

Appendix C

The Commission's Lake Management Program

.....

In June of 1990, the Land Use Regulation Commission amended its 1983 *Comprehensive Land Use Plan* by adopting a document entitled, *Amendment of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Regarding the Development and Conservation of Lakes in Maine's Unorganized Areas*. Concurrently, it adopted changes to its Land Use Districts and Standards which implemented several components of the comprehensive lake management program presented in the Plan Amendment.

Major features of the Commission's 1990 lake management program are reflected in the Water Resources section of this Plan, but some of the background information and other important details were too lengthy to include in the body of this plan. Because of the importance of this planning effort, the entire text of the original Amendment is reproduced here with appropriate changes to update the text. The Commission reaffirms its commitment to its lake management program as summarized in the Water Resources section and detailed below, and it will continue to follow the guidance provided below in managing the lake resources in its jurisdiction. At the same time, the Commission recognizes that periodic reviews were anticipated when the program was first adopted, and that having been in place for nearly 20 years, an evaluation of the program is warranted to ensure that it continues to respond to changing needs in a comprehensive manner.

A. PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT

This amendment to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan incorporated two major planning initiatives undertaken by the Commission — the *Wildlands Lake Assessment* and Lakes Action Program — as well as more current information regarding the relationship between land use and water quality.

B. LAKE ISSUES

The unorganized territories are host to a wealth of lake resources unparalleled in most regions of the nation. These lakes have long been a magnet for sportsmen and outdoor enthusiasts. In recent years, demand for recreational property has grown substantially throughout the northeastern United States. Land costs along Maine's coast have increased dramatically and lake-front properties in areas near population centers have in many cases become saturated with recreational camp development. Seeking both affordable property and a less crowded atmosphere, many people desiring to purchase waterfront property have turned their attention to the recreational opportunities offered by lakes in Maine's unorganized territories.

The demand for development on lake shorelands within Maine's unorganized areas in the 1980s was unprecedented. At virtually every Commission meeting, the Commission considered one or more issues relating to lakes and lake shorelands. Typical development proposals included those for new residences or additions to existing structures, docks and related recreational facilities, subdivisions, and roads. All told, between 1986 and 1988, approximately one-third of all building and development permit applications within the jurisdiction involved lakes. Subdivision applications appeared to be even more heavily weighted toward lakes; upwards of fifty percent of all subdivision applications over those three years involved areas adjacent to lakes. With its expansion both in volume and distribution, lakeshore development had significant potential to affect important natural values, timber harvesting, and traditional uses associated with lakes, such as sporting camps, in the unorganized territories.

While there seemed to be interest in shoreland development on lakes throughout the jurisdiction, there was a trend toward development on medium- to large-sized lakes located near organized townships. In the early 1980s, development attention focused on three main areas: the Rangeley Lakes, the Moosehead Lake region, and the Pemadumcook/Twin Lakes region. In northern Maine, interest in camp development was also evident in the Square, Cross, and Long Lakes region.

While some of the development proposals brought before the Commission were straightforward and non-controversial, an increasing number involved issues that were not easily resolved. Difficult issues that continually confronted the Commission included:

- Camp development on undeveloped lakes;
- Increased vehicle access to undeveloped, backcountry lakes;
- Subdivision development on larger lakes with significant natural, scenic, and recreational values;
- Protection of significant natural resource features outside of designated protection zones;
- Continued development on heavily developed lakes or on lakes with potential water quality problems; and
- Development of private recreational facilities such as docks and access roads where these already exist at other locations on the lake.

The Commission had at its disposal a variety of tools that could be used to regulate use of lake shorelands. These included protective zoning for sensitive areas and code requirements governing setbacks, road construction, timber harvesting, and subdivision of land. While these tools had proved sufficient to manage individual developments, they did not provide the means to effectively plan for the future of these lakes.

Due in part to their numbers, and in part to their remote locations, little information had been available for most lakes in the unorganized territories. This lack of information, and the inadequacy of the existing regulatory framework to deal wisely and comprehensively with lakeshore development, was noted in the 1983 Comprehensive Plan. In fact, the plan highlighted lake protection issues as needing further consideration.

The Commission has always made a special effort to provide for shoreland development while maintaining protection of significant natural values. Nonetheless, in the mid-1980s, faced with the increasing demand for lakefront property, the Commission acknowledged the danger that, even with minimum standards, lakes in its jurisdiction might, by attrition, lose the very character that makes them so unique. In evaluating its lake management goals, the Commission identified five basic needs: 1) the need for additional protection for lakes with exceptional values; 2) the need for a mechanism to guide lakeshore development toward lakes best suited to accommodate it; 3) the need for consistent, reliable, and readily accessible natural resource and land use information; 4) the need for a clearly stated lakes policy; and, 5) the need for a coordinated program to implement this policy.

The *Maine Wildlands Lake Assessment* and Lakes Action Program were initiated to meet these needs. In undertaking these initiatives, the Commission acknowledged that it had not yet "fulfilled all of its responsibilities to assure that the public interest in these unusual resources is protected" (*Maine Wildlands Lake Assessment Work Plan*, 1986).

C. SUMMARY OF LAKE PLANNING EFFORTS

Wildlands Lake Assessment

The *Maine Wildlands Lake Assessment* was initiated in 1986 to establish a systematic base of natural resource and land use information on all lakes within the Commission's jurisdiction. The study considered all lakes with a surface area of ten acres or more. Approximately 1,500 lakes met this size requirement. Smaller lakes were added when these were found to possess especially noteworthy natural resource values.

Based on methods presented in the *Maine Wildlands Lake Assessment Work Plan*, information was collected on the following natural resources:

- Fisheries
- Scenic quality
- Botanic features
- Physical resource
- Wildlife
- Shoreline character
- Cultural resources

Lakes that possessed "significant" or "outstanding" resource values in any of these areas were identified, and each lake was placed into one of the following four resource classifications based on its cumulative resource significance:

- › Lakes of statewide significance with multiple outstanding natural values, categorized as Resource Class 1A (114 lakes);
- › Lakes of statewide significance with a single outstanding natural value, categorized as Resource Class 1B (211 lakes);
- › Lakes of regional significance (one or more significant ratings), categorized as Resource Class 2 (577 lakes);
- › Lakes of local or unknown significance, categorized as Resource Class 3 (627 lakes).

The study also collected information pertaining to land and water uses, including:

- › Access
- › Zoning
- › Water level fluctuation
- › Proximity to services
- › Shoreline development
- › Ownership
- › Public water supply

The completion of the Assessment in June of 1987, served only to highlight the need for further action — to develop measures to protect exceptional resource values associated with lakes and to guide development to the most appropriate areas.

Lakes Action Program

Following completion of the Wildlands Lake Assessment, the Commission appointed a Lakes Policy Committee. The committee, which included representatives from major landowners, statewide environmental and sportsmen's organizations, the University of Maine, and the Commission, was charged to:

- (1) Develop a proposal for a policy that might guide future Commission lake management decisions, and
- (2) Identify specific actions that should be taken to implement this proposed policy.

The actions identified by the committee were ultimately consolidated into a proposed lake action program. Public meetings were held in the fall of 1988 to discuss the proposal. *An Action Program for Management of Lakes in Maine's Unorganized Areas* was accepted by the Land Use Regulation Commission in January of 1989.

The Lakes Policy Committee sought a balanced approach to lake conservation and development, and recommended to the Commission a variety of innovative regulatory and non-regulatory lake management techniques, including policy guidance, special review criteria for lake development, lake concept plans, lake management classifications, and other public and private efforts.

Other Initiatives

The Commission also recognized the need to update its approach to review of impacts on water quality. To meet this need, Commission staff worked with DEP to develop a systematic approach that more accurately reflects the current level of knowledge about the relationship between land use and lake water quality. Additional rule-making changes were necessary to implement this approach when it was finalized.

Understanding of the impacts of clearing and development activities on water quality and riparian habitat has increased dramatically in recent years. In keeping with this improved understanding, IF&W and the Lakes Division of DEP recommended stronger standards to minimize the impacts of these activities on water quality and riparian habitat. In response to these recommendations, the Board of Environmental Protection adopted new standards governing minimum shore frontage, building setback, and clearing for development which have been applied to shoreland in organized towns. To maintain consistent environmental policies throughout the state, the Commission enacted comparable standards in its jurisdiction.

D. POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

The Land Use Regulation Commission seeks a balanced and environmentally sound approach to lake conservation and development that:

- (1) Conserves important lake-related natural resource values;
- (2) Protects water quality;
- (3) Accommodates reasonable shoreland development and harvest of timber;
- (4) Provides a diversity of public recreation opportunities; and
- (5) Encourages continued use of the unorganized territories for the principal purposes of fiber and food production, non-intensive outdoor recreation, and fisheries and wildlife habitat.

To meet these goals, the Commission has undertaken the lake management program outlined below as part of its overall commitment to guide development and resource conservation on the shorelines of the more than 3,000 lakes and ponds in Maine's unorganized areas.

Policy Guidance

The Commission will seek a balanced approach to shoreland development and conservation, one which recognizes public and private needs, supports the integrity of large forest holdings, and provides opportunities for creative, non-traditional shoreland development and conservation. The Commission proposes to regulate development based on lake-related natural features and values identified in the *Wildlands Lake Assessment*, guiding development toward those lakes or lake areas best suited to absorb new development, while restricting use of certain high value lakes. As a general planning guideline, the Commission will seek to ensure that development on lakes will remain below an average of one dwelling unit per 400 feet of shore frontage, and one dwelling unit per ten acres of lake surface area. These guidelines are designed to preserve the natural character of lakes in Maine's unorganized territories and to prevent conflicts between incompatible uses.

Review Criteria for Shoreland Permits

The Commission reviews all applications to determine whether they meet statutory criteria regarding technical and financial capability, traffic and circulation, soils, and environmental fit. Of these four decision criteria, "environmental fit" is often the most difficult to assess. In order to increase predictability regarding the assessment of environmental fit, the Commission has identified the following seven areas which it will review as a guide for determining whether adequate provision has been made for fitting subdivisions and commercial, industrial, and other non-residential structures on lakes harmoniously into the existing natural environment. The same review will be applied to rezonings that precede such proposals on lakes.

- **Natural and Cultural Resource Values:** The Commission will utilize the findings of the *Wildlands Lake Assessment* and other information sources in evaluating the merits of lake-related development. The Commission will, at a minimum, specifically consider all natural resource values that received a rating of either "significant" or "outstanding" in the Assessment, and will look for a demonstration that these values will be maintained.
- **Water Quality:** The Commission will give specific consideration to the effect that a proposed development will have on lake water quality. For proposed development on lakes, the Commission will require a finding regarding the probable effect of the proposed action on lake water quality. In those instances where it is determined that an unacceptable increase in phosphorus concentration may occur, the applicant will be required to take additional measures to protect lake water quality. If unacceptable water quality degradation will result regardless of additional measures, the Commission will deny the application.

Independent of its review of specific proposals, the Commission will initiate actions aimed at refining its approach to evaluating lake water quality. This will include updating its approach to identification of water quality limiting lakes and switching to a one part per billion change in phosphorus concentration as an indicator of unacceptable water quality degradation, consistent with DEP's policy for the rest of the state.

- **Traditional Uses:** The Commission will consider the effect of lake-related development proposals on traditional uses, including non-intensive public recreation, sporting camp operations, timber harvesting, and agriculture, and will seek to ensure that such proposals do not have an undue adverse effect on these uses.
- **Regional Diversity:** The Commission will consider lake-related development proposals in a regional context. The objective will be to determine the effect of substantial land use changes on the diversity of lake-related uses afforded in any region of the jurisdiction. The Commission will make this determination based on a summary of existing lake shoreland uses in the region of the State where the proposed development will be located. The region is considered to be either the township in which the development will be located and the eight townships which abut that township, or, all townships abutting the lake in question, whichever is larger.
- **Natural Character:** The Commission will seek to maintain the natural character of lakes by encouraging: visual screening of larger developments and non-conforming structures; consolidated use of recreation facilities such as boat docks and access ramps; and provisions

for long-term protection of undeveloped shoreland as part of subdivisions and commercial, industrial, and other non-residential proposals.

Independent of its review of specific proposals, the Commission will adopt stronger shore frontage, setback, and clearing standards in order to maintain the natural character of lake shorelines in the jurisdiction.

- **Lake Management Goals:** In reviewing development proposals on or near lakes which fall into one of the Commission's seven lake management classifications, the Commission will seek to ensure that the proposed activity is consistent with the stated management intent for that class of lake.
- **Landowner Equity:** In certain instances, the amount of future development along a given lake's shoreline may need to be restricted due to water quality or other limitations. This can potentially cause an equity problem in that a landowner not wishing to develop his or her land in the short term could be precluded from developing at a later date due to heavy development on other parcels.

A landowner should not be penalized for voluntarily foregoing early development on lakes where development is otherwise allowed. In cases where future development may be restricted, each landowner should be allotted a percentage of allowable future development proportionate to the extent of his or her ownership. Where a landowner proposes to exceed this proportion, development rights should be acquired from other landowners.

Concept Plans

The Commission established the "lake concept plan" as a flexible alternative to traditional shoreland regulation, designed to accomplish both public and private objectives. Since originally establishing lake concept plans in 1990, the Commission amended its rules for the Resource Plan Protection (P-RP) Subdistrict in 2000, thereby allowing the development of concept plans for other land areas and resources in addition to lakes.

Concept plans are landowner-created, long-range plans for the development and conservation of a large block of land on a lake or group of lakes or other specified resources. The plan is a clarification of long-term landowner intent that indicates, in a general way, the areas where development is to be focused, the relative density of proposed development, and the means by which significant natural and recreational resources are to be protected. A concept plan does not require the detailed technical information associated with a site-specific development plan and does not take the place of such plans.

A concept plan can be prepared for a lake, a portion of a lake, a group of lakes, or other lands and resources. The plan is initiated by the landowner or landowners and must be approved by the Commission.

The goal of concept planning is to encourage long-range planning based on resource characteristics and suitability as an alternative to haphazard, incremental development. The planning process necessary to prepare a plan encourages landowners to chart the future of their lake shorelands and other lands and resources in a manner that is thoughtful and forward-looking. The landowner gains from the insight obtained in preparing the plan, from expanded flexibility in making land management decisions, and from increased predictability regarding Commission actions. The public gains from the improved planning that results from

comprehensive evaluation of recreational and natural resources, from provisions for the long-term protection of resources, from greater knowledge of future development patterns, and from the increased predictability of the development review process.

While concept plans are voluntary, initiated and prepared by the landowner, once approved by the Commission, they are binding. The Commission encourages the use of concept plans by its commitment to expedite the permitting process for approved plans and to consider adjusting certain standards, such as the adjacency criterion, provided any such relaxation is matched by comparable conservation measures. Concept plans may not be used to relax requirements associated with Management Class 1 or Class 6 lakes. A concept plan may be used to seek a variation of the density standard for Class 2 lakes. Such variation will be granted only where it can be demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that the plan is fully protective of the lake's special values and is consistent with the Commission's management intent for the lake.

Basic Requirements

A concept plan must be responsive to the Commission's policy guidelines for management of lakes and various resources in Maine's unorganized areas. With regard to lakes, a concept plan must give consideration to natural and cultural values identified in the *Wildlands Lake Assessment*, and be responsive to the Commission's intent to protect those lakes identified in the Maine Wildlands Lake Assessment as warranting special management consideration.

In general, a plan should identify: (1) all areas where new, lake- and other resource-related development is to be located; (2) resource values or shoreland areas that are to be protected; (3) mechanisms that will be used to conserve important resources or areas; and (4) the life span of the plan.

The emphasis and level of detail of a plan may vary depending on whether the plan is proposed for a single lake, a cluster of lakes, or an entire large ownership. At the option of the plan preparer, a detailed description of one or more development proposals may be submitted as a component of the plan.

Public Input

Plan preparers are encouraged to provide avenues for interested parties to offer input during the development of the plan. The Commission will provide opportunity for public review of proposed plans. Notice that the Commission has received a proposal for a concept plan will be given to interested parties including affected landowners and a public review and comment period will be established. Upon request by five or more people, or when desired by the Commission, a public hearing will be held.

Plan Approval

Concept plans are implemented through the Resource Plan Protection (P-RP) Subdistrict. In order to approve a concept plan, the Commission must find that the proposed plan conforms with the Commission's lake policies and lake program guidelines or other applicable resource policies, is feasible, and is compatible with other public and private interests. It must also find that the plan strikes a reasonable and publicly beneficial balance between development and conservation of lake and other resources, and that, taken as a whole, the plan is at

least as protective of the natural environment as the development, management, and protection subdistricts which it affects.

When a plan has been approved, the concept plan will be incorporated into the Commission's regulatory framework through appropriate changes to existing zoning. To accomplish the comprehensive planning objective of concept plans, the width of zones should generally be designed to encompass all lake- and other resource-related development planned for the area over the life of the concept plan, or 500 feet, whichever is more.

Plan Amendment and Termination

A time span for each plan will be established. Ten years will be the minimum period, but concept plans of less than twenty years duration will be discouraged if such plans propose significant deviations from existing standards. A plan may be extended beyond the designated time period upon mutual agreement of the landowner(s) and the Commission.

To adapt to changing circumstances, plans can be amended or terminated at any time subject to mutual agreement between the landowner(s) and the Commission and following public notice of the proposed Amendment. While proposals for amendment or termination may be initiated by either party, the Commission will be conservative in exercising this option. To ensure good planning, proposals for lake- or resource-related development proximate to a lake or other resource covered by a concept plan should be pursued through an Amendment to the concept plan. Amendments must be consistent with the intent of the original plan.

To maximize predictability, the plan shall stipulate all conditions associated with termination of the plan, such as the status of any development that was approved as part of the plan but was not initiated during the life of the plan. Upon the plan's termination, the Commission will, in conformity with its comprehensive plan, statutes, and standards, designate appropriate zoning which is consistent with zoning of equivalent areas. Any development or relaxation of regulations which took place as part of a concept plan cannot be used to justify subsequent rezonings, meet adjacency requirements, or otherwise alter zoning at any time in the future.

In the event that a plan is terminated, all transactions initiated as a component of the plan, such as the granting of conservation easements or creation of restrictive covenants on subdivided lands, will continue to apply to the extent that they are covered by legal contract or deeded covenants.

Lake Management Classes

The Commission recognizes six specific lake classifications for special planning and management purposes. Lakes are classified based on natural and other resource values and land use characteristics identified in the *Wildlands Lake Assessment*. Specific descriptions of the criteria for each classification, as well as lists of the lakes in Management Classes 1 through 6, can be found below. Those lakes which are not included in one of these six classes are considered to be Management Class 7.

- **Management Class 1** lakes are high value, least accessible, undeveloped lakes. It is the Commission's goal to preserve the best examples of these pristine lakes in their natural state by prohibiting development within 1/4 mile of their shores and restricting permanent vehicular

access to these lakes. Existing timber harvesting standards are currently considered sufficient to protect the values associated with these lakes from forest management activities.

A number of lakes that meet the criteria for Management Class 1 are not designated as such because they are already protected through remote pond zoning. These lakes are identified below.

- **Management Class 2** lakes are high value, accessible, undeveloped lakes. The Commission intends to conserve the special values of these lakes by significantly restricting the density and intensity of development to one development unit per mile of shoreline. These restrictions will be applied to the area within 500 feet of the lakeshore to enable the Commission to regulate back lot development which could affect the lake's special values and is consistent with the management intent of the lake. Variation of density requirements may only be sought as part of a concept plan which is demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence to be fully protective of the special values associated with the lake.
- **Management Class 3** lakes are those lakes identified in the Appendix considered by the Commission to be potentially suitable for development based on available information on water quality, access, conflicting uses, shoreland availability, water level fluctuation, location, regional considerations, and special planning needs. Soils were not considered in the designation of these lakes due to lack of information, and may affect the appropriateness of this designation for some lakes. The Commission supports additional responsible development around Class 3 lakes, yet will take care to ensure that their significant natural resource values are conserved. The Commission will waive the adjacency criterion for development proposals on these lakes provided it can be demonstrated to its satisfaction by clear and convincing evidence that the lake has no existing or potential water quality problems and that soils are suitable for development. This waiver is strictly limited to shoreland, and proximate areas may not subsequently use shoreland development on Class 3 lakes to meet the adjacency criterion.
- **Management Class 4** lakes are high value, developed lakes. The Commission's goal for these lakes is to allow a reasonable level of residential and recreational development while conserving natural resource values and maintaining undeveloped shoreland areas. The Commission will take special care in evaluating and regulating new subdivisions proposed on these lakes and will require cluster development to protect natural values except where clearly inappropriate due to site characteristics.
- **Management Class 5** consists of heavily developed lakes. The Commission seeks to maintain natural qualities associated with these lakes, enhance scenic values, and retain some undeveloped shoreline by requiring cluster development on these lakes except where clearly inappropriate due to site characteristics. The Commission has identified lakes approaching heavily developed status and will pursue similar goals on the lakes.
- **Management Class 6** lakes are remote ponds – inaccessible, undeveloped lakes with coldwater game fisheries. The Commission intends to continue to prohibit development within 1/2 mile of these ponds to protect the primitive recreational experience and coldwater lake fisheries in remote settings.
- **Management Class 7** consists of all lakes not otherwise classified, including many lakes which have multiple outstanding or significant resource values identified in the *Wildlands Lake Assessment*. The Commission will manage these lakes for multiple use, including resource

conservation, recreation, and timber production, giving specific consideration to identified resource values when evaluating the merits of lake-related rezoning and permit applications. It is the Commission's intention that the majority of these lakes remain in Management Class 7 and be managed under applicable requirements.

The Commission will consider reclassification of lakes within certain prescribed limitations. In cases where clear evidence of factual error indicates that a lake was misclassified, it will be reclassified to the appropriate class. Notwithstanding the above, changes in land use characteristics that occur after November 17, 1988, including without limitation, vehicle access and residential development will not be considered in future reclassifications. It is the Commission's intent to hold public hearings on all rule-making proposals involving proposed reclassifications.

The Commission has found that, in a few special cases, Management Class 3 criteria are not sufficiently refined for properly managing large lakes that are appropriate for a mix of conservation and development and which are or are likely to be under intensive development pressure. Moosehead Lake and the Rangeley Lakes, specifically Aziscohos, Mooselookmeguntic, and Upper and Lower Richardson, are considered to be such special cases. These lakes will be placed in Management Class 7 until comprehensive plans are developed to more specifically guide future growth in these areas. The Commission envisions that such plans will be substantially complete within 5 years.

Some lakes classified in Management Classes 1 through 6 abut other jurisdictions – either organized towns or Canada. The Commission should work cooperatively with other jurisdictions fronting on these lakes and encourage them to develop programs that are compatible with and comparable to LURC's lake management program. If comparable regulations are not implemented by abutting jurisdictions within a reasonable period of time, the Commission may choose to reconsider affected lakes' classification.

Other Public and Private Initiatives

The Commission encourages state agencies, landowners, and others to undertake actions that are consistent with and supportive of the Commission's lake management goals. Toward this end, the Commission: encourages interagency cooperation and coordination that furthers its lake management program; encourages non-regulatory measures that promote long-term conservation of important lake areas; supports measures to provide incentives for landowner conservation of important natural resources such as lake shorelands; and, encourages responsible shoreland use through camp owner education programs.

E. PERIODIC UPDATE OF LAKE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

It is the Commission's intention that its lake management program be periodically evaluated to ensure that it responds to changing needs in a comprehensive manner. As part of its periodic evaluation, the Commission will consider whether a program update is necessary and, if so, whether such an update warrants a comprehensive program update or whether a more circumscribed effort focused on specific elements of the program is sufficient to ensure that the program continues to respond to changing needs. To maintain consistency of policy, this review and update should occur concurrent with the periodic revision of the Comprehensive Plan and as needed to address changing circumstances and new trends.



Songo Pond (Management Class 5), Albany Township

Chapter 10, Land Use Districts and Standards, Appendix C currently contains the official list of lake management classes. The original list of lake management classes in the Lake Management Program as adopted by the Commission provided the basis for rulemaking in Chapter 10. Although the list has been updated here to reflect changes over the years, the management class lists remain subject to change and reference to Chapter 10 should be made to determine official lake management classes.

MANAGEMENT CLASS 1

High value, least accessible, undeveloped lakes¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
				F	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
BAY P (WEST)	4396	T07 SD	249	-	O	-	-	-	-	-
BOGUS MEADOW P	4380	T07 SD	26	S	O	S	-	-	-	-
CARIBOU P (BIG)	4142	T07 R10 WELS	64	S	-	S	S	O	-	-
DEBOULLIE L	1512	T15 R09 WELS	262	O	O	O	S	-	-	-
DEBSCONEAG L (1ST)	2060	T02 R10 WELS	320	O	-	O	S	O	-	S
DEBSCONEAG L (3RD)	0584	T01 R10 WELS	1,011	O	-	O	S	-	S	S
ENCHANTED P	0150	UPPER ENCHANTED TWP	330	O	O	O	O	-	-	S
GREAT WORKS P	1386	EDMUNDS TWP	50	S	O	-	-	-	-	-
HOBART BOG	7451	EDMUNDS TWP	30	S	O	-	-	-	-	-
HUDSON P (UPPER)	1928	T11 R10 WELS	32	O	-	O	-	-	-	-
JERRY P	2190	T05 R07 WELS	272	S	-	O	S	-	-	-
JO-MARY L (LOWER)	0984	T01 R10 WELS	1,910	S	-	O	-	-	S	S
JONES P	0172	WYMAN TWP	36	-	O	-	-	-	-	-
KATAHDIN L	2016	T03 R08 WELS	717	S	-	O	O	-	S	S
LOGAN P # 2	2082	T02 R09 WELS	20	-	-	O	S	-	-	-
MARBLE P	2186	T05 R08 WELS	75	S	-	S	S	O	-	O
MATHEWS P	2836	T08 R10 WELS	19	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
MILLIMAGASSETT L	3004	T07 R08 WELS	1,410	S	O	-	-	-	-	-
MOCCASIN P	1590	T14 R08 WELS	32	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
NORTH P	9781	T14 R09 WELS	15	O	-	-	-	-	S	-
PASSAMAGAMET L	0970	T01 R09 WELS	461	-	-	S	S	O	-	-
POLAND P (UPPER)	PPUP	T07 R14 WELS	245	S	O	O	S	-	-	O
RAINBOW L	0614	RAINBOW TWP	1,664	O	-	O	O	-	-	S
REED P (BIG)	2842	T08 R10 WELS	90	O	-	-	-	O	-	-
ROUND P (LITTLE)	2874	EAGLE LAKE TWP	58	O	S	-	-	-	-	O
SAWTELLE P	3008	T07 R08 WELS	174	-	O	-	-	-	-	-
SAWTELLE P (LITTLE)	5778	T07 R08 WELS	10	-	O	-	-	-	-	-
THE HORNS POND	8601	WYMAN TWP	10	S	-	O	O	-	-	-

¹CRITERIA: Not accessible within 1/4 mile by 2wd; less than 1 development unit per mile; at least one outstanding resource value.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

STATISTICS:	NUMBER:		% OF TOTAL
	NUMBER:	28 lakes	1.8%
	ACRES:	9,592 ac total (avg 343)	1.2%
	SHOREFRONT:	660,241 ft total (avg 23,580)	2.0%

**Lakes Meeting Criteria of Management Class 1
But Adequately Protected by Remote Pond Zoning (Mgt. Class 6)**

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
				F	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
BLACK L	1506	T15 R09 WELS	147	O	-	S	-	-	-	-
BRANCH P (MIDDLE)	0912	T05 R09 NWP	34	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEDAR P	0474	TB R10 WELS	65	O	-	-	-	-	-	S
CHAIRBACK P (WEST)	0796	T07 R09 NWP	47	O	-	-	-	-	-	S
CLEARWATER P	2692	ATTEAN TWP	34	-	-	-	-	-	O	-
CURRIER P (FIRST)	2768	T09 R11 WELS	20	O	-	S	-	-	-	-
CURRIER P (SECOND)	2774	T09 R11 WELS	28	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
DIXON P	9911	PIERCE POND TWP	17	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
ENCHANTED P (LITTLE)	0148	UPPER ENCHANTED TWP	35	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
FOWLER P	0686	T03 R11 WELS	19	S	-	O	S	-	-	-
GARDNER L	1528	T15 R09 WELS	288	O	O	O	-	-	-	-
GAUNTLET P	0472	TB R10 WELS	11	S	-	O	-	-	-	-
GREEN MTN P	3666	T06 R06 WELS	10	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
HARRINGTON P	0702	T03 R11 WELS	40	m	-	O	-	-	-	-
HELEN P	0094	PIERCE POND TWP	15	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
HIGH P	0092	PIERCE POND TWP	7	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
HORSERACE PONDS	0626	RAINBOW TWP	50	O	-	O	S	-	-	O
HURD P (LITTLE)	0596	T02 R10 WELS	60	S	-	O	S	-	-	S
IRELAND P	4168	T07 R08 WELS	30	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
LANE P	2490	COMSTOCK TWP	24	S	-	-	-	-	-	O
LANG P	2542	PARLIN POND TWP	30	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
LANG P (LITTLE)	2543	PARLIN POND TWP	13	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
LONG P (LITTLE)	4424	T10 SD	55	S	-	O	S	-	-	-
LOON P	2688	ATTEAN TWP	37	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARY PETUCHE P	2474	PRENTISS TWP	10	S	-	-	-	-	-	O
MCKENNA P	0688	T03 R11 WELS	53	m	-	O	S	-	-	-
MINISTER P (BIG)	0590	T02 R10 WELS	15	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
RAINBOW DEADWATERS	9698	RAINBOW TWP	58	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
ROACH P (FOURTH)	0446	SHAWTOWN TWP	266	S	-	O	S	-	-	-
SLAUGHTER P	0690	T03 R11 WELS	66	O	-	O	S	-	S	-
SPRUCE MOUNTAIN P	0466	TB R11 WELS	20	S	-	O	-	-	-	S
MOOSE P (BIG)	0334	MOOSEHEAD JUNCTION TWP	91	O	-	-	-	-	-	S
MOOSE P (LITTLE)	0336	MOOSEHEAD JUNCTION TWP	25	O	-	-	-	-	-	S
SWIFT RIVER P (LIT)	3572	TOWNSHIP E	15	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOBEY P #1	2674	T05 R07 BKP WKR	35	m	-	O	S	-	-	-
TROUT P	3260	MASON TWP	17	m	-	S	-	O	-	-
TURTLE P	0952	LAKE VIEW PLT	81	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
TWIN (TROUT) PONDS	2102	T02 R09 WELS	60	O	-	O	S	-	-	-
WADLEIGH P (LITTLE)	2974	T08 R15 WELS	15	m	-	-	-	-	-	O

² Some lakes span two or more townships.

³ Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

MANAGEMENT CLASS 2
Especially high value, accessible, undeveloped lakes¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
				F	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
ALLAGASH L	9787	T08 R14 WELS	4,260	O	O	O	O	-	S	O
ALLIGATOR L	4498	T34 MD	1,159	O	-	O	S	-	-	-
ATTEAN P	2682	ATTEAN TWP	2,745	O	-	O	O	O	-	O
BALD MOUNTAIN P	0314	BALD MTN TWP T2R3	1,152	O	O	O	O	-	-	-
BEAVER P	3310	MAGALLOWAY PLT	179	O	O	-	-	-	-	-
BENSON P (BIG)	0864	T07 R09 NWP	320	O	-	O	-	-	S	-
CAUCOMGOMOC L	4012	T06 R14 WELS	5,081	O	O	S	S	-	S	O
CHAIN OF PONDS	5064	CHAIN OF PONDS TWP	700	O	O	O	S	-	S	O
CHESUNCOOK L4	CHCH	T03 R12 WELS	18,470	O	O	-	-	O	O	O
CHURCHILL L	2856	T09 R12 WELS	2,923	O	O	-	-	-	S	S
CLEAR L	1938	T10 R11 WELS	614	O	-	O	S	-	-	-
CLIFF L	2780	T09 T12 WELS	563	O	-	O	S	-	-	-
CLIFFORD L	1304	GREENLAW CHOPPING TWP	954	O	O	-	-	-	-	-
CROSBY P	3330	COBURN GORE	150	O	S	O	-	-	-	-
DEBSCONEAG DEADWATER	2076	T02 R10 WELS	500	O	O	-	-	-	-	S
EAGLE L (BIG)	2858	EAGLE LAKE TWP	8,288	O	O	-	-	O	O	P
FLAGSTAFF L	0038	DEAD RIVER TWP	20,300	O	O	S	S	-	-	-
IRONBOUND P	2510	ALDER BROOK TWP	40	O	-	O	O	-	-	O
JACKSON P # 2	0704	T03 R11 WELS	12	S	-	O	O	-	-	-
JIM P	5054	JIM POND TWP	320	O	O	O	S	-	-	-
JO-MARY L (UPPER)	0243	TA R10 WELS	1,873	O	-	O	S	-	-	S
LOBSTER L	2948	LOBSTER TWP	3,475	O	O	O	O	O	S	O
LONG L	1892	T12 R13 WELS	1,203	O	O	-	-	-	S	S
MACHIAS L (THIRD)	1124	T42 MD BPP	2,778	O	O	-	-	-	S	-
MOOSELEUK L	1990	T10 R09 WELS	422	S	O	O	-	-	O	-
MUNSUNGAN L	4180	T08 R10 WELS	1,415	O	-	O	S	-	O	-
MUSQUASH L (WEST)	1096	T06 R01 NBPP	1,613	O	-	O	S	-	S	-
NAHMAKANTA L	0698	T01 R11 WELS	1,024	O	-	O	O	O	S	-
PENOBSCOT L	0339	DOLE BROOK TWP	1,019	O	-	O	S	-	S	O
PIERCE P	0086	PIERCE POND TWP	1,650	O	S	O	S	-	-	-
PLEASANT L	1100	T06 R01 NBPP	1,574	O	-	O	S	O	-	-
ROUND P	1470	T13 R12 WELS	697	O	O	-	-	-	S	-
SCRAGGLY L	4264	T07 R08 WELS	842	O	-	O	O	O	S	O
SPENCER L	5104	HOBBS TOWN TWP	1,819	O	-	O	O	O	O	-
SPENCER P	0404	E MIDDLESEX CANAL GR	980	S	O	O	S	-	-	-
TELOS L & ROUND P	2710	T06 R11 WELS	2,276	O	S	O	S	-	S	-
TIM P	2362	TIM POND TWP	320	O	-	O	-	-	-	-
UMSASKIS L	1896	T11 R13 WELS	1,222	O	O	-	-	-	S	S

¹CRITERIA: Accessible to within 1/4 mile by 2wd; less than 1 development unit per mile; two or more outstanding resource values in fisheries, wildlife, scenic or shore character – outstanding wildlife value must be due to especially concentrated and/or diverse wildlife values.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

⁴Includes Ripogenus Lake, but not Caribou Lake.

STATISTICS:		% OF TOTAL
	NUMBER:	38 lakes
	ACRES:	94,932 ac total (avg 2,498)
	SHOREFRONT:	3,591,904 ft total (avg 94,524)
		2.5%
		11.7%
		10.7%

(revised 3/21/1991 – added Big Benson Pond and Third Machias Lake per ZP 479;
revised 9/21/2000 – changed Clifford Lake from MC 4 to MC 2 due to lack of development per miscellaneous rule revisions;
revised 9/10/2008 – changed Debsconeag Deadwater from MC 1 to MC 2 due to correction of access information per ZP 720)

MANAGEMENT CLASS 3
Potentially suitable for development¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
				F	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
AZISCOHOS L (SOUTH)	3290 – AZ01	LINCOLN PLT	2,000	O	O	S	S	-	O	S
BEAU L	9785	T19 R11 WELS	2,003	S	-	-	-	S	S	S
BIG L	1288	BIG LAKE TWP	10,305	O	O	-	-	O	O	-
BOWLIN P	2188	T05 R08 WELS	115	S	-	S	-	-	-	-
BRANDY P	9651	T39 MD	723	S	O	-	-	-	-	S
BRASSUA L	4120	ROCKWOOD STRIP-East	8,979	S	-	-	-	-	O	-
CARIBOU L	CHCA	T02 R12 WELS	4,600	O	O	-	-	O	O	O
CHENEY P	2494	HAMMOND TWP	99	S	-	-	-	-	-	S
CLAYTON L	1958	T12 R08 WELS	264	S	-	-	-	-	-	-
EBEEMEE L (UPPER)	0966	T04 R09 NWP	196	-	-	-	-	-	-	S
ENDLESS L	0942	T03 R09 NWP	1,499	S	-	-	-	-	S	S
FALLS P	1490	T18 R10 WELS	256	S	S	-	-	-	-	-
FISH RIVER L	0009	T13 R08 WELS	2,642	S	S	O	S	-	S	-
GLAZIER L	9789	T18 R10 WELS	1,120	S	-	-	-	S	-	-
GRAHAM L	4350	FLETCHERS LANDING	7,865	S	O	-	-	-	O	-
GRAND L (WEST)	1150	T06 ND BPP	14,340	O	O	O	O	-	O	-
HORSESHOE P	3336	COBURN GORE	37	-	S	-	-	-	-	-
INDIAN P	4090	SAPLING TWP	3,746	S	O	-	-	-	S	-
JO-MARY L (MIDDLE)	0986	T4, INDIAN PURCHASE	1,152	S	-	O	S	-	S	S
LONG P	2536	LONG POND TWP	3,053	S	S	O	S	-	S	-
LONG P	3356	SEVEN PONDS TWP	35	S	-	-	-	-	-	-
MACHIAS L (BIG)	1960	T12 R08 WELS	692	S	S	-	-	-	S	-
MACHIAS L (LITTLE)	1578	NASHVILLE PLT	275	S	S	-	-	-	-	-
MATTAMISCONTIS L (LT)	2138	T03 R09 NWP	275	S	-	-	-	-	-	-
MATTASEUNK L	3040	MOLUNKUS TWP	576	S	-	-	-	-	-	-
MUD P	0023	JIM POND TWP	14	S	-	-	-	-	-	-
ONAWA L	0894	ELLIOTTSVILLE TWP	1,344	O	O	O	S	-	S	-
PEMADUMCOOK CHAIN L	0982	T01 R10 WELS	18,300	S	-	O	S	-	O	S
POCUMCUS L	1110	T05 ND BPP	2,201	O	O	-	-	-	S	-
RICHARDSON L (LOWER)	3308 – RHLW	TOWNSHIP C	2,900	O	S	S	O	-	S	S
ROACH P (FIRST)	0436	FRENCHTOWN TWP	3,270	S	-	S	S	S	S	-
ROCKABEMA L	3636	MORO PLT	339	S	-	S	S	-	-	-
ROCKY P	4476	T22 MD	666	m	-	-	-	-	-	-
ROUND P	1594	T14 R08 WELS	90	S	S	-	-	-	-	-
SAPONAC P	4722	GRAND FALLS TWP	922	S	-	S	S	-	S	P
SCHOODIC L ⁴	0956	LAKE VIEW PLT	7,168	S	-	S	-	-	S	S
SILVER L	0922	KATAHDIN IRN WKS PLT	305	S	-	S	S	-	-	S
SPECTACLE (SPEC) P	4450	OSBORN PLT	1,754	O	-	-	-	-	-	-

¹CRITERIA: See page C-14.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

⁴Also on Management Class 5 list.

STATISTICS:	NUMBER:	% OF TOTAL
	38 lakes	2.5%
	106,120 ac total (avg 2,793)	13.0%
	3,924,753 ft total (avg 103,283)	11.7%

(revised 1/1/2001 – added Aziscohos Lake (South) and Lower Richardson Lake per Prospective Zoning Plan for the Rangeley Lakes Region and miscellaneous rule revisions)

POTENTIAL MANAGEMENT CLASS 3 LAKES

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³							
				F	W	SC	SH	B	C	P	
MOOSEHEAD L	0390	MOOSEHEAD JUNCTION TWP	74,890	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	

Official classification of this lake will await completion of study.

SQUARE L	1672	T16 R05	8,150	O	-	-	-	-	S	S
----------	------	---------	-------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Square Lake may be placed on this list when and if the Maine Department of Environmental Protection is able to show that increased shoreland development around Square Lake would not significantly contribute to the stresses already being placed on it from lakes upstream.

AZISCOHOS L (NORTH)	3290 – AZ02	PARKERTOWN TWP	4,700	O	O	S	S	-	O	S
MOOSELOOKMEGUNTIC L	MLML	RICHARDSONTOWN TWP	14,101	O	O	S	O	-	O	-
RICHARDSON L (UPPER)	3308 – RHUP	RICHARDSONTOWN TWP	4,200	O	O	O	O	-	O	-

These lakes were removed from Management Class 3 based on a recognition that the Rangeley Lakes have special planning needs that are not addressed by this classification. The Rangeley Lakes, comprised of a string of large, high value lakes subject to intensive development pressure, represent a unique resource to the state. Management Class 3 is not considered a sufficiently refined designation to adequately manage and protect these lakes, which like Moosehead, are suited to a mix of development and conservation. Aziscohos Lake (South) and Lower Richardson Lake have been placed in Management Class 3 as part of the *Prospective Zoning Plan for the Rangeley Lakes Region*. These lakes will remain in Management Class 7.

¹Some lakes span two or more townships.
²Some lakes span two or more townships.
³Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

Criteria for Management Class 3 Lakes

The lakes listed in Management Class 3, also referred to as Potentially Suitable for Development, meet the following criteria:

- a. Water quality
 - Development of the remaining undeveloped shoreline at the rate of one dwelling unit per 150 feet of frontage will not result in a change in phosphorus concentration of 1 part per billion or more.
 - Not having additional lake specific water quality problems that would be exacerbated by additional shoreline development.
- b. Location
 - Located within two townships of the organized portion of the State or existing settlements with public services.
- c. Access
 - Accessible by 2-wheel drive motor vehicle during summer months to within 1/4 mile of the normal high water mark of the lake.
- d. Conflicting use
 - Not totally zoned as P-FW (Fish and Wildlife Protection Subdistrict), P-WL (Wetland Protection Subdistrict), or P-RR (Recreation Protection Subdistrict).
 - Not a municipal water supply.
 - No major or unavoidable conflict with critical species or habitats.
 - No major or unavoidable conflict with recreational activities requiring an undeveloped setting.
- e. Available shoreline
 - Greater than 10 acres of surface area per existing dwelling unit.
 - Undeveloped shore area adequate for 10 or more dwelling units.
- f. Water level fluctuation
 - No extreme water level fluctuation (i.e. dam regulated draw down) which makes shoreline unsuitable for development.
- g. Regional consideration
 - No region of the state is to have all or the great majority of the large water bodies in the area identified as suitable for development; in such cases, certain lakes otherwise eligible will be omitted from the list; preference will be given to retaining lakes which:
 - (1) are the least sensitive to water quality degradation;
 - (2) are closest to paved, all-season roads;
 - (3) are closest to existing development centers;
 - (4) have the least conflict between development and their resource significance.
- h. Special planning needs
 - Is not a large lake determined by the Commission as having special planning needs, as evidenced by a combination of: suitability for development, high resource value or significance, and intensive development pressure.

MANAGEMENT CLASS 4
High value, developed lakes¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
				F	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
ARNOLD P	3332	COBURN GORE	148	S	-	O	-	-	O	-
CARRY P (WEST)	0048	CARRYING PLC TWN TWP	675	O	-	-	-	-	O	-
CATHANCE L	9661	NO 14 TWP	2,905	O	O	-	-	-	S	O
CHAIN L (FIRST)	1236	T26 ED BPP	336	O	-	-	-	-	S	O
CHAIN L (SECOND)	1234	T26 ED BPP	589	O	-	-	-	-	S	O
CUPSUPTIC L	MLCU	ADAMSTOWN TWP	2,199	O	O	O	S	-	S	-
DONNELL P	4412	T09 SD	112	O	-	O	O	-	S	-
GRAND FALLS FLOWAGE	7437	FOWLER TWP	6,691	O	O	-	-	-	-	-
GREENWOOD P (BIG)	0884	ELLIOTTSVILLE TWP	211	O	-	O	-	-	-	-
HOLEB P	2652	HOLEB TWP	1,055	S	-	O	O	O	-	-
KENNEBAGO L (BIG)	2374	DAVIS TWP	1,700	O	O	O	O	-	S	O
LYFORD P (BIG)	0438	SHAWTOWN TWP	152	O	-	-	-	-	O	-
NICATOUS L	4766	T40 MD	5,165	S	O	O	O	-	S	-
POND IN THE RIVER	3328	TOWNSHIP C	512	O	S	S	-	O	-	-
RAGGED L	2936	T02 R13 WELS	2,712	O	-	O	S	-	S	-
RANGELEY L	3300	RANGELEY PLT	6,000	O	S	O	S	S	O	O
SPRING RIVER L	4432	T10 SD	704	S	-	O	O	-	-	-
SYSLADOBSIS L (LO)	4730	T05 ND BPP	5,376	S	-	S	S	O	S	-
TOGUE P (LOWER)	2084	T02 R09 WELS	384	S	-	O	S	-	-	O
TOGUE P (UPPER)	2104	T02 R09 WELS	294	S	-	O	S	-	-	O
TUNK L	4434	T10 SD	2,010	O	O	O	O	-	S	S
WILSON P (UPPER)	0410	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	940	S	S	O	S	-	-	S

¹CRITERIA: Two or more outstanding resource values; accessible to within 1/4 mile by 2wd; more than one development unit per mile; not included in management class 3 (potentially suitable for development).

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing info.

STATISTICS:	NUMBER:	% OF TOTAL
	22 lakes	1.4%
	41,878 ac total (avg 1,904)	5.1%
	1,975,017 ft total (avg 89,774)	5.9%

(revised 3/21/1991 – added Grand Falls Flowage per ZP 479)

MANAGEMENT CLASS 5Heavily developed lakes¹

<u>LAKE NAME</u>	<u>LAKE#</u>	<u>PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME²</u>	<u>SIZE(AC)</u>	<u>EXISTING DENSITY</u>	
				<u>ACRES PER D.U.</u>	<u>FEET PER D.U.</u>
AMBAJEJUS L ³	PAMB	T01 R09 WELS	3,289	10.	229.5
BAKER STREAM P	7104	BALD MTN TWP T2R3	12	3.0	1,827
BEAVER MOUNTAIN L	3562	SANDY RIVER PLT	543	4.7	253.6
BEAVER P	3354	SEVEN PONDS TWP	20	3.3	819.8
BOTTLE L	4702	LAKEVILLE PLT	281	3.8	338.0
BOYD L	2158	ORNEVILLE TWP	1,005	6.4	358.3
CAMPBELL P	2574	BLAKE GORE	15	5.0	828.3
CEDAR L	2004	T03 R09 NWP	685	7.3	305.9
CROSS L	1674	CROSS LAKE TWP	2,515	8.8	309.2
DAVIS (WAPITI) P	2196	T05 R07 WELS	69	8.6	1,186
DEAD STREAM P	4066	WEST FORKS PLT	67	9.6	1,669
DEER L	4512	T34 MD	38	5.4	861.9
EBEEMEE L	0914	EBEEMEE TWP	940	5.8	391.7
FISH P	4054	MOXIE GORE	15	7.5	1,973
HILLS P	3686	PERKINS TWP	22	4.4	973.4
HUTCHINSON P	3494	ALBANY TWP	96	5.6	581.8
KINGSBURY P	0262	MAYFIELD TWP	390	4.3	277.3
KNEELAND P	3266	ALBANY TWP	16	4.0	1,086
LONG (MARTIN) P	4108	THE FORKS PLT	26	3.2	814.7
LONG P	1200	T18 MD BPP	15	7.5	1,892
LOON L	2384	DALLAS	168	2.9	248.0
MADAWASKA L	1802	MADAWASKA LAKE TWP	1,526	4.8	167.4
NUMBER NINE L	1756	T09 R03 WELS	120	5.2	389.4
OTTER P	7142	MAYFIELD TWP	25	2.8	409.4
PAPOOSE P (LITTLE)	3268	ALBANY TWP	19	9.5	2,499
PEEP L	9821	T30 MD BPP	32	8.0	1,430
PENMAN P	0113	T26 ED BPP	29	3.6	543.4
PLEASANT PD	0224	THE FORKS PLT	1,120	5.8	180.3
PRESQUE ISLE L	1758	T09 R03 WELS	38	5.4	927.7
PROCTOR P	3210	ALBANY TWP	45	4.1	463.4
ROUND P	3584	TOWNSHIP E	42	7.0	959.2
SANDY RIVER P (MID)	3566	SANDY RIVER PLT	70	8.8	1,307
SANDY RIVER P (LOWER)	3564	SANDY RIVER PLT	17	5.7	1,450
SANDY RIVER P (UPPER)	3568	SANDY RIVER PLT	28	7.0	1,289
SCHOODIC L ³	0956	LAKE VIEW PLT	7,168	18.	386.2
SHIN P (LOWER)	2198	T05 R07 WELS	638	4.8	278.4
SMITH P	2012	T3, INDIAN PURCHASE	208	2.2	177.6
SOLDIER P	9783	WALLAGRASS PLT	96	6.9	1213
SONGO P	3262	ALBANY TWP	224	2.5	201.0
TWIN L (SOUTH) ³	PSTW	T04 INDIAN PURCHASE	3,406	14.	388.0
UNNAMED P	7062	THE FORKS PLT	10	3.3	573.7
UNNAMED P	8735	SALEM TWP	40	2.2	481.1
WHETSTONE P	0296	KINGSBURY PLT	256	4.2	263.5

¹CRITERIA: Lakes with less than 10 acres or 400 feet of frontage per dwelling unit taken as an average around entire lake.²Some lakes span two or more townships.³Also on Management Class 3 list.

STATISTICS:			% OF TOTAL
	NUMBER:	43 lakes	2.8%
	ACRES:	25,384 ac total (avg 590)	3.1%
	SHOREFRONT:	999,060 ft total (avg 22,234)	2.9%

(revised 2/3/1995 – dropped Redington Pond and Unnamed Pond (7818) due to lack of development per new zoning maps)

**LAKES APPROACHING
HEAVILY DEVELOPED STATUS¹**

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	EXISTING DENSITY	
				ACRES PER D.U.	FEET PER D.U.
BEAVER P	3588	TOWNSHIP D	20	20	5,577
BRANCH P (1ST WEST)	0440	SHAWTOWN TWP	119	15	2,021
CARRY P (MIDDLE)	0046	CARRYING PLC TWN TWP	126	16	2,381
CARRY P (WEST)	0048	CARRYING PLC TWN TWP	675	16	678.5
CENTER P	4040	SOLDIERTOWN TWP	51	17	2,646
CHAIN L (FIRST)	1236	T26 ED BPP	336	15	1,133
CHALK P	3270	ALBANY TWP	25	13	2,329
CHASE STREAM P	4080	CHASE STREAM TWP	75	19	4,386
CUT P	1706	DUDLEY TWP	26	13	3,390
DUCK L	4698	LAKEVILLE PLT	256	13	892
ELLIS P	4086	CHASE STREAM TWP	85	17	2,161
ENCHANTED P (LOWER)	0142	LOWER ENCHANTED TWP	20	10	6,764
ENOCH L	1328	FOWLER TWP	18	18	3,291
FISH P	3324	LINCOLN PLT	20	20	6,458
GULL P	3532	DALLAS	281	13	704
HATHORN P	4242	T04 R08 WELS	15	15	3,264
HUSSEY P	0292	BLANCHARD PLT	15	15	3,729
KENNEBAGO L (LITTLE)	3958	STETSONTOWN TWP	190	14	837.4
LONG L	1682	T17 R03 WELS	6,000	20	600.4
LONG P	3582	TOWNSHIP E	254	17	1,071
LONG P	4118	TAUNTON & RAYNHAM	173	14	1,190
LYFORD P (BIG)	0438	SHAWTOWN TWP	152	17	1,623
MATTASEUNK L	3040	MOLUNKUS TWP	576	16	1,191
MAYFIELD P	0260	MAYFIELD TWP	140	14	1,122
MOOSEHEAD L #6	MH06	TOMHEGAN TWP	9,925	31	670.8
MOXIE P	4050	EAST MOXIE TWP	2,370	14	800.2
MYRICK P	4416	T10 SD	45	15	3,007
NORTHWEST P	3342	MASSACHUSETTS GORE	45	15	1,986
PARLIN P	2544	PARLIN POND TWP	543	15	929.3
PEPPERPOT P	3298	ADAMSTOWN TWP	50	10	1,058
POSSUM P	1310	T26 ED BPP	30	15	2,532
PUDDING P	0932	BARNARD TWP	12	12	2,657
SABBATH DAY P	3578	TOWNSHIP E	57	11	1,547
SAINT CROIX L	1774	ST CROIX TWP	416	18	1,402
SAINT FROID L	1610	WINTERVILLE PLT	2,400	11	415.3
SECOND L	1134	T37 MD BPP	102	11	1,726
SHAW P	5152	T03 R04 BKP WKR	45	15	2,814
SILVER L	0922	KATAHDIN IRN WKS TWP	305	17	1,581
SPENCER P	3586	TOWNSHIP D	15	15	3,538
SPRING RIVER L	4432	T10 SD	704	19	1,395
THANKSGIVING P	0288	BLANCHARD PLT	17	17	3,873
TROUT P	0322	MOOSEHEAD JUNCTION TWP	33	17	2,628
UNNAMED P	9740	DENNISTOWN PLT	20	20	2,615
UNNAMED P	9668	T05 R07 BKP WKR	12	12	8,802
UNNAMED P	7314	HIGHLAND PLT	12	12	4,074
WALLAGRASS L (THIRD)	1552	ST JOHN PLT	45	11	1,509
WEST L	0503	T03 ND	1,344	19	794.8
YOKE PONDS	0504	TA R11 WELS	134	11	1,808

¹Lakes with less than 20 acres or 1,000 feet of frontage per dwelling unit taken as an average around entire lake.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

MANAGEMENT CLASS 6Remote ponds¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
				F	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
ALLIGATOR P	0502	TA R11 WELS	47	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
AZISCOHOS P	3106	MAGALLOWAY PL	12	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
BAKER P	0422	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	10	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
BEAN P	0656	T02 R12 WELS	16	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
BEAN P (LOWER)	0646	RAINBOW TWP	37	S	S	--	--	--	--	--
BEAN P (MIDDLE)	0648	RAINBOW TWP	10	--	S	--	--	--	--	--
BEAN P (UPPER)	0650	RAINBOW TWP	25	S	S	--	--	--	--	S
BEAR P*	4018	T06 R15 WELS	138	--	S	O	--	--	--	--
BEAR P	0636	RAINBOW TWP	30	S	--	--	--	--	--	S
BEATTIE P	5066	BEATTIE TWP	27	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
BEAVER P	0670	T03 R11 WELS	15	m	--	S	S	--	--	--
BEAVER P	0484	SHAWTOWN TWP	27	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
BEAVER P (BIG)	0610	RAINBOW TWP	45	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
BEAVER P (LITTLE)	9700	RAINBOW TWP	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
BEAVER P (LITTLE)	0612	T03 R11 WELS	10	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
BENJAMIN P	2684	ATTEAN TWP	121	m	--	S	S	--	--	--
BIRCH RIDGE P # 1	0514	TA R11 WELS	11	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
BLACK L	1506	T15 R09 WELS	147	O	-	S	-	-	-	-
BLACK P (LITTLE NO)	1508	T15 R09 WELS	6	S	--	S	--	--	--	--
BLACK P (LITTLE SO)	1510	T15 R09 WELS	7	S	--	S	--	--	--	--
BLUFF P	0434	FRENCHTOWN TWP	10	S	--	--	--	--	--	S
BLUFFER P (UPPER)	2798	T08 R11 WELS	15	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
BOARDWAY P (BIG)	0494	TA R11 WELS	15	S	--	--	--	--	--	S
BOULDER P	2672	T05 R07 BKP WKR	30	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
BOWLIN P (LITTLE)	2194	T05 R07 WELS	34	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
BRACKETT P	0290	BLANCHARD PLT	10	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
BRANCH P (MIDDLE)	0912	EBEEMEE TWP	34	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
BRAYLEY P	2706	T07 R10 WELS	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
BUCK P	0644	RAINBOW TWP	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CAPE HORN P	2568	PRENTISS TWP	22	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CEDAR P	0474	TB R10 WELS	65	O	-	-	-	-	-	S
CEDAR P	2654	HOLEB TWP	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CHAIRBACK P (EAST)	0802	T07 R09 NWP	46	S	--	--	--	--	--	S
CHAIRBACK P (WEST)	0796	T07 R09 NWP	47	O	-	-	-	-	-	S
CHASE STREAM P	4093	MISERY TWP	31	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
CHESUNCOOK P*	0672	T03 R11 WELS	272	S	--	O	O	--	--	O
CLAYTON P	2406	T06 R17 WELS	75	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
CLEAR P	5074	LOWELLTOWN TWP	21	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
CLEARWATER P	2692	ATTEAN TWP	34	-	-	-	-	-	O	-
CLEARWATER P*	2476	PRENTISS TWP	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	P
CLIFFORD P	0624	RAINBOW TWP	17	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
CLISH P	5158	T05 R20 WELS	21	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
CRANBERRY P (L, NOTCH)	0784	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CURRIER P (FIRST)	2768	T09 R11 WELS	20	O	-	S	-	-	-	-
CURRIER P (SECOND)	2774	T09 R11 WELS	28	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
DAISEY P	0594	T02 R10 WELS	11	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
DEBSCONEAG P (6TH)	0580	T01 R11 WELS	31	S	--	--	--	--	S	S
DINGLEY P (LITTLE)	2462	T04 R05 NBKP	17	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
DINGLEY P (UPPER)	2464	T04 R05 NBKP	20	S	--	--	--	--	--	--

MANAGEMENT CLASS 6 (cont)Remote ponds¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
				F	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
DIPPER P*	4042	PITTSTON ACAD GRANT	13	--	--	--	--	--	O	S
DIXON P	9911	PIERCE POND TWP	17	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOUGHNUT P	0616	RAINBOW TWP	12	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
DUBOIS P	2478	PRENTISS TWP	18	m	--	--	--	--	--	P
EDDY P	3546	SANDY RIVER PLT	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ENCHANTED P (LITTLE)	0148	UPPER ENCHANTED TWP	35	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
FOGG P	0426	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	23	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
FOLEY P (LITTLE)	2492	COMSTOCK TWP	35	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
FOWLER P	0686	T03 R11 WELS	19	S	-	O	S	-	-	-
FROST P (LITTLE)	0668	T03 R12 WELS	35	S	S	--	--	--	--	--
GARDNER L	1528	T15 R09 WELS	288	O	O	O	-	-	-	-
GAUNTLET P	0472	TB R10 WELS	11	S	-	O	-	-	-	-
GORDON P	0146	UPPER ENCHANTED TWP	28	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
GOULD P	0620	RAINBOW TWP	12	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
GREEN MTN P	3666	T06 R06 WELS	10	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
HAFEY P	1498	T18 R11 WELS	23	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
HALE P	2508	ALDER BROOK TWP	40	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
HALL P	2566	PRENTISS TWP	19	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
HALL P	5092	T05 R07 BKP WKR	42	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
HARRINGTON P	0702	T03 R11 WELS	40	m	-	O	-	-	-	-
HATHORN P	4242	T04 R08 WELS	15	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
HATHORN P (LITTLE)	2298	T04 R08 WELS	8	-	--	--	--	--	--	--
HEDGEHOG P	0556	T01 R11 WELS	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
HELEN P	0094	PIERCE POND TWP	15	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
HIGH P	0092	PIERCE POND TWP	7	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
HOLBROOK P*	0632	RAINBOW TWP	224	S	--	S	O	--	--	--
HORSERACE PONDS	0626	RAINBOW TWP	50	O	-	O	S	-	-	O
HORSESHOE P	9277	T16 R09 WELS	15	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
HORSESHOE P	2686	ATTEAN TWP	50	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
HOUSTON P (LITTLE)*	0920	KATAHDIN IRN WKS TWP	27	O	--	--	--	--	--	S
HURD P (LITTLE)	0596	T02 R10 WELS	60	S	-	O	S	-	-	S
IRELAND P	4168	T07 R08 WELS	30	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
JACKSON P #1	0684	T03 R11 WELS	23	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
JUNIPER KNEE P	0878	ELLIOTTSVILLE TWP	32	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
KELLY P	0654	T02 R12 WELS	60	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
LANE P	2490	COMSTOCK TWP	24	S	-	-	-	-	-	O
LANE BROOK P	3664	T06 R06 WELS	33	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
LANG P	2542	PARLIN POND TWP	30	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
LANG P (LITTLE)	2543	PARLIN POND TWP	13	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
LEDGE P	3554	SANDY RIVER PLT	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
LINE P	5162	T05 R20 WELS	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
LONG BOG	2668	HOLEB TWP	19	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
LONG P	2690	ATTEAN TWP	37	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
LONG P (LITTLE)	4424	T10 SD	55	S	-	O	S	-	-	-
LOON P	2688	ATTEAN TWP	37	m	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOON P	0554	T01 R11 WELS	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
LOST P	2694	ATTEAN TWP	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MARY PETUCHE P	2474	PRENTISS TWP	10	S	-	-	-	-	-	O
MCKENNA P	0688	T03 R11 WELS	53	m	-	O	S	-	-	-
MCKENNEY P	0154	UPPER ENCHANTED TWP	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

MANAGEMENT CLASS 6 (cont)Remote ponds¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
				F	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
MESSER P	4244	T05 R08 WELS	27	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
MIDWAY P	3544	SANDY RIVER PLT	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MINISTER P (BIG)	0590	T02 R10 WELS	15	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
MINISTER L (LITTLE)	0592	T02 R10 WELS	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MOOSE P (BIG)	0334	MOOSEHEAD JUNCTION TWP	91	O	-	-	-	-	-	S
MOOSE P (LITTLE)	0336	MOOSEHEAD JUNCTION TWP	25	O	-	-	-	-	-	S
MOUNTAIN CATCHER P	4258	T06 R08 WELS	84	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
MOUNTAIN P	0432	BEAVER COVE	56	S	--	--	--	--	--	S
MOUNTAIN VIEW P	0488	TA R11 WELS	13	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
MOXIE P	3585	TOWNSHIP D	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MUD P	2340	TOWNSHIP 6 N OF WELD	6	-	-	--	--	--	--	--
MURPHY P	0486	TA R11 WELS	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MURPHY P (BIG)	0638	RAINBOW TWP	15	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
MUSCALSEA P (BIG)	4036	RUSSELL POND TWP	14	m	--	S	--	--	--	--
MUSCALSEA P (LITTLE)	4034	RUSSELL POND TWP	11	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
NOTCH P	0786	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	10	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
NOTCH P (BIG)	0328	MOOSEHEAD JUNCTION TWP	12	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
NOTCH P (LITTLE)	0326	MOOSEHEAD JUNCTION TWP	10	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
PAPOOSE P	0338	MOOSEHEAD JUNCTION TWP	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PITMAN P	0598	T02 R10 WELS	20	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
POLLY P	0692	T03 R11 WELS	15	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
PORTER P*	4760	T03 ND	58	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
RABBIT P	0552	T01 R11 WELS	10	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
RABBIT P	0366	ELLIOTTSVILLE TWP	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
RAINBOW P	4436	T10 SD	17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
RAINBOW DEADWATERS	9698	RAINBOW TWP	58	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
REED P (LITTLE)	2838	T08 R10 WELS	25	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
RIPOGENUS P	2910	T04 R12 WELS	76	m	S	--	--	--	S	--
ROACH P (FOURTH)	0446	SHAWTOWN TWP	266	S	-	O	S	-	-	-
ROACH P (SEVENTH)	0500	TA R11 WELS	33	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
ROACH P (SIXTH)	0480	SHAWTOWN TWP	48	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
ROBAR P (BIG)	2296	T04 R08 WELS	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ROBERTS P	5164	T05 R20 WELS	19	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
ROCKY P (LITTLE)	0524	TA R11 WELS	12	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
ROUND P	2670	APPLETON TWP	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SADDLEBACK P	3550	SANDY RIVER PLT	13	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
SECRET P	0907	ELLIOTTSVILLE TWP	12	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
SLAUGHTER P	0690	T03 R11 WELS	66	O	-	O	S	-	S	-
SNAKE P	2548	JOHNSON MOUNTAIN TWP	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SOCATEAN P #1	4044	PLYMOUTH TWP	42	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
SOCATEAN P #2	4046	PLYMOUTH TWP	14	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
SPECK P	3288	GRAFTON TWP	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SPRING P	2832	T07 R10 WELS	15	O	--	--	--	--	--	--
SPRUCE MOUNTAIN P	0466	TB R11 WELS	20	S	-	O	-	-	-	S
ST JOHN P (SECOND)	2432	T04 R17 WELS	105	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ST JOHN P (THIRD)	2438	T04 R17 WELS	190	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
ST JOHN P (LOWER 1ST)	2428	T04 R17 WELS	29	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ST JOHN P (UPPER 1ST)	2440	T04 R17 WELS	30	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
STRATTON P	0618	RAINBOW TWP	15	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
SUNDAY P	3316	MAGALLOWAY PLT	30	S	S	--	--	--	--	--
SWIFT RIVER P (LIT)	3572	TOWNSHIP E	15	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
TILDEN P	4418	T10 SD	36	S	--	--	--	--	--	--

MANAGEMENT CLASS 6 (cont)
Remote ponds¹

LAKE NAME	LAKE#	PRINCIPAL TOWN NAME ²	SIZE(AC)	RESOURCE RATINGS ³						
				F	W	SC	SH	B	C	P
TOBEY P #1	2674	T05 R07 BKP WKR	35	m	-	O	S	-	-	-
TOBEY P #2	2676	T05 R07 BKP WKR	32	m	--	S	--	--	--	--
TOBEY P #3	2678	T05 R07 BKP WKR	14	m	--	S	S	--	--	--
TROUT L	1098	KOSSUTH TWP	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TROUT P	5082	LOWELLTOWN TWP	55	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
TROUT P	3260	MASON TWP	17	m	-	S	-	O	-	-
TROUT P	0792	BOWDOIN COL GR WEST	20	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
TUMBLEDOWN DICK P	0548	T01 R11 WELS	24	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
TUMBLEDOWN P	3512	TOWNSHIP 6 N OF WELD	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TURTLE P	0952	LAKE VIEW PLT	81	O	-	-	-	-	-	-
TWIN (TROUT) PONDS	2102	T02 R09 WELS	60	O	-	O	S	-	-	-
TWO MILE P	9765	T16 R13 WELS	12	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
UNNAMED P	7115	COMSTOCK TWP	15	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
UNNAMED P	9746	ATTEAN TWP	12	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
UNNAMED P	8934	ATTEAN TWP	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
UNNAMED P	8416	COMSTOCK TWP	20	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
UNNAMED P	8980	T05 R07 BKP WKR	10	m	--	--	--	--	--	--
UNNAMED P	8942	HOLEB TWP	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
UNNAMED P	8868	PARLIN POND TWP	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
UNNAMED P	7073	T06 R15 WELS	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
WADLEIGH P (LITTLE)	2974	T08 R15 WELS	15	m	-	-	-	-	-	O
WELMAN P (UPPER)	2482	PRENTISS TWP	45	S	--	--	--	--	--	--
WING P	2319	SKINNER TWP	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
WOODMAN P	0622	RAINBOW TWP	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
WOUNDED DEER P*	2484	PRENTISS TWP	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

¹CRITERIA: Not accessible within 1/2 mile by 2wd; no more than 1 non-commercial remote camp; cold water game fishery.

²Some lakes span two or more townships.

³Ratings: O = outstanding; S = significant; P = present; m = missing information.

*Identified and zoned as a remote pond in 1990.

STATISTICS:	NUMBER:		% OF TOTAL
	NUMBER:	176 lakes	11.4%
	ACRES:	5,674 ac total (avg 32)	0.7%
	SHOREFRONT:	935,343 ft total (avg 5,314)	2.8%

(revised 10/17/2000 – dropped Bear Brook Bog per miscellaneous rule revisions)

MANAGEMENT CLASS 7

Management Class 7 includes all lakes not otherwise designated herein.