelines that are heavily eroded, or dams that are intrusive. These features will be documented during the field visits and negative points assigned based on their how detractive and dominant they are.

**MAINE LAKE STUDY:
METHODS FOR SHORELINE CHARACTER**

Participants

Hank Tyler, coordinator
State Planning Office
Critical Areas Program

Field Survey:
Drew Parkin
John Lortie

Category Description

Shoreline character refers to those factors that make the shore area of a lake suitable for recreation pursuits such as swimming, diving, wading, camping, picnicking, fishing, and boating. Shoreline character is a combination of the physical characteristics of the lake itself and of the adjacent land area. Desirable lake characteristics include hard substrate, open water, and adequate depth. Shore characteristics include beaches, bedrock ledges, and open shorelines. While somewhat analogous to the project's "Physical features" category, "shoreline character" has a markedly different emphasis. The physical features category places emphasis on scientific and natural significance of lake related geologic and hydrologic phenomena. By contrast, the shoreline character category focuses on the public use potential of the lake shoreline.

Information Sources

There currently exists no base of consistent published or unpublished information on Maine's lake shoreline character.

Minimum Standards

To meet the study's minimum significance standards, a lake must be recognized as possessing noteworthy shoreline characteristics by means of:

1. Inspection of aerial photographs;
2. Field reconnaissance; or
3. Input from knowledgeable resource specialists.

In setting minimum standards, it is understood that the resulting list of lakes may not be all inclusive. Other lakes with shoreline characteristics merit recognition may go unreported due to a lack of current information.

Evaluation Criteria

Three major factors will determine the significance of lakes for shoreline character: beaches, bedrock ledges, and open shorelines. Due to the current lack of available information, quantitative evaluation criteria have not been developed. As an alternative, each of the above factors has been described and desirable qualities and potential public uses identified. The objective of the evaluation will be to identify lakes with shoreline features that best meet these descriptions.

Evaluation Process

Aerial photograph inspection and field reconnaissance will be conducted as a adjunct to the study's scenic qualities assessment. Aerial photograph inspection will be limited to identifying major beach complexes. Field reconnaissance will be accomplished using a float plane that will fly over and land on lakes being evaluated for scenic quality. A shoreline character evaluation form will be completed for each of these lakes. The form will characterize the shoreline, note the presence of beaches, ledges, open shorelands, and other shore features, and determine whether these features are "few or small," "large or dominant," or "extensive." A preliminary judgment regarding overall significance will also be made.

It is recognized that collected information will be qualitative. No attempt, therefore, will be made to tabulate results in any quantitative manner. Rather, information will be arrayed for each lake and an effort made to identify significant concentrations of features, unique occurrences, etc. Lakes will be given ratings of "significant" or "outstanding." Any lake with an identified beach will at the minimum be given a rating of significant. Lakes with dispersed or predominant ledges or open shorelines will receive a similar rating. An outstanding rating will be reserved for lakes with a high diversity of shore features or a unique shore feature (large slab or protruding ledge, extensive beach, etc.).

Preliminary findings will be listed by geographic area and distributed for review to persons with a knowledge of each area. Reviewers will be asked to verify findings and, as appropriate, to add to these findings. Those asked to participate will likely include:

1. Maine Bureau of Parks and Recreation Regional Managers;
2. Maine Bureau of Public Lands Regional Managers; and
3. Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Wardens and/or Retired Regional Biologists.

Data Entries

1. Lake Identifiers
2. General Character
 - o forested to shore
 - o peat/marsh
 - o beach
 - o bedrock ledge
 - o boulder
 - o other (identify)
3. Beaches
 - o narrow shoreline
 - o broad shoreline
 - o pocket
 - o spit
4. Bedrock Ledges
 - o protruding
 - o slab
 - o rocky shore
5. Open Shorelines
 - o access from water
 - o campsite potential
6. Overall Significance

**MAINE LAKES STUDY:
METHODS FOR CULTURAL FEATURES**

Participants

Arthur Spiess, Prehistoric Archeology
Robert Bradley, Historic Archeology
Frank Beard, Historic Structures
Maine Historic Preservation Commission

Category Description

For the purposes of this study, cultural resources include lake related prehistoric archeological sites, historic archeological sites and historic structures, districts and landmarks which may be evaluated in terms of the criteria from the National Register of Historic Places. Other lake related cultural features of significance such as Indian canoe routes will also be included in this category.

The area of concern for this category includes land within 250 feet of the lakeshore or beyond that area, if a cultural feature has been identified with direct connection to the lake in terms of cultural importance.

Assessments will be based on existing survey, inventory and National and State Register data bases.

Information Sources

Published sources of information for the historic structures category include Maine's Historic Places and the National Register of Historic Places. The Maine Archeological Survey will be a major source of both mapped and written information for prehistoric archeological resources. The Statewide Historic Archeological Inventory will be the major source of information for the historic archaeological category. The U.S. Forest Service is a source of information for historic archeological information for the White Mountain National Forest. Indian canoe route information will be gathered using publications.

Individual resource experts will provide information and expertise to determine the significance of features for the purpose of this study.

Minimum Standards

Archeological sites and historic structures will be required to have direct connection with the lake(s) in terms of cultural importance to be noted as significant by this study.

Evaluation Criteria

The criteria for evaluating cultural features are defined for each of the existing programs, surveys or registers, and those criteria will apply to lake related features identified in this assessment.

For example, for the historic structures category, the general criteria for evaluating potential entries to the National Register of Historic Places include the following:

The quality of significance relating to American history, architecture, archeology, and culture that is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and that:

- a. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the State's history;
- b. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in the state's past;
- c. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- d. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The criteria for inclusion of prehistoric archeological sites in the State of Maine's Archeological Survey essentially revolve around items a, b and d above, but include a judgment concerning the nature of preservation of the data in the archeological site. The basic rule of thumb is that an archeological site that has been so disturbed that it would not yield much information to controlled excavation is rarely considered significant to the National Register. The most common source of disturbance of lake-shore sites is erosion, caused by raised basin levels and wind-driven waves. These factors remove soil, roll and abrade stone artifacts, and destroy the more fragile types of archeological features (charcoal, etc.).

The criteria for inclusion in the Statewide Historic Archeological Sites Inventory is that a site displays evidence of historical events, places and activities from the 17th through 20th centuries. The inventory includes sites where artifacts

have been recovered that portray, for example, fishing activities, trading posts and civilian conservation corps camps.

Evaluation Process

Lake-related prehistoric archeological sites will be identified through the Maine Historic Preservation Commission's Archeological Survey by using the mapped information on file at the Commission to locate sites within the area of concern for lakes under consideration. Once identified, resource experts will review survey information to determine the types of sites and their significance for the purposes of this study.

Lake-related historic archeological sites will be identified through the Statewide Historic Archeological Sites Inventory using mapped and written information to locate sites within the area of concern for lakes under consideration. Again, once identified, resource experts will determine their significance based on the criteria described earlier.

Lake-related historic structures will be identified through the Maine Historic Preservation Commission by using the information in the Commission's files of National Register materials. Each site has its own file which includes descriptions of the site and USGS maps showing the location of the structure. The quality of significance is present by virtue of being entered on the register. Therefore, any site that is found to have direct connection with the lake(s) in terms of cultural importance, which is an entry on the register, will be included in the assessment of lake-related cultural resources.

An assessment of the overall cultural significance of any given lake will include consideration of each of the above features.

Data Entries

The information fields that will be included in the final computerized data system will indicate known and potential significant cultural features for each lake under 4 general groups: prehistoric archeological features, historic archeological features, historic structures and other lake-related cultural features. If the significance of a cultural feature is not known, that will also be indicated. For prehistoric archeological features, the number of sites associated with each lake and a summary of their overall significance will be indicated. These data will be collected by USGS quadrangle. For historic archeological sites and historic structures, a description, site number and significance by site or structure will be noted. For lakes with more than one historic archeological site or historic structure, an overall significance rating will be indicated. The length and overall significance of canoe routes will also be noted.

Appendix B: Data Management Strategy

(Excerpt from the Maine Lakes Study Work Plan, February 1988)

Background

The project contract for the Maine Lakes Study stipulates that the contractor is responsible for recommending a system for managing natural resource data on significant lakes in the State of Maine. The objective is to develop information that is compatible with computerized data bases maintained by the following programs:

- 1) Maine Critical Areas Program (CAP);
- 2) Maine Endangered and Nongame Wildlife Program (ENWP);
- 3) The Nature Conservancy Heritage Program (TNC);
- 4) Land Use Regulation Commission (LURC);
- 5) Department of Inland Fish and Wildlife (DIFW) Fisheries Division; and
- 6) Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

In addition, the data management format should be consistent with the program report, "Recommendations for a Maine Natural Areas Data Management System", prepared by Joseph M. Chaisson for the Maine Land and Water Resources Council.

The agencies and organizations listed above use the following computer hardware software systems:

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Hardware</u>	<u>Software</u>
CAP	obtaining IBM compatible PC	D-Base III plus
ENWP	IBM PC	R-Base System V
TNC Heritage Prog.	IBM compatible PC	D-Base III plus
LURC	Burroughs minicomputer	R-Base 5000
DIFW Fisheries	mainframe	SAS software
DEP	mainframe	custom program, SAS (Storet)
	obtaining IBM compatible PC	no decision

The Chaisson report recommends that the following actions be taken to improve and augment existing data management systems:

1. Natural area data files from the Maine Critical Areas Program should be automated using the Nature Conservancy Heritage Program data management system.
2. Using R-Base System V data management software to ensure compatibility with IF&W data, the Endangered and Nongame Wildlife Program should automate its data file structure for optimal compatibility with the Heritage Program system.
3. The State Planning Office (SPO) should create and maintain an index file and map series containing information on significant natural areas. The information should be made available to state regulatory agencies, regional planning commissions and other users.
4. File structure for the Endangered and Nongame Wildlife Program and The Nature Conservancy should be designed and modified to ensure compatibility with the Department of Conservation geographic information system (MEGIS).
5. The Critical Areas Program lakes study should use the LURC lakes data base to guarantee compatibility with LURC data files as well as with analytic procedures developed in the study.
6. To provide sufficient natural areas information to users, the State government should allocate necessary funding to improve natural areas program data management.

Recommendations

Taking a statewide perspective on management of lakes information, the contractor makes the following recommendations:

1. Information collected for the State Planning Office study should be encoded into IBM PC format using D-Base III plus software.
2. Prior to initiating this study, a baseline data set should be obtained from DIFW which includes the name, MIDAS number, and other basic data parameters for all lakes that are within Maine's organized townships. A list of these data parameters is attached. Lakes partially within LURC jurisdiction should be excluded as these were inventoried by the previous study. (Note that Lakeville, Wallagrass, and Brighton townships contain both organized and unorganized areas.)
3. Prior to initiating the study, a series of D-Base III plus data files should be set up, to include:

- a.) one file for each resource category
 - b.) a summary data file, and
 - c.) a baseline data file (as obtained from DIFW).
4. The data files for each resource category should include a list of all lakes together with basic locators, i.e., lake name, MIDAS number, township, and surface area.
 5. The consultants to the State Planning Office lakes project should, to the extent practical, encode collected information directly into the project's D-Base data files. Computer files would take the place of the manual files originally envisioned and would be turned over to the State Planning Office as one of the project's final products. (Note that this is not an actual requirement of the contract.)
 6. Fisheries information should initially be encoded into the DIFW computer system then merged with the SPO data format.
 7. Information should be reported and encoded using protocol similar to that of the Land Use Regulation Commission lakes assessment, e.g., "outstanding", "significant", etc.
 8. To the extent possible, the structure of the data system (data files, fields, abbreviations, etc.) should parallel the existing Land Use Regulation Commission data base. Revisions to the wildlife inventory method will require a substantial modification though critical data fields will be consistent with the LURC data system.
 9. Information collected through this study should be made available to the agencies listed above by means of 5 1/4 inch floppy discs in D-Base or ASCII format. Most likely, users will wish to access information by means of MIDAS number (LURC, DIFW Fisheries, DEP) or township (CAP, ENWP, TNC). Both locators should be provided.
 10. At the conclusion of the study a single, statewide lakes data base should be assembled which, for each lake, would include:
 - a.) lake identifiers and locators,
 - b.) summary information from the Maine Lakes Study,
 - c.) summary information from the DIFW fish data base, and
 - d.) information from other available resource data bases.

One agency should be selected to house this master data base and to provide information as appropriate. (Note that the Department of Environmental Protection has been designated by the State legislature as the agency principally responsible for storing environmental data.)

11. Protocol should be devised for data system update and revision. Example: Principal users could coordinate activities such that future lake related information collected by any agency or organization might be easily transferred from its data base to the master lake data base or to the data bases of others maintaining lake information.

12. To contribute to the overall data development effort, the Maine Lakes Study should focus on collecting the following information:

a. Fish

Cold water species
Warm water species
Habitat quality
Recreation value

b. Wildlife

Important nongame species
Important game species
Wetland habitat
Riparian habitat
Wildlife viewing

c. Physical Features

Geologic:

Significant fossil localities
Relic shorelines
Significant bedrock outcrops
Sand beaches
Cliffs
Caves
Waterfalls
Reverse deltas
Significant glacial features
(moraines, kettleholes, boulder trains, etc.)

Hydrologic:

Deep lakes
Water clarity
Springs
Unusual water chemistry
Unusual thermal regimes

d. Botanic Features

Rare species
Unique plant communities

e. Cultural Features

Prehistoric archeology
Historic archeology
Historic structures

f. Scenic Qualities

Relief
Physical features
Shoreline configuration
Diversity of vegetation
Special features (wildlife viewing, water clarity)
Lack of inharmonious development

g. Shoreline Character

Beaches
Rock ledges
Camp/picnic areas

Appendix C: Lakes Questionnaire

As part of its lakes planning effort, the State Planning Office is identifying rare and exemplary lakes. Do you know lakes which have any of the following types of rare features?

	Lake or Pond
1. Boiling springs	_____ _____
2. Extremely low nutrient content	_____ _____
3. Naturally high alkalinity	_____ _____
4. Naturally eutrophic	_____ _____
5. Naturally highly acidic	_____ _____
6. Chemically stratified meromictic-lakes	_____ _____
7. Rare diatom or benthic communities	_____ _____
8. High use eagle feeding areas	_____ _____
9. Rare fish species	_____ _____
10. Black tern or Banapartes gull nesting areas	_____ _____
11. Rare aquatic plants	_____ _____

12. Oscillatoria Rubescence

13. Patterned bog ponds

14. Cirques and tarns

15. Grabens

16. Iron concretions in the
sediments

17. Underwater cliffs

18. Diatomaceous earth

19. Reverse deltas

20. Relic shorelines

21. Unusual freshwater
beaches

22. Extreme depth

Do you know lakes which are outstanding examples of the following common lake types?

1. Oligotrophic lakes _____

2. Mesotrophic lakes _____

3. Exemplary two story fisheries - warm and cold water species _____

4. Exemplary brook trout fishery _____

5. Exemplary smelt, salmon fishery _____

6. Exemplary lake trout fishery _____

7. Exemplary warm water fishery _____

8. Barren ponds _____

9. Exemplary benthic communities _____

10. Kettle hole ponds _____

11. Lakes in classic U-shaped valleys _____

12. Exemplary beach types _____

13. Moraine and bedrock dams _____

14. Chains of ponds _____

3. Are there other rare or exemplary lake types beyond these listed above which you feel should be identified?

	Type	Lake or Pond
Rare water features	_____ _____	_____ _____
Rare biotic features	_____ _____	_____ _____
Rare geologic features	_____ _____	_____ _____
Exemplary water features	_____ _____	_____ _____
Exemplary biotic features	_____ _____	_____ _____
Exemplary geologic features	_____ _____	_____ _____

Appendix D: Summary of Findings for Lakes in Maine's Organized Townships

On the following pages all lakes that are ten acres or more in size are listed alphabetically by township. For each lake the final ratings from each resource category (fish, cultural features, etc.) are presented. An "O" signifies an outstanding resource, while an "S" signifies a significant resource. A blank indicates that either the lake did not meet the study's minimum standards for that particular resource or there was inadequate information to draw conclusions.

Lakes that are located wholly or partially in unorganized townships are not included. For a summary of findings on these lakes see Maine Wildlands Lake Assessment: Findings (June 1, 1987) or contact the Land Use Regulation Commission.

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ABBOT											
GREENLEAF P	0778	E	27						S		2
PIPER P	0298	E	420						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ACTON											
GREAT EAST L	3922	A	1768						S		2
HANSEN P	3928	A	30						S		2
HORN P	3924	A	205 0						S		1B
LION P	9695	A	94						S		2
MOOSE P	3926	A	27						S		2
MOUSAM L	3838	A	900		0			S	S		1B
SQUARE P	3916	A	910 0		S			S	S		1B
SWAN P	3930	A	11						S	S	2
WILSON L	3920	A	288 0		S			S	S		1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ALBION											
LOVEJOY P	5176	B	324							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ALEXANDER											
PLEASANT L	0159	C	339		S			S	S		2
POCAMOONSHINE L	1290	C	2464		S				0	0	1A
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ALFRED											
SHAKER P	3976	A	78						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ALLAGASH											
FALLS P (LITTLE)	1486	G	74						S	0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ALNA											
PINKHAM P	5402	B	21								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ALTON											
HATCH (MANSELL) P	9857	F	10						S		2
HOLLAND P	2150	F	92						S		2
PICKEREL P	2152	F	77						S		2
PUG P	2154	F	12						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: AMHERST											
DEBEC P	4580	C	31						S		2
DUTTON P	4570	C	17								3
HALFMILE P	4558	C	29				0		S		1B
JELLISON HILL P	4575	C	45				S	S	S		2
PARTRIDGE P	4556	C	28						S		2
TROUT P	4562	C	6								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: APPLETON											
SENNEBEC P	5682	B	532			S			S		2

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
THE TARN	4456	C	8		0						1B
WITCH HOLE P	4458	C	28					S			2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: BATH											
HOUGHTON P	5226	B	14					S			2
HOUGHTON P	5226	B	14					S			2
LILY P	0039	B	11					S			2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: BEDDINGTON											
BEDDINGTON L	4524	C	404					S			2
SOUTHWEST P	1208	C	138					S			2
SPRUCE MOUNTAIN L	1228	C	448					S			2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: BELFAST											
MASON P (LOWER)	5526	B	30							S	2
MASON P (UPPER)	4828	B	75							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: BELGRADE											
CHAMBERLAIN P	0465	B	6								3
GREAT P	5274	B	8239		S			0		S	1B
HAMILTON P	5276	B	19		S					S	2
LONG P	5272	B	2714	S				0		0	1A
MESSALONSKEE L	5280	B	3510					S		S	2
PENNY P	5286	B	44							S	2
SALMON L (ELLIS P)	5352	B	666					0		S	1B
WELLMAN P	5434	B	9								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: BELMONT											
TILDEN P	4844	B	383					S		S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: BERWICK											
BEAVER DAM P	6967	A	19						S	0	1B
MURDOCK P	3931	A	300					S	S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: BIDDEFORD											
WILCOX P	5620	A	4								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: BLUE HILL											
FIRST (BILLINGS) P	4650	C	93				S	S	S		2
FOURTH P	4654	C	50						S		2
NOYES (NORRIS) P	4656	C	23								3
SECOND (DOUGLAS) P	4648	C	62								3
THIRD (WOODS) P	4652	C	206				0		S		1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: BOOTHBAY											
ADAMS P	5366	B	73						S	S	2
KNICKERBOCKER P	5368	B	105						S		2

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CAMBRIDGE											
CAMBRIDGE P	0748	B	38							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CAMDEN											
HOSMER P	4808	B	53							S	2
MEGUNTICOOK L	4852	B	1305				0		S	S	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CANAAN											
LAKE GEORGE	2608	B	335					S	S	0	1B
SIBLEY P	2612	B	380							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CANTON											
FOREST P	3602	A	45				S	S	S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CAPE ELIZABETH											
GREAT P	5648	A	169						S	S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CARATUNK											
BAKER P	0242	D	186	S					0		1B
DIMMICK P (BIG)	0236	D	90						S		2
DIMMICK P (LITTLE)	0240	D	41						S		2
DIMMICK P (MOUNTAIN)	0238	D	50						S		2
HEALD P	0234	D	31						S		2
HEALD P (LITTLE)	9909	D	26						S		2
MACDOUGALL P	0403	D	18								3
ROBINSON P	0220	D	40						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CARTHAGE											
HALFMOON P	3514	D	53				0		S		1B
PODUNK P	3684	D	51						S	S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CASCO											
COFFEE P	3390	A	137		S				S		2
DUMPLING P	3698	A	30		S				S	S	2
OWL P	3386	A	20						S		2
PARKER P	3388	A	166						S		2
THOMAS P	3392	A	442			S			S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CHAPMAN											
ALDER BROOK L	1779	G	16						S		3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CHARLOTTE											
COLEBACK L	1446	C	25						S		2
JAMES P	9671	C	31						S		2
LEDGE (BALD LEDGE) P	9673	C	17						S		2
PENNAQUAN L	1402	C	1209		S			S	S	S	1B
ROUND L	0171	C	558		S				S		2

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CHELSEA											
TINKHAM P	5436	B	17								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CHESTERVILLE											
EGYPT P	5218	B	60						S		2
CROWELL P	5200	D	211						S		2
HORSESHOE P	5208	D	51						S		2
NORCROSS P	5214	D	122						S		2
NORTH P	5206	D	170						S		2
ROUND P	5212	D	13								3
SAND P	5204	D	81						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CHINA											
BRANCH P	5754	B	316						S	O	1B
CHINA L	5448	B	3845						S	S	2
DUTTON P	5724	B	57							S	2
EVANS P	5414	B	19							S	2
THREEMILE P	5416	B	1162						S	O	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CLIFTON											
BURNT P (LITTLE)	4266	C	15								3
FITTS P	4268	C	106						S		2
PARKS P	4272	C	124				S		S		2
SNOWSHOE P	9653	C	8								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: COLUMBIA											
MEYERS P (NORTH)	0181	C	6								3
MEYERS P (SOUTH)	0183	C	3								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CONCORD TWP											
TIBBETTS P	0184	D	6								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CORINNA											
BROOKS P	2262	B	31							O	1B
MOWER P	5476	B	75						S	S	2
WEYMOUTH P	5478	B	87							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CORNVILLE											
BARKER P	2600	D	106						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: CRAWFORD											
BARROWS L	1298	C	281						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: DAMARISCOTTA											
BISCAY P	5710	B	377						S		2
LITTLE P	5706	B	60						O		1B

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: DOVER-FOXCROFT											
BRANNS MILL P	4130	E	271						0		1B
SNOW'S P	4131	E	21								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: DURHAM											
RUNAROUND P	3786	A	91					S	S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: EAGLE LAKE											
DICKWOOD L	5816	G	96								3
ISIE L	1632	G	3								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: EAST MACHIAS											
HADLEY L	1352	C	1776		S			S	S	0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: EASTBROOK											
ABRAMS P	4444	C	423						S		2
MOLASSES P	4448	C	1252				S		S		2
WEBB P	4346	C	915						0		1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: EASTON											
BENNETT L	1824	G	12						S		2
LINDSAY L	1822	G	6								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: EDDINGTON											
EDDINGTON (DAVIS) P	4276	C	417	S					S		3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: EDGECOMB											
LILY P	5358	B	67							0	1B
SHERMAN L	5404	B	216					S		0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ELIOT											
YORK P	9713	A	47	S					S	S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ELLSWORTH											
BRANCH L	4328	C	2703	S					0		1B
LEONARD L	9663	C	90						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: EMBDEN											
BLACK HILL P	0079	D	34						S		2
EMBDEN P	0078	D	1568						S	0	1B
FAHI P	0074	D	196						S	0	1B
SANDY P	0076	D	107						S	0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ENFIELD											
COLD STREAM P	2146	F	3628						0	S	1B

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: FRYEBURG											
BLACK P	5564	A	20								3
BOG P	3248	A	45					S		S	2
CHARLES P	3206	A	90				S		S		2
CLAY P	5566	A	25							S	1B
HUNT P	3258	A	25						S		2
KEZAR P	9709	A	1299	0		S	S	S	0		1A
KIMBALL P (LOWER)	3240	A	486	0			S	S	S		1B
LITTLE P	5580	A	9								3
LOVENELL P	3254	A	1120	0			S		S		1B
PEAT P	5570	A	5								3
PLEASANT P	3252	A	239				S		S		2
ROUND P	5576	A	5								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: GARDINER											
PLEASANT (MUD) P	5254	B	746				S		S	S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: GARLAND											
GARLAND P	4128	B	102							S	2
GARLAND P (WEST)	4126	B	32							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: GORHAM											
ALDEN'S P	0515	A	1								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: GOULDSBORO											
FORBES P	4464	C	208						S		2
JONES P	4466	C	467						S		2
LILY P	4470	C	19						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: GRAY											
CRYSTAL L (DRY P)	3708	A	189				S		S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: GREENE											
ALLEN P	3788	B	183						S		2
BERRY P	3794	B	31								3
SABATTUS P	3796	B	1962				0		S	S	1B
SABATTUS P (LITTLE)	3790	B	25								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: GREENVILLE											
GRENELL P	9853	E	6								3
MUD P (LITTLE)	0400	E	13						S		2
SALMON P	0346	E	12						S		2
SAWYER P	0386	E	67						S	S	2
SECRET P	0344	E	14						S		2
WILSON P (LOWER)	0342	E	1380						0	S	1B

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
TRACY P	2290	B	52						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: HERSEY											
CRYSTAL L	3662	F	137						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: HIRAM											
BARKER P	3136	A	206						S		2
CLEMONS P (BIG)	3174	A	85						S		2
CLEMONS P (LITTLE)	3176	A	25						S		2
JAYBIRD P	3178	A	14						0	S	1B
SOUTHEAST P	3138	A	173						S		2
STANLEY P	3182	A	137						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: HOLDEN											
HOLBROOK P	4274	C	280						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: HOLEB TWP											
CEDAR P	2654	E	5								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: HOLLIS											
DEER P	5016	A	32		S				S		2
KILLICK P	5014	A	45		S				S	0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: HOPE											
ALFORD L	4798	B	577						S		2
FISH P	4802	B	142							S	2
HOBBS P	4806	B	264				S			S	2
LERMOND P	4800	B	171							S	2
LILY P	4796	B	29								3
MANSFIELD P	4842	B	40							S	3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: HOLLTON											
LOGAN L	9777	G	13						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: HOWLAND											
POND FARM P	9863	F	125						S	0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: HUDSON											
PUSHAW P (LITTLE)	2156	F	411						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: INDUSTRY											
CLEARWATER P	5190	D	751						S	S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ISLE AU HAUT											
LONG P (TURNERS L)	5562	B	73	S							2

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LEWISTON											
NO NAME P	3882	B	143								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LIBERTY											
CARGILL P	4884	B	69						S		2
COLBY P	4898	B	26						S		2
SAINTE GEORGE L	9971	B	1095					0	0		1A
STEVENS P	4886	B	336						0		1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LIMERICK											
HOLLAND (SOKOSIS) P	3942	A	192		S			S	S		2
PICKEREL P	3940	A	46						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LIMESTONE											
TRAFTON L	9779	G	85						S	0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LIMINGTON											
BOYD P	5008	A	26						S		2
BOYD P (LITTLE)	6895	A	10						S		2
DOLES P	5006	A	25						S	S	2
HORNE (PEQUAMKET) P	3408	A	166						S		2
SAND P	5012	A	26 0		S				S		1B
WARDS P	3410	A	44						S	S	2
WEBSTER'S MILL P	6889	A	40						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LINCOLN											
CAMBOLASSE P	2214	F	211						S		2
CARIBOU, EGG, LONG P	2216	F	825						S		2
CENTER P	2218	F	192						S	S	2
COLD STREAM P (UPPER)	2232	F	685						S		2
CROOKED P	2220	F	220						S		2
FOLSOM P	2222	F	282						S		2
MATTANAWCOOK P	2226	F	832						S		2
ROUND P (LITTLE)	2224	F	75						S		2
SNAG (STUMP) P	2228	F	160						S		2
UPPER P	2230	F	506						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LINCOLNVILLE											
COLEMAN P	4846	B	223							0	1B
MOODY P	4838	B	61							S	2
NORTON P	4850	B	133							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LINNEUS											
DREWS (MEDUXNEKEAG) L	1736	G	1057		S				0	0	1A
HUNTER (TOWN LINE) P	1046	G	12						S	S	2
MUD P	1734	G	19						S	0	1B

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LITCHFIELD											
BUKER P	5242	B	75					S		S	2
JIMMY P	5244	B	40							S	2
LOON P	5246	B	26							S	2
PURGATORY P (LITTLE)	5250	B	44							S	2
SAND P (TACOMA LKS)	5238	B	177					S		S	2
WOODBURY P	5240	B	436					S		S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LITTLETON											
CARRY L	1050	G	20		S			S			2
DEEP L	1052	G	6		S						2
LONG L	1048	G	19		S						2
MONSON L	1054	G	6		S						2
ROSS L	1020	B	32		S			S			2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LIVERMORE											
BARTLETT P	3820	B	28					S			2
BRETTUN'S P	3608	B	165					S		S	2
LONG P	3816	B	208							S	2
NELSON P	3610	B	17				S	S		S	2
ROUND P	3818	B	161							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LIVERMORE FALLS											
MOOSE HILL P	5790	B	95					S		S	2
SCHOOLHOUSE P	5674	B	21							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LOVELL											
BRADLEY P	3220	A	34					S			2
CUSHMAN P	3224	A	32					S			2
DAN CHARLES P	3226	A	20					S		S	2
FARRINGTON P	3200	A	89				S	S			2
HORSESHOE P	3196	A	131				S	S			2
KEZAR L	0097	A	2600		S					0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LOWELL											
TROUT P	4716	F	20					S			2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: LYMAN											
BUNGANUT P	3980	A	280					S		S	2
KENNEBUNK P	3998	A	224		S			S		0	1A
PARKER (BARKER) P	5036	A	26		S			S			2
ROBERTS & WADLEY PDS	5034	A	203					S		S	2
ROUND P	5038	A	6								3
SWAN P	5032	A	147					S			2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MADAWASKA											
GERMAIN L	1806	G	122					0		S	1B

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MADISON											
WESSERUNSETT L	0070	D	1446					S	S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MADRID											
BEAL (TROUT) P	2320	D	32				S		S		2
HARVEY P	3570	D ^h	10						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MANCHESTER											
FAIRBANKS P	5296	B	14							S	2
HUTCHINSON P	5304	B	100							O	1B
JAMIES (JIMMIE) P	5302	B	107					S		S	2
SHED P	5300	B	37							O	1B
TYLER P	5298	B	17					S		S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MAPLETON											
HANSON BROOK L	9767	G	118					S			2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MARIAVILLE											
HOPKINS P	4538	C	442				O	O	S		1A
WEBB P (LITTLE)	4348	C	77						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MARSHFIELD											
KEELEY L	1278	C	49					S			2
LILY L (LITTLE)	1356	C	6								3
MARKS L (FIRST)	1282	C	240					S			2
MARKS L (SECOND)	1276	C	51		S			S			2
SIX MILE L	1280	C	55					S			2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MERRILL											
READ L	1716	G	5								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MONMOUTH											
ANNABESSACOOK L	9961	B	1420					O		O	1A
COCHNEWAGON P	3814	B	410					S		O	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MONROE											
BASIN P	5488	B	19							O	1B
THISTLE P	5486	B	12							O	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MONSON											
BELL P	0340	E	19					S		S	2
DOE P	0372	E	54					S			2
DOUGHTY P (LOWER)	0376	E	20				S		S		2
DOUGHTY P (UPPER)	0374	E	13				S		S		2
HEBRON L	0301	E	525						S		2
MONSON P	0380	E	359						O		1B

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: MT CHASE											
LAWTON P	9773	F	4								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NAPLES											
BAY OF NAPLES	9685	A	762						S		2
COLD RAIN P	3376	A	38			S			S	S	2
TRICKEY P	3382	A	311						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NEW GLOUCESTER											
LILY P	3702	A	38						S		2
SABBATHDAY L	3700	A	340		S				S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NEW LIMERICK											
BRADBURY (BARKER) L	9763	G	38						S		2
COCHRANE L	1744	G	79						S	S	2
COUNTY ROAD L	1742	G	25						S		2
GLANCY L	1032	G	22						S		2
GOULD P	1738	G	55								3
GREEN P	1034	G	29						S	S	2
HANNIGAN P	1740	G	6								3
LAMBERT P	9775	G	6								3
NICKERSON L	1036	G	234		S				0		1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NEW SHARON											
MCINTIRE P	5328	D	20						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NEWFIELD											
ADAMS P (ROCK HAVEN)	3890	A	210		S		S		S		2
BALCH & STUMP PONDS	3898	A	704						S	0	1B
DREW P	3888	A	5								3
MUD P	3902	A	9								3
PINKHAM P (HIDDEN L)	3896	A	49						S		2
POVERTY P (BIG)	0157	A	166		S		S		S		2
ROUND P	3900	A	3								3
SMARTS P	3932	A	20						S	S	2
SYMMES P	3892	A	36						S		2
TURNER P (MIRROR L)	3894	A	32						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NEWPORT											
NOKOMIS P	5480	B	199							S	2
SEBASTICOOK L	2264	B	4288	0					S	0	1A
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NOBLEBORO											
COOKS P	5696	B	73							0	1B
DUCKPUDDLE P	5702	B	293							S	2
PEMAQUID P	5704	B	1515						0	0	1A

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NORTH BERWICK											
BAUNEAG BEG L	3992	A	200		S				S		2
CIDER MILL P	3868	A	10								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NORTH HAVEN											
FRESH P	5504	B	85							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NORTHFIELD											
BOG L	1258	C	826		S			S	S		2
FULTON L	1260	C	96						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NORTHPORT											
KNIGHT P	5528	B	102 0				S			0	1B
PITCHER P	4848	B	367 0							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: NORWAY											
BIRD P	9693	A	4								3
NORTH P	3500	A	175 S						S		2
PENNESSEEWASSEE (LT)	0367	A	96						S		2
PENNESSEEWASSEE L	3434	A	922			S			S		2
SAND P	3432	A	141						S		2
SPECK P #1	3490	A	4				S				2
SPECK P #2	3492	A	14				S				2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: OAKFIELD											
LONG L	1752	G	55						S	S	2
SPALDING L	1750	G	125						S		2
TIMONEY L	1748	G	57						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: OAKLAND											
MCGRATH P	5348	B	486						S	0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: OLD ORCHARD BEACH											
MILLIKEN MILLS P	6859	A	10						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: OLD TOWN											
PUSHAW L	0080	F	5056 0			S			S	0	1A
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ORIENT											
DEERING L	0507	F	474						S		2
NORTH L	1063	F	970						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ORLAND											
ALAMODSOOK L	4336	C	1133			0			S		1B
CRAIG P	4332	C	218				0	S	S		1B
HEART P	4338	C	73						S		2

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
PATTEN P (UPPER)	4342	C	361						S		2
ROCKY P	4330	C	153								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ORRINGTON											
BREWER L	4284	C	881						S		2
FIELDS P	4282	C	182						S		2
SMETTS (SWEETS) P	5544	C	125						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: OTIS											
BEECH HILL P	4352	C	1351						S		2
BURNT P	4354	C	70								3
FLOODS P	4370	C	654				0	0	0		1A
ROCKY P	4358	C	128							S	2
SPRINGY P (LOWER)	4540	C	114						S		2
YOUNGS P	4360	C	13						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: OTISFIELD											
MOOSE P	3438	A	160						S	S	2
PLEASANT L	3446	A	1077						S		2
SATURDAY P	3440	A	179						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: OXFORD											
GREEN P	3768	A	38	0		S			S		1B
HOGAN P	3770	A	177	0		S			S		1B
MUD P	3756	A	19			S			S		2
THOMPSON L	3444	A	4426			S			0		1B
WHITNEY P	3772	A	170			S			S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: PALERMO											
BEECH P	5726	B	59							0	1B
BELDEN P	5730	B	24						S	0	1B
BOWLER (BELTON) P	5732	B	34						S	S	2
CHISHOLM P	4910	B	41							0	1B
FOSTER (CROTCH) P	5748	B	31							S	2
JUMP P	5740	B	29							0	1B
PRESCOTT P	5746	B	14							S	2
SABAN P	5744	B	11							0	1B
SHEEPSCOT P	4896	B	1193						S	0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: PALMYRA											
WHITES P	5470	B	149							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: PARIS											
COLE P	3782	A	3								3
HALLS P	3780	A	51	S	0				S		1B

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
ROUND (GREY) P	5500	B	134							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: POLAND											
DEAD P	9691	A	5								3
RANGE P (LOWER)	3760	A	290		S	S			S		2
RANGE P (MIDDLE)	3762	A	366						S		2
RANGE P (UPPER)	3688	A	391						S		2
TRIPP P	3758	A	768						S		2
WORTHLEY P	3764	A	42						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: PORTAGE LAKE											
PORTAGE L	1602	G	2474	0					S	0	1A
** TOWNSHIP NAME: PORTER											
BICKFORD P	3158	A	237						S		2
BLACK P	0351	A	50						S	S	2
CHAPMAN P	3168	A	13						0		1B
COLCORD P	3160	A	243				S	S	S		2
HUBBARD P	3162	A	5								3
MINE P	3164	A	58		S		0	S	S		1B
PLAIN P	3166	A	16				S		S		2
SPECTACLE P #1	3170	A	57						S		2
SPECTACLE P #2	3172	A	45						S		2
TRAFTON P	3180	A	56						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: PORTLAND											
CAPISIC P	9681	A	4								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: PRESQUE ISLE											
ARNOLD BROOK L	0409	G	395	S					S	0	1B
ECHO L	1776	G	90						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: PROSPECT											
HALFMOON P	5536	B	176							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: RANGELEY											
CLOUTMAN P	3952	D	20								3
DODGE P	3528	D	230						S		2
QUIMBY P	3526	D	165						0		1B
ROSS P	3530	D	26						S		2
ROUND P	3524	D	166						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: RAYMOND											
CRESCENT L	3696	A	716		S				S		2
NOTCHED P	3706	A	77						S		2
NUBBLE P	3692	A	23						S		2
PANTHER P	3694	A	1439		S	0			S		1B

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
RAYMOND P	3690	A	346						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: READFIELD											
BRAINARD P	5306	B	20							S	2
MILL P	5308	B	12							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: RIPLEY											
RIPLEY P	0746	B	240							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ROBBINSON											
EASTERN L	1440	C	38						S		2
GOULDING L	1434	C	18						S		2
MONEYMAKER L	1438	C	32						S		2
RAND L	1432	C	18								3
WESTERN L	1436	C	68						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ROCKPORT											
CHICKAWAUKIE P	4822	B	352						S		3
GRASSY P	4812	B	188							S	2
LILLY P	0083	B	29							S	2
MACES P	4820	B	29							S	2
MIRROR L	4814	B	109						S		2
ROCKY P	4816	B	10								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ROME											
NORTH & LITTLE PONDS	5344	B	2873						S	0	1B
WATSON P	5338	B	66							0	1B
WHITTIER P	5336	B	21							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: ROGUE BLUFFS											
SIMPSON P	9752	C	21						S	S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: RUMFORD											
JOES P	7618	D	15				S	0	S		1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SABATTUS											
LOON (SPEAR) P	3806	B	70							S	2
SUTHERLAND P	3808	B	53							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SANFORD											
DEERING P	3844	A	26						S		2
ESTES L	0007	A	387						S		2
SUNKEN P	9679	A	3								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SANGERVILLE											
CENTER P	0760	E	403						S		2
MARR P	0762	E	93						S		2

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SEARSMONT											
LAWRY P	4834	B	83							S	2
LEVENSELLER P	4836	B	34								3
QUANTABACOCK L	4832	B	693							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SEARSPORT											
CAIN P	5522	B	38							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SEBAGO											
PEABODY P	3374	A	735				S	S	S		2
FERLEY P	3378	A	29	S					S		2
SEBAGO L	5786	A	28771	S	S	0	S	0	0		1A
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SEBEC											
DOW P	4138	E	19								3
GARLAND P	4132	E	28						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SEDGWICK											
FROST P	4646	C	154		S		S				2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SHAPLEIGH											
GRANNY KENT P	3908	A	70		S			S	S		2
POVERTY P (LITTLE)	9697	A	13						S		2
SHAPLEIGH P (NORTH)	3950	A	80				S		S		2
SHY BEAVER P	3914	A	25						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SHIRLEY											
BUNKER P (BIG)	8362	E	10						S		2
ORDWAY P	8352	E	94				0		S		1B
SHIRLEY P	8335	E	60						S	S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SIDNEY											
BEAN (EMERY) P	8455	B	4								2
EMERY (MUD) P	8019	B	9							S	2
FIGURE EIGHT P	5294	B	29						S	S	2
GOULD P	5290	B	19							S	2
JOE P	5284	B	40							S	2
LILY P	5288	B	44								3
WARD P	5282	B	52							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SKOWHEGAN											
DAKS P	2614	D	182						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SMITHFIELD											
EAST P	5349	B	1823						S	0	1B

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
** TOWNSHIP NAME: STONEHAM											
BACK (5 KEZARS) P	3199	A	62						S		2
KEEWAYDIN L	3272	A	307						S		2
TROUT P	3212	A	64						0		1B
VIRGINIA L	3274	A	145				0	0	S		1A
WEYMOUTH P	3214	A	16						S		2
WHITNEY P	3216	A	10						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: STONINGTON											
BURNTLAND P	5556	C	20								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: STRONGS											
PORTER L	0012	D	527						S	S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SULLIVAN											
FLANDERS P	4388	C	537						S		2
LONG P	4390	C	58						S		2
TUNK P (LITTLE)	4386	C	141				S	0	S		1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SUMNER											
ABBOTTS P	3472	A	32				0		0		1A
CUSHMAN P	3614	A	15						0		1B
LABRADOR P (BIG)	3598	A	115				S		S	S	2
LABRADOR P (LITTLE)	3600	A	15				S		S	S	2
NORTH P	3616	A	164				S	S	0		1B
PLEASANT P	3612	A	118						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SURRY											
PATTEN P (LOWER)	4344	C	741			S			S		2
TODDY P	4340	C	1987						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SWANS ISLAND											
GOOSE P	4668	C	38 S						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SWANVILLE											
HURDS P	4826	B	49							0	1B
NICHOLS P	4824	B	14						S		2
SWAN L	5492	B	1370						S	S	2
TODDY P	5490	B	156							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: SWEDEN											
KEYS P	3232	A	192						S		2
STEARNS P	3234	A	247						S		2
WEBBER P	3236	A	34						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: TEMPLE											
DRURY P	5192	D	32						S	S	2

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
KIMBALL P	5330	B	55					0	S		1B
WHITTIER P	5184	B	37						0		1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: VINYLHAVEN											
ROUND P	5508	B	6								3
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WALDOBORO											
HAVENER P	5718	B	83							S	2
KALERS P	5700	B	87							S	2
MEDOMAK P	5692	B	237							0	1B
MEDOMAK P (LITTLE)	5694	B	75					S			2
PETERS (GROSS) P	5714	B	12					0		S	1B
SIDENSPARKER P	5722	B	142							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WARREN											
NORTH P	5690	B	338				S			S	2
SOUTH P	5716	B	548				S			S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WASHBURN											
CARIBOU L	1794	G	115	S				S		0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WATERBORO											
BARTLETT P	5026	A	30					S		S	2
BRANCH P (MIDDLE)	3936	A	38					S		S	2
ISINGLASS P	5010	A	30		S			S			2
LONE P	0133	A	8								3
MOODY P	5028	A	18					S			2
NORTHWEST P	3938	A	38					S			2
OSSIPEE FLOWAGE (LIT)	9715	A	1005		S			0		0	1A
OSSIPEE L (LITTLE)	5024	A	564					S			2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WATERFORD											
BEAR P	3420	A	218				S				2
DUCK P	3228	A	37					S			2
ISLAND P	3448	A	166	S				S			2
JEWETT (5 KEZARS) P	3198	A	32					S			2
KEOKA L	3416	A	467	S				0			1B
LONG (MCWAIN) P	3418	A	473					S			2
MIDDLE (5 KEZARS) P	3201	A	72		S			S			2
MOOSE P	3424	A	181				S	S			2
MUD (5 KEZARS) P	3422	A	45					S			2
PAPOOSE P	3414	A	64					S			2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WAYNE											
POCASSET L	3824	B	601							S	2
WILSON P	3832	B	582					S		0	1B

Maine Lakes Assessment
Organized Townships

Lake Name	Lake #	IFW Region	Size (Acres)	Botanic	Physical	Cultural	Scenic	Shoreline	Fisheries	Wildlife	Overall Rating
PETTINGILL P	3716	A	42						S		2
SEBAGO L (LITTLE)	3714	A	1898		S				S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WINDSOR											
MOODY P	5438	B	32							S	2
MUD P	9959	B	52							0	1B
SAVADE P	5442	B	42						S	0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WINSLOW											
MUD P	5412	B	112							0	1B
PATTEE P	5458	B	712							0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WINTER HARBOR											
BIRCH HARBOR P	4468	C	19						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WINTHROP											
BERRY P	3828	B	174							0	1B
COBBOSSEECONTEE (LT)	8065	B	75						S	0	1B
COBBOSSEECONTEE L	5236	B	5543			0			0	0	1A
DEXTER P	3830	B	111							S	2
KEZAR P	5316	B	18							S	2
MARANACOOK L	5312	B	1673						0	0	1A
NARROWS P (LOWER)	8103	B	255						S	0	1B
NARROWS P (UPPER)	8098	B	279						S	S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WISCASSET											
GARDINER P	5406	B	78							S	2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WOODSTOCK											
BRYANT P	3464	A	278	0					S		1B
CONCORD P (BIG)	3466	A	135						S		2
CONCORD P (LITTLE)	3468	A	38				S	S	0		1B
NORTH P	3460	A	284						S		2
SHAGS P	3470	A	64				S		0		1B
WASHBURN P	3476	A	11						S		2
** TOWNSHIP NAME: WOOLWICH											
NEQUASSET P	5222	B	392					S	S	0	1B
** TOWNSHIP NAME: YORK											
PASSACONWAY P	5606	A	26								3
SCITUATE P	5596	A	41						S		2

