



**2018 Amendment to the 2002 Gore Mountain
Unit Management Plan
and
Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement**



**Olympic Regional
Development Authority**

May 2018

Lead Agency and Prepared by:

The Olympic Regional Development Authority
2634 Main Street, Lake Placid, New York 12946
(518) 302-5332

Contact: Robert W. Hammond
and

Gore Mountain Ski Center
793 Peaceful Valley Road, North Creek, New York 12853
(518) 251- 2411
Contact: Emily Stanton

In cooperation with:

The NYS Department of Environmental Conservation

and in consultation with:

The Adirondack Park Agency
Ray Brook, New York 12977

Private Consultants:

The LA Group, Landscape Architecture and Engineering, P.C.
40 Long Alley, Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
(518) 587-8100
Contact: Kevin Franke

Date of Acceptance of DGEIS: January 3, 2018

Date of Public Hearing: January 24, 2018

Date of Close of Comment Period: February 9, 2018

Date of Acceptance of FGEIS: April 25, 2018

Submitted: May 2, 2018

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

This 2018 Unit Management Plan (UMP) Amendment has been prepared in accordance with the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan (APSLMP), addresses changes to the 2002 UMP and the 2005 UMP Amendment thereto, and adds several new management actions. This 2018 UMP Amendment lists and reviews the status of the 1995, 2002 and 2005 management actions and identifies those management actions that have been completed, those which are pending, and those that are modified or abandoned within this 2018 UMP Amendment. Previous UMP documents are incorporated by reference into this document.

Since the completion of the last UMP Amendment, Gore Mountain has received recognition from the Ski Industry and the press for, not only its quality skiing experience, but also for its environmental stewardship. In May 2016, Gore Mountain was awarded the esteemed Golden Eagle for Overall Environmental Excellence by a ski area from the National Ski Areas Association. The Golden Eagle is the industry's most prestigious award for sustainability and Gore's broad range of environmental stewardship across several areas of its operation was integral to its win.



Gore Mountain successfully demonstrated that a growing resort¹ can at the same time be sustainable. Projects that contributed to this award were Gore's contracting of two 25-year solar power purchasing agreements, strategic trail modifications to increase uphill operational efficiency, energy-saving snowmaking, creative repurposing of buildings, the redevelopment of historic trails, various education efforts and Gore's increased provision of locally sourced food.

II. 2018 UMP AMENDMENT MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

New management actions are identified and analyzed in this 2018 UMP Amendment. The potential environmental impacts and the attendant proposed mitigation measures for any new or modified management actions are also identified and discussed. The potential impacts and

¹ Gore's acreage and uphill capacity have increased 131 percent and 142 percent respectively over the past 20 years.

the identified mitigation measures for the previously approved UMP management actions remain in effect and will not be repeated here, but are incorporated by reference.

The following lists the New Management Actions that are the subject of this UMP Amendment and that can be undertaken after the UMP Amendment is adopted. The suggested land exchange included below is a conceptual action at this time. Conceptual actions are subject to future SEQRA analyses should they be pursued in the future. See **Figure ES-1, 2018 Master Plan (South)** and **Figure ES-2, 2018 Master Plan (North)**.

Trail Construction and Trail Widening

- Construct a new trail at Burnt Ridge that connects to the Base Lodge via the lower portion of Echo
- Convert the existing Half 'N Half glade to an alpine ski trail (portion on Forest Preserve lands)
- Widen the bottom of Echo as it turns toward the base area
- Widen some sections of Twister
- Widen Sunway and other green trails served by Lift 3

Lifts

- Add a new triple or quad chair (Lift 9B) from Northwoods Lodge up Lower Sunway to just past the bend in Lower Sunway

Vehicular Access and Parking

- Modify the 1995-approved shuttle lane separated from and independent of main traffic route and circulation route and parking

Buildings

- Expand the NYSEF building
- Reconfigure the 1995-approved maintenance complex to locate groomer garage and fueling station adjacent to Sunway trail

Snowmaking

- Enlarge the snowmaking reservoir
- Install a new 24-inch water line from the snowmaking reservoir to the pump house

Mountain Biking


- Construct a single-track bike trail for Town trail at the top of Little Gore


Hiking

- Develop a hiking center based out of the Northwoods Lodge.

Requests for Land Reclassifications (Conceptual Action)

- Request a land reclassification from Wild Forest to Intensive Use and from Intensive Use





to Wilderness which could allow the historic Rabbit Pond Trail to be used as a trail, if authorized in a subsequent UMP.

(Note: The Adirondack Park Agency (APA) cannot find that a UMP Amendment proposing management actions on lands to be reclassified conforms to the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan (APSLMP) before the land is reclassified. First, the Agency must receive a request to reclassify, accompanied by a UMP for the proposed Intensive Use lands. The Agency must follow SEQRA regulations regarding public notice and comment and must hold hearings inside and outside the Adirondack Park on the request to reclassify, pursuant to the APSLMP. After notice, comment and hearings, the reclassification proposals would be presented to the Agency for a recommendation to the Governor for approval of the classification. The process culminates in the Governor's action on that recommendation. This UMP Amendment does not assume that a reclassification request will be approved and does not authorize any actions on lands requested to be reclassified, based on a proposed future classification. The actual request for reclassification and a UMP Amendment for those actions on the lands proposed for reclassification would be presented separately from this UMP Amendment. Discussion of actions on those lands in this UMP is conceptual only, and those actions cannot be authorized by this UMP Amendment.)

These management actions are discussed in the context of existing resources, facilities and use (Section 3) and ORDA's Management and Policy relating to the Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area (Section 3). The management actions themselves are described in detail in Section 4.

An introductory section (Section 1) first gives an overview of project purpose, a general facility description, the history of the ski area, a description of the UMP/GEIS process and a summary update of the status of actions contained in previous UMPs.

III. SEQRA PROCESS

ORDA, as the Agency responsible for undertaking the actions in this 2018 UMP Amendment/FGEIS, completed a New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) Parts 1, 2, and 3 (See Appendix 1). Based on the analysis in Part 3 of the FEAF, ORDA determined that the Project may result in one or more significant adverse impacts on the environment and this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared to further assess the impacts and possible mitigation and to explore alternatives to avoid or reduce these impacts.

The SEQRA aspects of this document are presented as a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS). A Generic EIS may be used to assess the environmental effects of a sequence of actions contemplated by a single agency or an entire program or plan having wide application (6NYCRR 617.10(a)(2) and (4)). They differ from a site specific EIS in that it applies to a group of common and related activities which have similar or related impacts. It is the intent of this GEIS to provide sufficient, site-specific information for all aspects of this UMP Amendment. In conformance with SEQRA, these related actions are being considered in this FGEIS. No additional SEQRA analyses are anticipated to be required for any

management action in this UMP, provided that such actions are carried out in accordance with the recommendations of this document. Conceptual actions are subject to future SEQRA analyses should they be pursued in the future.

A preliminary version of the UMP Draft Amendment/DGEIS was provided to NYSDEC and to the APA for their review on December 8, 2017. Comments from these agencies were received by ORDA, and ORDA revised the preliminary document accordingly. ORDA then declared that document to be complete for public review on January 3, 2018. Notice of ORDA's acceptance of the DGEIS, establishment of the public comment period, and directions for accessing the Public Draft UMP Amendment/DGEIS were published in the January 10, 2018 issue of the Environmental Notice Bulletin. The Public Draft UMP Amendment/DGEIS was presented to the APA at their January 11, 2018 Agency meeting.

The Draft 2018 UMP Amendment/DGEIS was open for public comment until February 9, 2018 including a SEQRA public hearing held at 7:00 PM on January 24, 2018 at the Gore Mountain Base Lodge. Responses were prepared to comments received at the public hearing and to written comments submitted during the public comment period. A transcript of the public hearing, copies of written comments and responses to comments are included in this FGEIS. Also included in this FGEIS is an errata section that summarizes the changes that were made to the DGEIS when preparing this FGEIS. ORDA, as the SEQRA Lead Agency, accepted this FEIS on April 25, 2018.

Part 3 of the FEAF identified those topics for which additional information was required within the GEIS. Primary concerns include steep slope soil erosion and water quality, water quality impacts associated with enlargement of the snowmaking reservoir, and potential impacts to the Bicknell's thrush, a species of special concern in New York State. Potential impacts and mitigation measures for these topics and a range of other topics are discussed in detail in Section 5 of this UMP/FGEIS.

Section 6 considers alternatives to the new management actions including alternative trail improvements, lift configurations, parking and circulation and appurtenances.

ORDA is currently contemplating simultaneous improvements on Town of Johnsbury owned lands at the North Creek Ski Bowl, outside of the Intensive Use Area. Because these actions are not within the Intensive Use Area, they are not covered within this UMP Amendment. Instead, these actions will be subject to APA review under section 814 of the Adirondack Park Agency Act and also subject to review under SEQRA. In order to make the requisite assessment of cumulative impacts, this UMP Amendment/GEIS is accompanied by two companion documents which will be referred to as Part B and Part C (Part A being the UMP/GEIS). Part B is the Ski Bowl Notice of Intent to the APA required under section 814 and accompanying SEQRA documentation. Part C is a cumulative impact assessment of the actions proposed within the Intensive Use Area and the actions proposed at the Ski Bowl.

IV. CONFORMANCE WITH THE APSLMP

It is stated in Section I of the APSLMP that “In accordance with statutory mandate, all [unit management] plans will conform to the guidelines and criteria set forth in the master plan”

The following is from the Intensive Use Area portion of Section 2 of the APSLMP and includes descriptions of how this UMP Amendment conforms to the stated guidelines.

Guidelines for Management and Use

Basic Guidelines

1. *The primary management guideline for Intensive Use Areas will be to provide the public opportunities for family group camping, developed swimming and boating, downhill skiing, cross country skiing under competitive or developed conditions on improved cross country ski trails, visitor information and similar outdoor recreational pursuits in a setting and on a scale that are in harmony with the relatively wild and undeveloped character of the Adirondack Park.*

The Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area will continue to provide opportunities for downhill skiing, cross-country skiing and similar outdoor recreational pursuits.

There are no new management actions in this UMP Amendment that change the current setting or scale of the facilities at Gore Mountain. One ski lift will be slightly relocated and replaced while another lift will be added in the same general area to provide better service on the beginner ski terrain low on the mountain. Selective trail widening will occur on the trails served by these lifts. A single new ski trail is proposed to be constructed in between existing ski trails in order to provide a connection between Burnt Ridge and the Base Area during those times when the Echo trail is being used for ski racing and is not available for public use. Selective trail widening on the Twister trail is limited in nature and is intended to provide a more uniform trail width along its length.

2. *All intensive use facilities should be located, designed and managed so as to blend with the Adirondack environment and to have the minimum adverse impact possible on surrounding state lands and nearby private holdings. They will not be situated where they will aggravate problems on lands already subject to or threatened by overuse, such as the eastern portion of the High Peaks Wilderness, the Pharaoh Lake Wilderness or the St. Regis Canoe Area or where they will have a negative impact on competing private facilities. Such facilities will be adjacent to or serviceable from existing public road systems or water bodies open to motorboat use within the Park.*

All the new management actions proposed in this UMP Amendment, and that can take place after the adoption of this UMP Amendment, are located low on the mountain where they will not cause a visual impact (see UMP section V.C.I). All actions are located

in the interior of the Intensive Use Area removed from adjoining State and private lands. This UMP amendment is not proposing any significant enlargement of the ski area, so there is no potential for adversely affecting lands subject or threatened by overuse or competing private facilities.

3. *Construction and development activities in Intensive Use Areas will:*

-- *avoid material alteration of wetlands;*

Impacts to wetlands have been avoided (see UMP section V.A.5).

-- *minimize extensive topographic alterations;*

No extensive topographic alterations are proposed (see UMP section V.A.3).

-- *limit vegetative clearing;*

Vegetative clearing has been limited and it is well within the limits established by Article 14 of the NYS Constitution (see UMP section V.B.1 and Appendix 5).

and,

-- *preserve the scenic, natural and open space resources of the Intensive Use Area.*

See items 1 and 2 above.

4. *Day use areas will not provide for overnight camping or other overnight accommodations for the public.*

No overnight accommodations, camping or otherwise, are proposed.

5. *Priority should be given to the rehabilitation and modernization of existing Intensive Use Areas and the complete development of partially developed existing Intensive Use Areas before the construction of new facilities is considered.*

The actions contained in this UMP amendment are for the improvement and modernization of the existing Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area.

6. *Additions to the intensive use category should come either from new acquisitions or from the reclassification of appropriate wild forest areas, and only in exceptional circumstances from wilderness, primitive or canoe areas.*

This UMP amendment suggests land reclassification that would include an addition to the Intensive Use Area from the Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild Forest and an addition to the Siamese Ponds Wilderness Area from the Intensive Use Area (see UMP section IV.8).

7. *Any request for classification of a new acquisition or reclassification of existing lands from another land use category to an Intensive Use Area will be accompanied by a draft unit management plan for the proposed Intensive Use Area that will demonstrate how the applicable guidelines will be respected.*

These same ten Intensive Use Area guidelines from the APSLMP will be examined for the lands requested for reclassification (see UMP section IV.8).

8. *No new structures or improvements at any Intensive Use Area will be constructed except in conformity with a final adopted unit management plan for such area. This guideline will not prevent the ordinary maintenance, rehabilitation or minor relocation of conforming structures or improvements.*

None of the new management actions contained in this UMP amendment will be constructed unless and until they are included in the final UMP amendment adopted by NYSDEC.

9. *Since the concentrations of visitors at certain intensive use facilities often pose a threat of water pollution, the state should set an example for the private sector by installing modern sewage treatment systems with the objective of maintaining high water quality. Standards for the state should in no case be less than those for the private sector and in all cases any pit privy, leach field or seepage pit will be at least 150 feet from the mean high water mark of any lake, pond, river or stream.*

No in-ground wastewater treatment is proposed.

10. *Any new, reconstructed or relocated buildings or structures located on shorelines of lakes, ponds, rivers or major streams, other than docks, primitive tent sites not a part of a campground (which will be governed by the general guidelines for such sites set forth elsewhere in this master plan) boat launching sites, fishing and waterway access sites, boathouses, and similar water related facilities, will be set back a minimum of 150 feet from the mean high water mark and will be located so as to be reasonably screened from the water body to avoid intruding on the natural character of the shoreline and the public enjoyment and use thereof.*

No new buildings or structures are proposed anywhere near any shorelines.

V. IMPACT ANALYSIS

A. Geology

Bedrock is at or near the ground surface in many locations in the Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area.

Bedrock may be encountered when constructing a portion of the dedicated shuttle lane. There is an area of Lyman-Rock Outcrop soils between parking lot E and the base lodge. It may be necessary to blast some bedrock to create the shuttle lane through this area. It is also possible that blasting may be necessary as part of some of the trail creation or trail widening management actions. Bedrock may also be encountered when enlarging the snowmaking

reservoir which could also necessitate blasting. Hermon-Lyman-Rock Outcrop soils are mapped on the north and south sides of the reservoir.

As described in UMP Section II.A.1.a, the landform that is Gore Mountain, including the Barton garnet mine that is located on the north side of the mountain, is considered a unique geologic feature because of the nearby garnet deposits (<http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/53858.html>). These deposits will not be affected by the construction activities associated with the shuttle lane or the snowmaking reservoir which are both located at low elevations on the mountain.

ORDA will employ the services of a professional, licensed and insured blasting company to perform any needed blasting. Blasters in New York State are required to possess a valid NY State Department of Labor issued Explosive License and Blaster Certificate of Competence. The Explosives License permits the licensee to purchase, own, possess or transport explosives. The Blaster Certificate of Competence permits the use of explosives.

If it is determined that blasting will be required, a written blasting plan will be developed and approved prior to the commencement of blasting. In general, the blast plan will contain information about the blasting methods to be employed, measures to be taken to protect the safety of the public, and how the applicable rules and regulations will be complied with. If during the evolution of the project there are significant changes in the blast design a new blast plan will be required. A test shot will be required for the first shot after the approval of each blast plan.

See Section V.A.1 for a full description of all of the measures ORDA will implement to mitigate potential impacts from any blasting that may be required.

B. Soils

Soil Erodibility (K) Factors are discussed in Section 2.A.1.b of the UMP. “K” is one factor used to calculate potential soil loss using the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE). Other factors in RUSLE include slope length (L) and slope steepness (S).

Construction of most new Management Actions is proposed on soils with an “E” slope category. E soils are described as steep. Some new management actions are proposed on soils with a “C” slope category. C soils are described as sloping.

Disturbance of areas of steep slopes during construction can lead to an increased vulnerability of the soils to erosion. Suitable measures must be implemented to first prevent soil erosion and then second to make sure that any soils that are eroded are contained and prevented for causing sedimentation in receiving waters.

ORDA will implement proper erosion and sediment control practices when undertaking construction practices at their venues that oftentimes involve construction on steep slopes. These proper practices are set forth in the New York State Standards and Specifications for

Erosion and Sediment Control (last updated November 2016). These standards and specifications will be used to develop Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) for construction activities in accordance with NYSDEC's SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Construction Activity, GP-0-15-002.

SWPPPs will detail those measures that will be implemented during construction to mitigate potential soil erosion and surface water sedimentation. SWPPP content will include such things as construction sequencing and phasing, temporary and permanent stabilization, structural erosion control practices and vegetative control practices. SWPPPs will include provisions for monitoring, inspections, data collection, and compliance documentation.

Section V.A.2 provides a lengthy and detailed description of mitigation measures that ORDA commonly and successfully employs during ski area construction activities that will be incorporated into pre-construction SWPPP plans and specifications, and installed, monitored and maintained during construction until soils become stabilized.

C. Topography and Slope

Very limited grading is required for new ski trails, trail widening or ski lifts. Trails are laid out to follow natural fall lines. Lift grading is limited to the upper and lower terminals and at the lift tower foundations.

Grading will be required to create the building pad for the groomer garage as well as for sections of the shuttle lane. Significant grading (excavation) is proposed for the enlargement of the snowmaking reservoir.

Impacts associated with grading involve erosion and sediment control (see the previous section) and protection of water resources (see the following section).

D. Water Resources

Identified impacts to surface water are (1) sedimentation of eroded soils, (2) increased stormwater runoff with accompanying loadings (nutrients, dissolved solids, etc.), and (3) exposure of disturbed soils in the snowmaking reservoir expansion area along with separating clean inflow waters from the active construction areas during reservoir excavation.

Those measures that will be implemented to prevent erosion and subsequent sedimentation were described previously in the Soils section.

The new management actions include only two actions that will introduce significant amounts of new impervious surfaces that will increase stormwater runoff. These are the new groomer garage and those portions of the shuttle lane that will be outside of existing parking areas and drives. A Stormwater Management Report has been prepared for these two actions. See UMP Appendix 7.

The Project has been designed in accordance with Chapter 4 of the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual (SWMDM), and NYSDEC's General Permit GP-0-15-002 for construction activities. Stormwater calculations were performed utilizing widely accepted engineering methodologies, including TR-55, and the stormwater modeling computer program HydroCAD (version 10.00) produced by HydroCAD Software Solutions, LLC.

Under the watershed's proposed condition, all stormwater from the Project will continue to discharge to the same point as in the existing condition (Analysis Points 1 & 2). The total watershed has generally remained unchanged, as is shown on the drawing "W-2 Proposed Conditions Watershed Map" contained in Appendix 7. To meet NYSDEC requirements (see Section 5.0, NYSDEC Design Criteria in Appendix 7) a bioretention basin and wet swale have been incorporated into the stormwater management design to mitigate the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff discharged from the Project Site.

For the snowmaking reservoir expansion, first the reservoir will be fully drained through its drain valve. Once the reservoir is drained a haul road stabilized outlet will be created in the southeast corner of the reservoir where the remnant of a haul road currently exists. Next, a rip rap stream channel will be constructed to convey water from the main reservoir inlet to the outlet structure. The intent is to isolate and pass through reservoir inflow from the inlet while the reservoir is being excavated. Two 24 foot wide haul roads would then be constructed in order to remove excavated materials from the north and south ends of the reservoir. Excavation work will proceed from west to east. Once excavation is complete, haul roads would be removed and removed material would be stabilized, the outlet valve will be closed, and the reservoir will be allowed to gradually fill. This gradual filling should allow for the settling of solids that become suspended during pond refilling. Exposed soils will be mostly fine sands that will tend not to stay in suspension as compared to silts or clays.

E. Wetlands

None of the new management actions proposed in the UMP Amendment will impact wetlands. Avoidance of wetland impacts in the areas of the groomer garage, the shuttle lane and the snowmaking reservoir was accomplished by field evaluation for the presence of wetlands and then designing these components to avoid wetlands. Periphery wetlands at the snowmaking reservoir will experience temporary hydrological alteration when the reservoir is emptied. This will not significantly impact wetlands since the effects will be temporary and since these wetlands have persisted when the reservoir has regularly been emptied in the past for inspection and maintenance purposes. Additional information regarding wetland avoidance can be found in UMP Section 6, Alternatives.

F. Climate and Air Quality

No new permanent sources of air emissions are proposed as part of this UMP.

Gore Mountain Ski Center has a current NYSDEC Air Quality Permit for which they are compliant.

Construction activities may result in localized increases in dust levels. However, areas of proposed construction that can take place after this UMP Amendment is adopted are located within the interior of the Intensive Use Areas, so no offsite areas will be affected.

Many ORDA venues exist within the boundaries of State protected lands and the impact of climate change on our environment is recognized. ORDA will be a leader in environmental stewardship with consistent commitment to sustainability, responsible development practices, and continuous communication with DEC, APA, and other regulatory agencies to ensure we are taking the appropriate measures.

G. Vegetation

Tree clearing associated with the new management actions includes 18.1 acres for downhill ski trails (9.4 on the current Intensive Use Area lands and 8.7 acres in the lands that could be added from the VMWF reclassification (conceptual action)), 9.2 acres for trail widening, 3.1 acres for ski lifts, 0.8 acres for the groomer garage, and 6.5 acres for the shuttle lane. An area around maintenance and Lifts 9A and 9B previously approved in 1995 is no longer proposed. The 7.3 acres of clearing in this area is no longer proposed.

The numbers of trees proposed to be cut are summarized in the Table below.

Tree Cutting by Location and Community Type

Location	Community	Action(s)	Acreage	Total Trees
Gore Mtn IUA	B (mixed hardwood)	Burnt Ridge Trail (partial)	4.2	1,565
Gore Mtn IUA	E (mixed hardwood)	Burnt Ridge Trail (partial) + Trails 11A, 1N-P	6.9	4,447
Gore Mtn IUA	Q (pioneer hardwood)	Twister Widening	1.1	415
Gore Mtn IUA	P (northern hardwood)	Various	15.4	3315
			SUBTOTAL	9,742
Land Reclassif. (conceptual)	E (mixed hardwood)	Lift 12 and Trails 12	10.2	6,574
			TOTAL	16,316

A total of 9,742 trees are proposed to be cut on lands that are currently classified as Intensive Use Area. Approximately 25% of these will be 3-4" dbh and the remainder will be >4" dbh.

The area of Gore Mountain tree cutting is less than 1% of the size of the Intensive Use Area which fits within the capacity of the natural resources to absorb the impact.

There is no tree cutting proposed above 2,800 feet in elevation.

All tree cutting will be done in compliance with the DEC tree cutting policy LF-91-2.

No rare, threatened or endangered plant species will be impacted.

Only areas absolutely necessary for construction of ski trails, ski lifts, and other proposed improvements will be cleared of vegetation. All other areas will be maintained in a natural state.

Erosion control measures will be used on cleared areas with disturbed soils to avoid affecting adjacent vegetation by erosion or siltation. Erosion-control devices to be used will include filter fabric fences and staked straw bale filters.

Upon the completion of clearing of new ski trails and ski lift corridors, they will be seeded with grass mixtures to promote rapid revegetation. Areas disturbed for any other improvements will also be landscaped and revegetated as soon as practicable.

H. Wildlife

The actions proposed in this UMP are expected to have minimal impacts on wildlife. Proposed management actions are spread over the landscape of the existing developed ski trails and lifts. New management actions are proposed at low elevations on the mountain.

Trail widening projects, including the green trails, involve existing trails. This will result in the loss of some currently treed areas along the edge of existing ski trails and move most of the forest edge slightly outward.

Replacing and relocation the Sunway Lift will occur in the immediate vicinity of the existing lift.

The new lift 9B will parallel the existing Lower Sunway trail and much of it will occur in an already cleared area.

Enlarging the snowmaking reservoir will entail converting 1.6 acres of shoreline wooded areas to open water.

The new groomer garage will require some tree removal in an area that has existing work roads on two sides and an existing ski trail on a third side.

The NYSEF building expansion will occur in a grassy area immediately adjacent to the existing building.

The improvements associated with the dedicated shuttle lane take place in and around existing parking areas and the existing access road and will have minimal wildlife habitat impact.

I. Fisheries

The only proposed management action that involves aquatic resources is the expansion of the snowmaking reservoir. Significant adverse impacts to fisheries resources are not expected to occur as a result of reservoir drawdown for construction of the expansion. There may be some temporary short-term impacts to the fisheries resource within the reservoir proper, but these resources have developed and persisted while the reservoir is regularly drained for inspection and maintenance activities.

See the earlier section entitled Water Resources for a description of how the flow of clean inflow through the reservoir and downstream in Roaring Brook will be maintained in the snowmaking reservoir during the expansion process. The same section describes how the reservoir will be allowed to fill gradually after expansion is complete in order to allow for settling out of suspended solids within the reservoir before the reservoir begins to flow over the spillway.

J. Unique Areas

There are no unique biological areas present.

K. Critical Habitat

No new management actions are proposed to occur above 2,800 feet in elevation. There will no impact to the Adirondack Sub Alpine Forest Bird Conservation Area. Any carryover actions from previous UMPs that require construction activities above 2,800 feet in elevation will not commence prior to August 1 of any year.

L. Visual Resources

The actions proposed in this UMP are expected to have minimal visual impacts. The existing ski area is already visible from some area roadways. Proposed actions are spread across the landscape of the existing developed ski trails and lifts. New management actions are proposed at low elevations on the mountain.

Trail widening projects involve existing trails. For any trails that are currently visible from off site, the visual effect of minor widenings will be essentially imperceptible.

Replacing and relocating the Sunway Lift will occur in the immediate vicinity of the existing lift.

The new lift 9B will be low on the mountain and will parallel the existing Lower Sunway trail. The widening of the green trails will occur at low elevations not visible from off site.

The snowmaking reservoir is not visible from outside the Intensive Use Area.

The new groomer garage will be located in a low elevation wooded area. Although it will be visible on-site, it will not be visible from off site

The NYSEF building is not visible from off site.

The improvements associated with the dedicated shuttle lane take place in and around existing parking areas and the existing access road that are not visible from off site.

The suggested land reclassification (conceptual action) itself would not result in any changes to the site.

M. Transportation

The proposed management actions do not include any significant expansion of mountain facilities, such as the addition of a new pod of ski trails, that would result in significant increases in peak hour traffic generation.

N. Community Services

The project primarily involves improvements to existing facilities designed to retain the existing skier base and increase the future number of skiers, hikers and bikers at Gore Mountain. It is anticipated that there will be a minor incremental increase in demand for community services such as fire, police, rescue, solid waste and health care due to the gradual increase in the number of visitors to the mountain. Many of the improvements are designed to build visitation during the off-seasons of spring, summer and fall thereby distributing the potential impacts over a 12-month period. The Ski Center presently makes very little demand on most services and the increase in such demand is anticipated to be small and can be accommodated by the service providers.

The North Creek Health Center was developed, and the Warrensburg Health Center was recently expanded to respond to the growing need for services in local communities and businesses in the region. The potential long-term and incremental increase in visitors may increase the demand for medical care slightly and these facilities are capable of meeting any increased demand. The Glens Falls Hospital is also prepared to handle a minor increase in patients to the emergency room.

The extra revenue derived from EMS calls from skiers, hikers and mountain bikers helps offsets the year-round costs and therefore has a positive impact on the people who live and pay taxes in Johnsbury.

O. Local Land Use Plans

The actions in the UMP Amendment are consistent with local planning documents including the 2005 Johnsbury Comprehensive Plan and the 2007 Town of Johnsbury Zoning Law/LLUP that serve to guide community planning. Both documents seek to forge stronger links between the Gore Mountain Ski Resort, the North Creek Ski Bowl, and the hamlet of North Creek, all of which are goals of Gore Mountain, ORDA and this UMP Amendment.

The UMP Amendment contains specific actions designed to encourage skiers to use both ski areas thereby increasing the overall number of skiers at both Gore Mountain and the Ski Bowl. ORDA has cooperated with North Creek in developing hiking, cross-country ski and mountain bike trails with the goal of connecting Ski Bowl Park and Gore Mountain lands.

The actions on State lands authorized by the UMP Amendment will not have any effects on adjoining or nearby private lands inconsistent with local land use controls such as the Johnsbury Zoning Law and the North Creek Action Plan that serve to guide community planning.

P. Historical and Archaeological Resources

Appendix 3 of the UMP Amendment contains a November 9, 2017 letter from NYS Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation stating that there will be no impacts to archeological or historic resources.

VI. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Section 6 of the UMP contains an analysis of alternatives to the proposed management actions. Alternatives were examined for trail improvements, lift configurations, parking and circulation improvements, appurtenances (including the snowmaking reservoir) and the no-action alternative. Information is provided as to why the proposed management actions are the preferred alternatives from a ski area operations standpoint, while at the same the proposed actions have avoided significant adverse environmental impacts as compared to other alternatives considered.

Gore Mountain
2018 Amendment to the 2002 Unit Management Plan and
Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement

Executive Summary

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

List of Appendices

List of Abbreviations

SECTION I INTRODUCTION

A.	Project Purpose	I-1
B.	Brief Overview	I-2
C.	General Facility Description	I-3
	1. Location Description	I-3
	2. Property Description	I-4
D.	History of the Ski Area	I-4
E.	Description of UMP/GEIS Process	I-5
F.	Status of Previous UMP Updates and Amendments	I-7

SECTION II INVENTORY OF EXISTING RESOURCES, FACILITIES, SYSTEMS AND USE

A.	Inventory of Natural Resources	II-1
	1. Physical Resources	II-1
	a. Geology	II-1
	b. Soils	II-1
	c. Topography and Slope.....	II-3
	d. Water Resources.....	II-3
	e. Wetlands	II-4
	f. Climate and Air Quality.....	II-5
	2. Biological Resources	II-9
	a. Vegetation.....	II-9
	b. Wildlife	II-9
	c. Fisheries.....	II-11
	d. Unique Areas.....	II-11
	e. Critical Habitat	II-11
	3. Visual Resources	II-12
B.	Human Resources.....	II-12
	1. Transportation	II-12
	2. Community Services.....	II-13
	3. Local Land Use Plans.....	II-14
	4. Historical and Archaeological Resources	II-16

C.	Man-Made Facilities	II-16
1.	Inventory of Constructed Facilities	II-16
a.	Downhill Ski Slopes	II-16
b.	Cross-country, Hiking and Mountain Bike Trails.....	II-18
c.	Lifts	II-18
d.	Parking	II-19
e.	Access Roads	II-19
f.	Buildings.....	II-20
g.	Maintenance Roads	II-20
h.	Potable Water	II-20
i.	Snowmaking	II-21
j.	Grooming Equipment.....	II-21
k.	Water Supply for Snowmaking.....	II-21
l.	Sanitary Wastewater.....	II-22
m.	Drainage.....	II-22
n.	Electrical Distribution.....	II-23
o.	Solid Waste Management.....	II-23
p.	Equipment Inventory	II-23
2.	Inventory of Systems	II-23
a.	Management	II-23
b.	Organization.....	II-24
c.	Operations.....	II-24
d.	Contractual Arrangements	II-25
D.	Public Use of the Ski Center	II-26
1.	Ski Season Use	II-26
2.	Non-Ski Season Use	II-28

SECTION III MANAGEMENT AND POLICY

A.	Orientation and Evolution of Management Philosophy	III-1
B.	Regulatory Issues	III-2
1.	New York State Constitution Article 14	III-2
2.	Adirondack State Land Master Plan	III-5
3.	2005 Unit Management Plan Amendment.....	III-7
4.	Environmental Conservation Law	III-7
5.	Olympic Regional Development Authority Act.....	III-7
6.	DEC - ORDA Memorandum of Understanding and Consolidation Agreement	III-8
C.	Management Goals and Objectives.....	III-8

SECTION IV PROPOSED MANAGEMENT ACTIONS AND PROJECTED USE

A.	Proposed Management Actions to be Undertaken after Acceptance and Adoption of this UMP and Conceptual Management Actions	IV-1
1.	General.....	IV-1
2.	New Downhill Trails and Lifts.....	IV-1
a.	Non-Beginner Trail Widening.....	IV-1
b.	Add new triple or quad chair (Lift 9B), from Northwoods Lodge	

	up Lower Sunway to just past the bend in Lower Sunway	IV-1
	c. Widen Sunway and other green trails served by Lift 3	IV-2
	d. Construct Trails 11-O and 12-O	IV-2
3.	Enlarge snowmaking reservoir.....	IV-2
4.	Buildings.....	IV-4
	a. Expand NYSEF building.....	IV-4
	b. Reconfigure 1995 UMP-approved maintenance area to locate groomer garage and fueling adjacent to existing ski trail	IV-4
5.	Bike Trail - Single track bike trail for Town trail at top of Little Gore	IV-5
6.	Vehicle Access-modify 1995 UMP-approved shuttle lane separated from and independent of main traffic circulation route and parking	IV-5
7.	Land reclassification involving Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area, Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild Forest and Siamese Ponds Wilderness Area which could allow the historic Rabbit Pond trail to be reclaimed and used winter and summer (Conceptual Action)	IV-5
8.	Rabbit Pond Trail Activities (Conceptual Action).....	IV-11
B.	Projected Use	IV-11
C.	Actions Approved in Previous UMP/EIS which are Part of the Foregoing 5-year Plan.....	IV-11
D.	Prioritization of Management Actions	IV-12

SECTION V POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

A.	Physical Resources	V-1
1.	Geology	V-1
2.	Soils	V-3
3.	Topography and Slope	V-9
4.	Water Resources.....	V-10
5.	Wetlands	V-12
6.	Climate and Air Quality	V-12
B.	Biological Resources	V-13
1.	Vegetation.....	V-13
2.	Wildlife	V-15
3.	Fisheries	V-16
4.	Unique Areas.....	V-16
5.	Critical Habitat	V-16
C.	Human Resources.....	V-17
1.	Visual Resources	V-17
2.	Transportation	V-17
3.	Community Services.....	V-18
4.	Local Land Use Plans	V-18
5.	Historical and Archaeological Resources	V-19

SECTION VI ALTERNATIVES

A.	Alternative Trail Improvements	VI-1
B.	Alternative Lift Configurations	VI-1
C.	Alternative Parking/Circulation Improvements	VI-2
D.	Alternative Appurtenances	VI-2
E.	The No-Action Alternative	VI-3

SECTION VII SUMMARY OF UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

SECTION VIII IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

SECTION IX GROWTH INDUCING, SECONDARY AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

SECTION X EFFECTS ON THE USE AND CONSERVATION OF ENERGY

List of Figures

Figure ES-1	2018 Master Plan – Approved and Proposed Actions (South)
Figure ES-2	2018 Master Plan – Approved and Proposed Actions (North)
Figure 1	2018 New Management Actions (South)
Figure 2	2018 New Management Actions (North)
Figure 3	Regional Location Map
Figure 4	Site Location Map
Figure 5	Intensive Use Area Boundary
Figure 6	Surrounding Land Use Classification
Figure 7	Existing Conditions (South)
Figure 8	Existing Conditions (North)
Figure 9	Existing and Approved Hiking and Biking Trails (South)
Figure 10	Existing and Approved Hiking and Biking Trails (North)
Figure 11	Previously Approved Actions, Not Yet Constructed (South)
Figure 12	Previously Approved Actions, Not Yet Constructed (North)
Figure 13	2018 Master Plan – Approved and Proposed Actions (South)
Figure 14	2018 Master Plan – Approved and Proposed Actions (Base Area)
Figure 15	2018 Master Plan – Approved and Proposed Actions (North)
Figure 16	Soils Map
Figure 17	Topography
Figure 18	Slope Map
Figure 19	Surface Water and Wetland Resources
Figure 20	Vegetation Map
Figure 21	Potential Bicknell's Thrush Habitat
Figure 22	Gore Mountain Ski Trail Inventory
Figure 23	Organizational Structure Gore Mountain Ski Area
Figure 24	Snowmaking Reservoir Existing Conditions
Figure 25	Proposed Snowmaking Reservoir Expansion
Figure 26	Shuttle Lane Plan
Figure 27	Suggested Land Reclassification Map
Figure 27A	North Creek Ski Map 1940's

Figure 27B	1958 USGS Map Gore Mountain Area
Figure 27C	Ski Bowl Trail Network
Figure 27D	Rabbit Pond Trail Relocation Area
Figure 28	Soils Map and Management Actions
Figure 29	Topography and Management Actions
Figure 30	Surface Water, Wetland Resources, and Proposed Actions
Figure 31	Snowmaking Reservoir Construction Sequencing
Figure 32	Vegetation and Management Actions
Figure 33	Potential Bicknell's Thrush Habitat and Management Actions
Figure 34	Snowmaking Reservoir Expansion Alternative 1
Figure 35	Snowmaking Reservoir Expansion Alternative 2
Figure 36	Snowmaking Reservoir Expansion Alternative 3
Figure 37	Snowmaking Reservoir Expansion Alternative 4
Figure 38	Snowmaking Reservoir Expansion Alternative 5
Figure 39	Snowmaking Reservoir Expansion Alternative 6

List of Tables

Table 1	2018 UMP Amendment and Status of 2005 UMP Actions
Table 1A	Ski Trails at Gore Mountain
Table 2	Town of Johnsburg Land Classification
Table 3	Gore Mountain Lifts
Table 4	Snowmaking Utilization
Table 5	Winter Public Use of Gore Mountain Ski Area
Table 6	Non-winter Public Use of Gore Mountain Ski Area
Table 7	Tree Cutting by Location and Community Type

List of Appendices

Appendix 1	SEQRA Full Environmental Assessment Form Parts 1, 2 and 3
Appendix 2	ORDA/NYSDEC Consolidation Agreement
Appendix 3	Correspondence
Appendix 4	Adirondack Sub-alpine Forest Bird Conservation Area Description
Appendix 5	Trail Inventory and Analysis
Appendix 6	Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild Forest 2005 UMP Excerpts
Appendix 7	Stormwater Management Report
Appendix 8	Tree Counts
Appendix 9	Gore Mountain Sustainability Analysis
Appendix 10	DGEIS Public Hearing Transcript
Appendix 11	DGEIS Written Public Comments
Appendix 12	DGEIS Comments and Responses to Comments
Appendix 13	Errata – Narrative Summary of Changes Made to the DGEIS in the FGEIS

List of Abbreviations

APA	– Adirondack Park Agency
APSLMP	– Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan
DGEIS	– Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement
FEAF	– Full Environmental Assessment Form
FGEIS	– Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement

LLUP – Locally Approved Land Use Program

Mgal – million gallons

NYSDEC – NYS Department of Environmental Conservation

ORDA _ NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority

SEQRA – (NY) State Environmental Quality Review Act

UMP – Unit Management Plan

VMWF – Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild Forest



SECTION I INTRODUCTION

A. Project Purpose

The Olympic Regional Development Authority (ORDA), in conjunction with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), is amending the 2002 Unit Management Plan (UMP) and Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) for Gore Mountain Ski Center in North Creek, Town of Johnsbury, Warren County, New York. This document serves as an amendment to that 2002 UMP. As an amendment to the 2002 UMP, this document will discuss changes to actions which have been previously approved, will include any new information relating to changes such that it satisfies State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) requirements, and will refer to the previously accepted and approved EIS for sections which have not changed as a result of this UMP Amendment. The document is organized so that it follows the sequence of the 2002 UMP.

ORDA's goals for Gore Mountain will be advanced through the actions contained in this UMP Amendment. Included in these goals are the following:

- modernize facilities in order to enhance the guest experience, improve skier safety, and increase local and regional economic benefits, while maintaining environmental quality,
- develop new summer and fall uses of the Ski Center to provide greater year-round use of the facility by the public, consistent with Article 14 and the APSLMP,
- work closely with the North Creek community and Town of Johnsbury to provide information to visitors about the area and to cooperate in the establishment of a shuttle link between the Ski Center and North Creek and a physical ski link to Ski Bowl Park in order that public use may better help promote the economy of the area,
- improve environmental performance in all aspects of its operations and managing the area to allow for continued enjoyment by future generations,
- seek to increase the capacity of the ski area in concert with other modernization objectives in order to provide a higher quality skiing experience,
- improve infrastructure reliability in order to reduce the high frequency of breakdown, excessive staffing requirements and consequent financial drain,
- seek to reduce its operations and maintenance costs by replacing outdated and aged equipment,
- improve skier safety and enjoyment by widening certain trails and improving certain trail intersections, and

- improve trail selection and create a better balance among trails in order to appeal to a greater cross-section of the skiing market by increasing the number of trails for the beginning and advanced skier.

B. Brief Overview

The following lists the New Management Actions that are the subject of this UMP Amendment and that can be undertaken after the UMP Amendment is adopted. **Figures 1 and 2, 2018 UMP New Management Actions (North and South),** show the locations of the actions.

Trail Construction and Trail Widening

- Construct a new trail at Burnt Ridge (11-0) that connects to the Base Lodge via the lower portion of Echo
- Convert the existing Half 'N Half glade to an alpine ski trail (portion on Forest Preserve lands)
- Widen the bottom of Echo as it turns toward the base area
- Widen some sections of Twister
- Widen Sunway and other green trails served by Lift 3
- Reestablish alpine skiing on a portion of Rabbit Pond Trail (conceptual action)

Lifts

- Add a new triple or quad chair (Lift 9B) from Northwoods Lodge up Lower Sunway to just past the bend in Lower Sunway

Vehicular Access and Parking

- Modify the 1995-approved shuttle lane separated from and independent of main traffic route and circulation route and parking

Buildings

- Expand the NYSEF building
- Reconfigure the 1995-approved maintenance complex to locate a groomer garage and fueling station adjacent to Sunway trail

Snowmaking


- Enlarge the snowmaking reservoir
- Install new 24-inch water line from the snowmaking reservoir to the pump house

Mountain Biking

- Construct a single track bike trail that connects to an existing trail on Town of Johnsbury lands, and ends at the top of Little Gore

Hiking





- Develop a hiking center at the Northwoods Lodge

Land Reclassification (Conceptual Action)

- Request land reclassification from Wild Forest to Intensive Use and From Intensive Use to Wilderness which could allow the historic Rabbit Pond Trail to be reclaimed and used winter and summer if authorized in a subsequent UMP.

(Note: The Adirondack Park Agency cannot find that a UMP Amendment proposing management actions on lands to be reclassified conforms to the APSLMP before the land is reclassified. First, the Agency must receive a request to reclassify, accompanied by a UMP for the proposed Intensive Use lands. The Agency must follow SEQRA regulations regarding public notice and comment and must hold hearings inside and outside the Adirondack Park on the request to reclassify, pursuant to the APSLMP. After notice, comment and hearings, the reclassification proposals would be presented to the Agency for a recommendation to the Governor for approval of the classification. The process culminates in the Governor's action on that recommendation. This UMP Amendment does not assume that a reclassification request will be approved and does not authorize any actions on lands to be reclassified, based on a proposed future classification. The actual request for reclassification and a UMP Amendment for those actions on the lands proposed for reclassification would be presented separately from this UMP Amendment. Discussion of actions on those lands in this UMP is conceptual only, and those actions cannot be authorized by this UMP Amendment.)


C. General Facility Description


1. Location Description


Gore Mountain Ski Center is located off NY Route 28, approximately two miles south of the Hamlet of North Creek, and 15 miles northwest of Warrensburg, in the Town of Johnsburg, Warren County, New York. A paved access road approximately one and one-half miles in length leads from County Route 29, Peaceful Valley Road, to the base lodge and parking areas. See **Figure 3**, "Regional Location Map," and **Figure 4**, "Site Location Map," for site location and regional travel routes. Gore Mountain Ski Center is State Land classified as "Intensive Use" under the APSLMP. The APSLMP identifies the specific boundaries of the ski center. The ski area's holdings encompass slopes of two mountains, Gore Mountain and Pete Gay Mountain, with approximately 3,755 acres of land. See **Figure 5**, "Intensive Use Area Boundary," for the delineation of the area boundaries.

Adjoining lands are a mix of State lands and private lands. Gore Mountain Ski Center is bordered to the north by a portion of the Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild Forest. The Siamese Ponds Wilderness Area adjoins the Ski Center to the west.

Private land borders the ski area lands to the north, south, east and west. According to the Adirondack Park Land Use and Development Plan Map, lands to the north and west are







Gore Mountain
Intensive Use Area

classified as "Resource Management" and "Industrial," to the east as "Low Intensity Use," "Hamlet," and "Moderate Intensity Use," and to the south as "Moderate Intensity Use" and "Rural Use," as shown on **Figure 6**, "Surrounding Land Use Classification."

The industrial use lands are under the ownership of the Barton Mines Corporation. The corporation has been in operation, mining garnet for use as coated abrasives, since 1878. Operations by Barton Mines at Gore Mountain were ceased in the late 1970's, and the corporation is now actively mining at Ruby Mountain.

2. Property Description

The facility is classified as an "Intensive Use Area" under the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan. Gore Mountain targets winter sports enthusiasts for downhill and cross-country skiing. It includes 27.4 miles of constructed alpine ski trails, 14.6 miles of Nordic ski trails, 11 ski lifts, a ski school program, a ski racing program, three lodges, a nursery program and a cocktail lounge/restaurant. There are eight parking lots for cars and buses. See **Figures 7 and 8**, Existing Conditions (South and North), and **Figures 9 and 10**, Existing and Approved Hiking and Biking Trails (South and North)


The summer and fall season program centers around hiking, mountain biking (including mountain bike racing), educational interpretive opportunities and nature-oriented activities. Gore Mountain hosts an annual fall festival. The gondola is operated as a tourist attraction year-round. Hunting, trapping and fishing are prohibited at the Gore Mountain Ski Center. Only non-consumptive use of wildlife resources is permitted on Ski Center lands. Current annual non-winter usage was approximately 8,500 people in 2016-2017 and has been as high as almost 13,000 people within the last 5 years.


D. History of the Ski Area


Gore Mountain Ski Center was built in the early 1960's and was first opened to the public in 1964. Early management was under the direction of the Bureau of Winter Recreation, Conservation Department (now known as the Department of Environmental Conservation). On April 1, 1984, management was delegated to the Olympic Regional Development Authority (ORDA) through an agreement with DEC, authorized by Chapter 99 of the Laws of 1984 (Article 8, Title 28, Section 2614, Public Authorities Law).

This agreement transferred to ORDA the use, operation, maintenance and management of the ski area. DEC remains the statutory custodian of the state-owned ski area. Under the agreement, ORDA is to maintain the facility subject to DEC inspections; make capital improvements with DEC'S prior written approval; establish a sinking fund for capital improvements; continue the level of prior public recreation; comply with specified prior agreements; and cooperate with DEC in completion of a Unit Management Plan for the ski area.

In 1991 DEC and ORDA entered into a Memorandum of Understanding superseding a 1984







memorandum between the parties, establishing methods and procedures by which managerial requirements contained in the underlying DEC/ORDA management agreements are to be complied with, and setting forth requirements for the operation of ORDA facilities and detailing procedures on how Unit Management Plans for each of the ORDA facilities are to be implemented. In 2013 ORDA and DEC executed a Consolidation Agreement that incorporated the 1991 MOU. A copy of the Consolidation Agreement is in **Appendix 2**.

E. Description of UMP/GEIS Process

Section 816 of the Adirondack Park Agency Act directs the DEC to develop, in consultation with the Adirondack Park Agency (APA), Unit Management Plans (UMPs) for each unit of land under its jurisdiction classified in the APSLMP. Pursuant to its enabling law and agreement with the DEC for the management of Gore Mountain, ORDA works with the DEC, in the consultation of the APA, to update and amend the Gore Mountain UMP. The original UMP for Gore Mountain was prepared in 1987. UMP Amendments for Gore Mountain were prepared 1995, 2002, and 2005.

Specific requirements pertaining to the development of UMPs for ORDA venues was specified in the March 9, 1991 DEC/ORDA MOU and were then expounded upon in the November 2013 DEC/ORDA Consolidation Agreement. Section 2 of the Consolidation Agreement (copy in **Appendix 2**) provides specifics regarding the preparation of UMPs for ORDA venues, including the following topics:

- UMP Content,
- APSLMP Compliance,
- Consultation with NYSDEC Prior to and During UMP Preparation,
- Procedural Steps for preparation of Preliminary Draft UMPs, Public Review Draft UMPs, and Final UMP's,
- Consultation with APA,
- APA APSLMP Consistency Review,
- APA Resolution on APSLMP Conformance, and
- Commissioner Approval of UMPs

The Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) included in this document in prepared in accordance with the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA, 6 NYCRR Part 617 and Implementing Regulations). The March 9, 1991 DEC/ORDA MOU, which is now incorporated as part of the November 2013 DEC/ORDA Consolidation Agreement states, "ORDA will normally serve as lead agency for State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) and the Department and the Agency will participate in the SEQRA process as involved agencies."

ORDA, as lead agency, completed a SEQRA Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) Parts 1, 2, and 3 (See **Appendix 1**). Based on the analysis in Part 3 of the FEAF, ORDA determined that the Project may result in one or more significant adverse impacts on the environment and that

an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared to further assess the impacts and possible mitigation and to explore alternatives to avoid or reduce these impacts.

The SEQRA aspects of this document are presented as a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS). A Generic EIS may be used to assess the environmental effects of a sequence of actions contemplated by a single agency or an entire program or plan having wide application (6NYCRR 617.10(a)(2) and (4)). They differ from a site specific EIS in that it applies to a group of common and related activities which have similar or related impacts. It is the intent of this GEIS to provide sufficient, site-specific information for all aspects of the UMP. In conformance with SEQRA, these related actions are being considered in this FGEIS. No additional SEQRA analyses are anticipated to be required for any new management action in this UMP, provided that such actions are carried out in accordance with the recommendations of this document. Any conceptual actions will require additional review under SEQRA should they be pursued in the future.

A preliminary version of the UMP Draft Amendment/DGEIS was provided to NYSDEC and to the APA for their review on December 8, 2017. Comments from these agencies were received by ORDA, and ORDA revised the preliminary document accordingly. ORDA then declared the Public Review UMP Draft Amendment/DGEIS to be complete for public review on January 3, 2018. Notice of ORDA's acceptance of the EIS, establishment of the public comment period with a public hearing, and directions for accessing this document was published in the January 10, 2018 issue of the Environmental Notice Bulletin. The Public Draft of this document was presented to the NYS APA at their January 11, 2018 Agency meeting.

The 2018 UMP Draft Amendment/DGEIS was open for public comment until February 9, 2018 including a SEQRA public hearing that was held at 7:00 PM on January 24, 2018 at the Gore Mountain Base Lodge. Following the completion of the public comment period, ORDA, in consultation with NYSDEC and in cooperation with the APA, prepared this FGEIS in accordance with the requirements of SEQRA. Responses were prepared to comments received at the public hearing and to written comments submitted during the public comment period. A transcript of the public hearing, copies of written comments and responses to comments are included in this FGEIS. Also included in this FGEIS is an errata section that summarizes the changes that were made to the DGEIS when preparing this FGEIS. ORDA accepted this FEIS on April 25, 2018.

F. Status of Previous UMP Updates and Amendments

See **Figure 7**, Existing Conditions (South) and **Figure 8**, Existing Conditions (North). These are the facilities that currently exist on the Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area.

There are a number of management actions that were approved for Gore Mountain in earlier UMPs that have yet to be constructed. These actions remain in effect as approved and continue to be proposed. See **Figure 11**, Previously Approved Actions, Not Yet Constructed (South) and






Figure 12, Previously Approved Actions, Not Yet Constructed (North).

Figures 1 and 2 referenced previously show the new management actions that are proposed in this 2018 UMP Amendment.

Together, the previously approved, but not yet constructed actions, combined with the 2018 new management actions, constitute the proposed Master Plan for Gore Mountain. Master Plans for the southern part of the Intensive Use Area, the base area, and the northern part of the Intensive Use Area are shown on **Figures 13, 14 and 15** respectively.

Table 1 below indicates which management actions approved in previous UMPs are completed, partially completed, pending construction, modified in this 2018 UMP Amendment, or are abandoned altogether.








Table 1
2018 UMP Amendment and Status of 2005 UMP Actions
(with carry over 1987, 1995, and 2002) Actions

Item #	Facility	Management Action / Improvements		Current Status				
1	Ski Trails							
	Trail # (By Pod)	Trail Name						
	1F	Twister	Build on previously approved widening efforts and widen portions less than 120' wide to 120' width to achieve consistent width along entire trail.	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	11A, 1N-P	Echo	Widen bottom to 120' to accommodate new trail connection and existing ski racing on Echo	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	1C (1C-1A), 3A	Sunway	Widen and re-grade bottom portion to 120' width for use as primary beginner trail accessed by new Lift 9B	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	3B	Ward Hill	Widen to 120' width and grade for increased ski ability / safety for beginner-intermediate skier	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	3C-UP	Cutoff	Widen to avg. 100' width and grade for increased ski ability / safety for beginner-intermediate skier	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	3C-LOW	Little Dipper	Widen to avg. 100' width and grade for increased ski ability / safety for beginner-intermediate skier	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	3I	Otter Slide	Widen to 120' width to alleviate congestion at intersection at Sunway and accommodate new Lift 3 terminal location.	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	9A		Abandon clearing proposed in 1995 but never undertaken	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	11-O	New Trail	New downhill trail 11-O on Burnt Ridge, as additional intermediate trail connection from Burnt Ridge to Base Area	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	12O	New Trail	New Downhill Trail from the intersection of Peaceful Valley and The Oak Ridge Trail connecting to Moxham, replacing the Half 'N Half Glade.	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	12L	New Trail	New Downhill Trail from top of New Lift 12, connecting to Ski Bowl Trails and Burnt Ridge	Ski Bowl				
	12M	New Trail	New Downhill Trail from top of New Lift 12, connecting to Ski Bowl Trails	Ski Bowl				
	12I-A	New Trail	New Downhill Trail from top of New Lift 12, providing access to Rabbit Pond area, Ski Bowl Trails	Ski Bowl				
	Previously Approved Action - Ski Trail Construction			Action Approved In	Action Completed	Partially Completed (% complete)	Approved, Not Yet Started	Action Abandoned
	1N-O			1995			X	
	1N-P	Echo (Lower)		1995	X			
	2N-L			1995			X	
	6N-O			1995			X	
	7N-P			1995			X	
	9A Upper			1995			X	
	9B			1995			X	
	10B-UPPER			1995				X (05)
	10D			1995				X (05)
	10F			1995			X	
	10G Lower			1995				X (05)
	10H			1995			X	
	11A	Echo (Upper)		2002	X			
	11B-UPPER	Hedges		2002	X			
	11B Lower			2002			X	
	11C			2002				X (05)
	11D			2002				X (05)
	11E			2002				X (05)
	11F			2002				X (05)
	11G			2002			X	
	11M			2002			X	
	11L			2005			X	
	11I			2005			X	
	11J			2005			X	
	11K	Sagamore		2005	X			
	11N	Eagle's Nest Crossover		2005	X			
	12A	Peaceful Valley (Lower)		2005	X			
	12B	The Oak Ridge Trail		2002	X			

Item #	Facility		Management Action / Improvements	Current Status				
	12C	Peaceful Valley (Upper)		2005	X			
	12D	Moxham		2002	X			
	12E			2002			X	
	12F	46ER		2005	X			
	12G Upper			2005			X	
	12G Lower	Hudson		2005	X			
	12H			2005			X	
	12I			2005			X	
	12J			2005			X	
	12K			2002				X (05)
	12L			2002				X (05)
	12M			2002				X (05)
	15A			2002				X (05)
	C5			1995				X (05)
	C7	Ruby Run		2005	X			
	Previously Approved Action - Ski Trail Widening			Action Approved In	Action Completed	Partially Completed (% complete)	Approved, Not Yet Started	Action Abandoned
	1H	1A		1995			X	
	1E	2B		2002			X	
	3F, 3H	3B		1995,2002			X	
	9A Lower	Bear Cub Run		1995		X		X (2018)
	7A	Chatiemac		1987		5		
	6B-UP, 2K	Cloud		1987,1995		50		
	7B	Hawkeye		1987,2002			X	
	7F	Headwaters		1987,2002			X	
	3G	Jamboree		2002			X	
	3C-LOW	Little Dipper		1995,2002			X	
	6G	Lower Darby		1995			X	
	6F	Lower Steilhang		1995			X	
	3A	Lower Sunway		87,95,02			X	
	2D	North Star		1995			X	
	6E, 7N-O	Open Pit		2002			X	
	2E UP, LOW	Pete Gay		1995,2002		5		
	2C	Powder Pass		1995			X	
	1B	Quicksilver		1987			X	
	1C (1A-1D), 1D	Showcase		1987,2002		5		
	1K	Showoff		1995			X	
	2B, 2I	Sleeping Bear		1987			X	
	1C (1C-1A), 1A	Sunway		87,95,02		15		
	2A	Tahawus		1995			X	
	C1	Tannery		1995	X			
	1C (FROM 1NR)	The Arena		2002			X	
	7H	The Glen		1987			X	
	2F (2J-2E)	The Loop		2002			X	
	3E	Twin Fawns		2002			X	
	1F	Twister		1995	X			
	10C-UP	Uncas		2002			X	
	6D	Upper Darby		1995			X	
	1G	Upper Sleighride		1995			X	
	6C	Upper Steilhang		1987			X	
	2F (TO 2J)	Upper Wood In		2002			X	
	1N-Q-1NR, 1N-R	Wildair		2002			X	
	6J	Wood Lot North		1995			X	
	6B-LOW(FROM 6K)	Wood Lot South		1987			X	
2	Ski Lifts							
	Lift 9b	New Lift	Add new triple or quad chair (Lift 9B) from Northwoods Lodge up Lower Sunway to just past the bend in Lower Sunway.	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	Lift 12	Hudson Chair	Replace, re-align and extend Lift 12 to location north of existing top terminal, to enhance access to Rabbit Pond area for both Winter and Summer recreation	Ski Bowl				
	Previously Approved Action - Lift Installation			Action Approved In	Action Completed	Partially Completed (% complete)	Approved, Not Yet Started	Action Abandoned
	Lift 1 (Replace)	Adirondack Express II		1987	X			
	Lift 3 (Re-Locate)	Sunway Chair		2002			X	
	Lift 4 (Relocate)	J-Bar		2002			X	
	Lift 6 (Extend)	High Peaks Chair		2002			X	
	Lift 9b	Beginner Triple		2002			X	
	Lift 9c	Surface-Magic Carpet		2002	X			
	Lift 9d	Surface-Magic Carpet		2002	X			

Item #	Facility		Management Action / Improvements	Current Status				
	Lift 11	Burnt Ridge Quad		2005	X			
	Lift 12	Hudson Chair	Ski Bowl	2002	X			
	Lift 13	Village Chair	Ski Bowl	2002	X			
	Lift 14	Base to Base Gondola	IUA and Ski Bowl	2005			X	
3	Buildings							
	NYSEF Building		Expand NYSEF building	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	Base Lodge		Incorporate Hiking center into Main Lodge	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	Previously Approved Actions			Action Approved In	Action Completed	Partially Completed (% complete)	Approved, Not Yet Started	Action Abandoned
	Base Lodge and Northwoods Lodge (Former Gondola Building)		Renovation/Expansion	1995		55%		
	Saddle Lodge		Renovation/Expansion/Ski Patrol	1995	X			
	Bear Mtn. Lodge		Build Lodge	1995			X	
			Wastewater Line to Saddle Lodge	1995			X	
	NYSEF Building		Addition/Expansion	2005	X			
	Summit Lodge		Build Summit Lodge	1987		X		
	Sand Shed		Build Sand Shed in existing parking lot	2002				X (2005)
4	Snowmaking							
	North Creek Snowmaking Reservoir		Increase reservoir capacity to improve snowmaking efficiency and operational flexibility.	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	Overall Snowmaking Capacity		Permit withdrawal Capacity	Previously Approved Action. 4,400 GPM completed, 6,800 GPM Approved				
	Distribution Lines		Install Distribution Lines on New Trails	Previously Approved Action, ongoing				
	Diesel Air Compressors		Create area for Diesel Air compressors with Fuel	Previously Approved Action, partially completed.				
5	Maintenance Facility							
	Groomer Garage		Re-Configure approved maintenance complex to locate new groomer garage and fueling station adjacent to existing ski trail, to improve efficiency and functionality of operations	New Management Action, 2018 UMP				
	General Buildings		Relocate Buildings, renovate, add garages	Approved in 1995, not yet constructed. (Reconfiguration is 2018 Management Action)				
	Fuel		Install additional fuel storage	Approved in 1995, partially completed				
6	Parking / Circulation							
	Shuttle Lane		Update 1995-approved shuttle lane to conform to current conditions, and provide service separated from and independent of primary traffic circulation	New Management Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	General Parking		Construct New Lots	Action approved in 1995, 50% completed				
	Drop Off Area		Reconfigure entry lane and drop off area	Action approved in 1995, 50% completed				
	Shuttle Lane		Build independent Shuttle Lane	Action approved in 1995, not yet constructed (Reconfiguration is 2018 Action)				
	Bus Parking Lot		Built new Bus Lot	Conceptual Action in 2005				
7	Backcountry Trail Network							
	Hiking and X/C Ski Trails		Trail Construction	Approved in 1995, partially completed.				
8	Miscellaneous							
	Land Use Reclassification		Suggested land reclassification involving Gore Mountain IUA, Vanderwhacker Mtn. WF and Siamese Ponds Wilderness Area which could allow the historic Rabbit Pond trail to be reclaimed and used winter and summer	Conceptual Action, 2018 UMP amendment				
	Interpretive Systems		Interpretive Systems installed	Approved, 25% completed				
	Sand Pit Reclamation		Re-claim sand pit area	Approved, partially completed				

Table 1A that follows is derived from Table 1 above and provides the amounts of ski trails at Gore Mountain that (1) currently exist, (2) were previously approved but have not yet been constructed, and (3) are proposed in this UMP Amendment. Locations of trails are shown on

Figures 13 and 15. Detailed information on the inventory of Gore Mountain ski trails in contained in Appendix 5.

Table 1A
Ski Trails at Gore Mountain

Trail Length Data				
	Trail Pod #	Trail Name	Trail Length on Intensive Use Area Lands	Trail Length on Town Lands
Existing Trails				
	1H	1A	825	0
	1E	2B	357	0
	3F	3B	1952	0
	12F	46ER	0	3260
	9A Lower	Bear Cub Run	608	0
	WORKRD	Cedar's Traverse	3514	0
	7A	Chatiemac	3119	0
	6B-UP, 2K	Cloud	3486	0
	N/A	Crystal	157	0
	3C-UP	Cutoff	922	0
	7E	Dell	344	0
	7N-Q(b)	Double Barrel (Looker's Right)	780	0
	11N	Eagle's Nest Crossover	4082	0
	11A, 1N-P	Echo	5735	0
	C4	Farview	965	0
	10G-Upper, C6	Foxlair	1870	0
	7B	Hawkeye	1939	0
	7F	Headwaters	2740	0
	11B-UP, M8	Hedges	1489	0
	12G Lower	Hudson	0	2403
	6H	Hullabloo	1173	0
	3G	Jamboree	1619	0
	N/A	Jibland	318	0
	N/A	Jug Handle	434	0
	7N-M	Lies	1109	0
	6K	Little Cloud	364	0
	3C-LOW	Little Dipper	993	0
	N/A	Little Gore Crossover	0	770
	2K	Lower Cloud Traverse	655	0
	6G	Lower Darby	1019	0

Trail Length Data				
	Trail Pod #	Trail Name	Trail Length on Intensive Use Area Lands	Trail Length on Town Lands
	1C (1D-1NR)	Lower Sleighride	1817	0
	6F	Lower Steilhang	1246	0
	3A	Lower Sunway	3769	0
	10C-LOW	Lower Uncus	794	0
	2J-UP	Lower Wood In Traverse	1115	0
	M2	Mica	444	0
	12D	Moxham	368	2509
	2D	North Star	1803	0
	6E, 7N-O	Open Pit	972	0
	3I	Otter Slide	407	0
	12C, 12A	Peaceful Valley	3173	2837
	2E UP, LOW	Pete Gay	3976	0
	10A, 10B LOW	Pine Knot	2455	0
	N/A	Pipeline Traverse	5419	0
	1C (1NR-3F)	Pot Luck	723	0
	2C	Powder Pass	3580	0
	1B	Quicksilver	2036	0
	C7	Ruby Run	2563	0
	11K	Sagamore	6037	0
	6B-LOW (2K-6K)	Santanoni	133	47
	1C (1A-1D), 1D	Showcase	5928	22
	1K	Showoff	188	0
	2B, 2I	Sleeping Bear	2796	0
	N/A	Starting Gate	359	0
	1C (1C-1A), 1A	Sunway	5047	0
	2A	Tahawus	4184	0
	C1	Tannery	2768	0
	1C (FROM 1NR)	The Arena	991	0
	7H	The Glen	433	0
	N/A	The Gully	730	0
	2F (2J-2E)	The Loop	850	0
	12B	The Oak Ridge Trail	1984	0
	N/A	The Peace Pipe	918	0
	7N-L	The Rumor	1260	0
	10E	Topridge	3900	0

Trail Length Data				
	Trail Pod #	Trail Name	Trail Length on Intensive Use Area Lands	Trail Length on Town Lands
	1K	Tower 6	118	0
	3E	Twin Fawns	1094	0
	1F	Twister	6603	0
	N/A	Twister's Little Sister	121	0
	10C-UP	Uncas	1833	0
	12c	Eagles Nest Bridge	620	0
	6D	Upper Darby	808	0
	1G	Upper Sleighride	1727	0
	6C	Upper Steilhang	1739	0
	2F (TO 2J)	Upper Wood In	973	0
	13A	Village Slopes	0	1260
	3B	Ward Hill	874	0
	1N-Q-1NR, 1N-R	Wildair	4980	0
	6J	Wood Lot North	924	0
	6B-LOW(FROM 6K)	Wood Lot South	1163	0
	2J (FROM 6B)	Wood Out	2340	0
	M1	Woodchuck	1163	0
		Totals (LF)	144,814	13,108
		Totals (MILAGE)	27.43	2.48
Trails Approved, Not Yet Constructed				
	1N-O	Approved, not yet constructed	2,850	0
	2N-L	Approved, not yet constructed	600	0
	6N-O	Approved, not yet constructed	362	0
	7N-P	Approved, not yet constructed	1170	0
	9A Upper	Approved, not yet constructed	925	0
	9B	Approved, not yet constructed	1,250	0
	10F	Approved, not yet constructed	2,345	0
	10H	Approved, not yet constructed	3,848	0
	11B Lower	Approved, not yet constructed	1,480	0
	11G	Approved, not yet constructed	1,720	0
	11M	Approved, not yet constructed	1,925	0
	11L	Approved, not yet constructed	4,095	0
	11I	Approved, not yet constructed	2,495	0

Trail Length Data				
	Trail Pod #	Trail Name	Trail Length on Intensive Use Area Lands	Trail Length on Town Lands
	11J	Approved, not yet constructed	4,085	0
	12E	Approved, not yet constructed	0	1,605
	12G Upper	Approved, not yet constructed	0	1,580
	12H	Approved, not yet constructed	0	3,067
	12I	Approved, not yet constructed	0	6,410
	12J	Approved, not yet constructed	0	2,140
		Totals (LF)	29,150	14,802
		Totals (MILAGE)	5.52	2.80
Trails Proposed in 2018 UMP				
	11O	Proposed	3,415	0
	12L	Proposed (Conceptual Action)	1,210	0
	12M	Proposed (Conceptual Action)	340	1,035
	12I-A	Proposed (Conceptual Action)	1,520	1,223
	12J-A	Proposed (Conceptual Action)	100	1,235
	12N	Proposed	0	600
	12O	Proposed	305	280
		Totals (LF)	6,890	4,373
		Totals (MILAGE)	1.30	0.83

Summary of Totals	(In Miles)
Total Existing Trails on Intensive Use Lands	27.43
Total Approved/Not Constructed Trails on Intensive Use Lands	5.52
Total Existing and Approved Trails on Intensive Use (IU) Lands	32.95
¹ Total Proposed Trails on Intensive Use Lands	1.30
Total Existing/Approved and Proposed Trails on IU Lands	34.25
Constitutional Trail Mileage Limit	40.00
Total Existing Glades on IU Lands	7.89
² Total Glades within footprint of Existing/Approved Trails	3.04
Net Calculated Glade Length	4.85
² Total Glades within footprint of Proposed Trails	0.35
Net Calculated Glade Length	4.50
Total Existing/Approved and Proposed Trails on IU Lands	34.25
Net Calculated Glade Length	4.50
Total Existing/Approved and Proposed Trails and Glades on IU Lands	38.75

¹ Includes Conceptual Trails

² If including the glades in a comparison against total trail mileage, these lengths must be subtracted from the total length of glades on IU Lands, since these lengths are already included under the "Approved, Not Yet Constructed" and "Proposed" trail length categories.

SECTION II INVENTORY OF EXISTING RESOURCES, FACILITIES, SYSTEMS AND USE

A. Inventory of Natural Resources

1. Physical Resources

a. Geology

Gore Mountain Ski Center is within the Adirondack Upland physiographic province which consists of an ancient domed Pre-Cambrian erosion surface, with erosional remnants forming the higher, more rugged features such as The High Peaks. Ancient crystalline metamorphic rocks similar to those of the Canadian Shield in Canada prevail. Specifically, the bedrock at the Ski Center is composed of granitic and quartz syenitic gneiss which contains varying amounts of such minerals as hornblende, pyroxene, garnet and micas. Intense glacial scour has removed most of the glacial soil and, in general, smoothed the land surface.

The landform that is Gore Mountain, including the former Barton garnet mine that is located on the north side of the mountain, is considered a unique geologic feature because of the nearby garnet deposits (<http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/53858.html>).

b. Soils

Soils on the site are shown on **Figure 16**, "Soils Map". Soils mapping was obtained from the US National Resources Conservation Service's Soil Survey Geographical Data Base (SSURGO).

The following soils are present within the Intensive Use Area.

Bice very bouldery fine sandy loam – these are deep, well drained soils on hillsides, hill crests and narrow valley sides.

Hermon very bouldery fine sandy loam – these are very deep, well drained and somewhat excessively drained soils on hilltops, hill sides, ridges and mountainsides.

Hermon-Lyman Rock outcrop complex – this complex is a mix of the previously described Hermon soils with the shallow and somewhat excessively drained Lyman soils. This complex is found on mountain sides and hilltops where the landscape is influenced by underlying bedrock. Bedrock outcrops typically make up 15%. This series is the most prevalent soil type in the Intensive Use Area.

Hinckley cobbly sandy loam – these are gently sloping to sloping, deep, excessively drained soils on terraces and benches in valleys.

Hinckley-Plainfield complex – the Plainfield series is in complex with the Hinckley series described above, and consist of deep, excessively drained sandy and gravelly soils. This complex occurs along the Gore Mountain access road from Peaceful Valley Road.

Lyman – Rock outcrop complex – these are shallow and somewhat excessively drained Lyman soils with 30 percent rock outcrop. These soils occur on mountain tops in the Intensive Use Area.

Marlow very bouldery fine sandy loam – these are deep well drained soils on hillsides, crests of hills and mountainsides. A large portion of the lower elevations of the Intensive Use Area contain Marlow soils.

Plainfield loamy sand – see the description of the Hinckley-Plainfield complex above for a description of the Plainfield soils.

Wareham loamy sand – two very small areas of this series are located in the southwest corner of the Intensive Use Area. These are nearly level, deep, and somewhat poorly drained soils.

Two of the important soil characteristics that need to be given consideration are the susceptibility of soils to erosion and the depth to bedrock in the soils.

Soil erodibility is a function of soil detachment potential and the amount of runoff generated from a soil. Clays tend to have low detachment potentials and coarse sands tend to have low runoff potential. Both of these soil types with have a low erodibility which is expressed numerically as soil K factors. Generally speaking, low erosion potential soils have K values that range from 0.05 to 0.2. Soils with moderate erosion potential generally have K factors that range from 0.25 to 0.4, while high erosion potential soils have K factor values higher than 0.4. The following provides the list of soils in the Intensive Use Areas and their K values.

Soil Series	Erosion Factor (K)
Bice	0.20-0.24
Hermon	0.10
Hinckley	0.17
Lyman	0.20-0.32
Marlow	0.20-0.32
Plainfield	0.15-0.17
Wareham	0.10-0.17

Soils in the Intensive Use Area generally have low erosion potentials with the Lyman and Marlow series being in the low-moderate range of erodibility.

Construction activities that require excavation in areas of soils with shallow depth to bedrock can require blasting. Generally speaking, the soils at lower elevation in the Intensive Use Area have deeper bedrock. The following are the depths at which bedrock is typically present in the soils at Gore Mountain.

Soil Series	Depth to Bedrock (inches)
Bice very bouldery fine sandy loam	>72
Hermon very bouldery fine sandy loam	>60
Hermon-Lyman-Rock outcrop complex	0 - >60
Hinckley cobbly sandy loam	>65
Hinckley-Plainfield complex	>60
Lyman-Rock outcrop complex	0 - 17
Marlow very bouldery fine sandy loam	>65
Plainfield loamy sand	>60
Wareham loamy sand	>60

c. Topography and Slope


As shown on **Figure 17**, "Topography," topography on the site ranges from approximately 1100 to 3500 feet above mean sea level (MSL).

The peak of Gore Mountain is situated at an elevation of 3583 feet MSL, Bear Mountain is at 3218 feet MSL and Pete Gay Mountain is at 3130 feet MSL. The base lodge is located at 1500 feet MSL. The Slope Map, **Figure 18**, was developed from site topography and slope classes by percentage are provided below:


<u>Slope Class</u>	<u>% of Site</u>
0- 10%	5.4
10-15%	11.9
15-25%	33.7
25-30%	16.5
30-35%	10.4
35-40%	7.1
40-45%	4.9
45-60%	6.7
60-85%	2.7
>85%	0.4


d. Water Resources

See **Figure 19**, Surface Water and Wetland Resources.





Legend


 Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area


 20 Foot Contour Line


Slope


 0-10%


 10-15%


 15-25%


 25-30%


 30-35%

 35-40%

 40-45%

 45-60%

 60-85%

 >85%

There are three streams on the site which flow to the east and are tributaries to North Creek. Straight Brook (941-1257) drains the southwest part of the Intensive Use Area. Roaring Brook (943-1253 and 1254) drains the northern part of the Intensive Use Area. The North Creek Reservoir, now the snowmaking reservoir for Gore Mountain, was formed by damming Roaring Brook. The unnamed brook which is crossed by the ski center entry road is tributary 2 of North Creek and drains the central portion of the Intensive Use Area.

Rabbit Pond (H-P527b) is currently located on the part of the Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild Forest (VMWF) to the north of the Intensive Use Area. A land reclassification that would add the portion of the VMWF containing Rabbit Pond to the Intensive Use Area is suggested in this UMP/GEIS as a conceptual action. According to the 2005 UMP for the VMWF, Rabbit Pond is 0.4 acre in size.

A water quality monitoring summary was prepared on behalf of ORDA in March 2007, evaluating data collected during the period 1995 – 2006. The data were collected with the intent of assessing changes in water quality “as it relates to construction activities and changes in vegetation cover types following construction”. The conclusions of that report are restated in pertinent part below:

- Based on the analysis of storm-event conductivity data from the two streams, construction activities at Gore Mountain for the period analyzed do not appear to be affecting local surface water quality.
- The location of construction activities and their proximity to surface water resources does not appear to be a factor affecting water quality in the streams that drain Gore Mountain.
- Consideration should be given to increasing the number of baseline samples that are taken and analyzed for conductivity and phosphorus levels. This would provide a more robust data set which may be helpful in elucidating any trends in water quality.

e. Wetlands

The official New York State wetland map for this area and aerial photographs were used to locate potential wetlands on the ski center property. These areas were then visited in the field and their approximate boundaries were drawn on aerial photographs. The boundaries were then transferred to a topographic map of the site to develop **Figure 19, "Surface Water and Wetland Resources,"** which shows the locations of wetlands, ponds, streams, and the main drainage courses on the ski area property. A map of the wetland locations at a scale of 1 inch = 400 feet is incorporated by reference and is available from the Lead Agency. There are several scattered, small boggy wetlands on Gore Mountain that range in size from less than an acre to approximately 5 acres. These are found in flat pocket areas that hold water flowing from steep slopes above. Water is at or near the surface in these areas during most of the year. Predominant vegetation consists of sedges, peat moss, alders, red maple, or cedar.


The large wetland just above the snowmaking reservoir had previous beaver activity. The earlier flooding and standing water in the wetland is no longer present since the abandoned beaver dam has naturally breached over time. The two wetlands on the upper mountain are intermittent drainageways that are shrub swamps typical of hillside drainages. Alders, balsam fir and viburnums are predominant. In terms of the functions and benefits that they provide, wetlands on the mountain serve to retain and slow down runoff flowing from higher elevations. They also may serve as habitats for certain species of wildlife, particularly some species of amphibians and reptiles, which may not be able to use the surrounding upland habitats for their breeding or foraging activities. The wetlands on the ski center were field checked by APA personnel during the preparation of the 1995 UMP.

f. Climate and Air Quality

Climate-Snowfall


For the past five November to March ski seasons Gore Mountain received an average of 128.4 inches of snowfall. Each of the last five seasons is presented below. (Source: <https://www.onthesnow.com/new-york/gore-mountain/historical-snowfall.html?&y=2009>)

Gore Mountain received 122 inches of snowfall in the 2016-2017 ski season. Snowfall amounts were spread fairly evenly from December to March. The first snowfall of the season was 2 inches that fell on November 24.




The 2015 to 2016 ski season in the northeast was characterized by many as “the winter that wasn’t”. Gore Mountain received a total of 39 inches all ski season. The first snowfall of the season, 7 inches, did not fall until December 19. Attendance was down that ski season by 30%


compare to the average of the other 4 of the last 5 seasons.




The 2014-2015 ski season had a total of 134 inches of snowfall with the first snowfall occurring on November 23.




The 2013-2014 ski season saw a total of 158 inches of natural snowfall at Gore Mountain with the first snowfall occurring on November 23.



The highest ski season snowfall for the past 5 seasons occurred in 2012-2013 when Gore Mountain received 189 inches of total snowfall.



Just looking at the last 5 ski seasons leading up to last year it would appear that there is a downward trend in the amount of ski season snowfall (198, 158, 134, 39 and 122 inches). However, if the period examined is extended back another 3 seasons, this trend does not continue. It turns out that 2012-2013 and 2013-14 had higher than normal amounts and that 2016-2017 was consistent with 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.



Climate- Temperature

For the months of November through March average monthly temperatures in the region (in degrees Fahrenheit) are 20 degrees in December, 14.9 for January, 16.4 for February, and 26.6 degrees in March. No temperature data specific to North Creek were available from the National Climatic Data Center, so these regional average monthly temperatures may vary somewhat from North Creek due to local climatic influences. The presence and configuration of the Adirondack Mountains contribute to the variability of the climate within the region including an increase in cloudiness and precipitation during the winter months.

Both natural snow cover and winter temperatures influence the duration of the ski season. Although natural snow cover generally exists between December and May, the ski season generally runs from November through April if conditions suitable to snow making exist early in the season. Snowmaking generally requires that the mean temperature drops to 32 degrees Fahrenheit. As long as the night temperatures are sufficiently cold an accumulation of man-made snow is possible even if daytime temperatures rise slightly above the freezing point.

The frost-free growing season generally extends from the first week in May to the first week in October and average monthly temperatures in this interval range from a low of 45.3 degrees Fahrenheit in October to a high of 65.1 degrees in June.

Air Quality

NYSDEC's *New York State Ambient Air Quality Report for 2016* reports that levels of sulfur dioxide and inhalable particulates (PM_{2.5}) in Region 5 were well within acceptable air quality standards.

2. Biological Resources

a. Vegetation

Figure 20, "Vegetation," illustrates the plant communities existing on Gore Mountain Ski Center mapped as part of the 1995 UMP. Tree composition data from NYSDEC timber cruises were provided in Appendix 2 of the 1995 UMP, "NYSDEC Tree Cruise Data For Gore Mountain," were used to determine which of the ecological communities defined by the New York Natural Heritage Program (NHP) of NYSDEC (Reschke, 1990) were present on the project site. The timber inventory data and corresponding maps were then used in combination with 1983 aerial photographs to produce a map illustrating the approximate extent of the plant communities. This map shows only the broad-scale forest patterns and does not include such fine detail as the vegetation types within small areas such as clearings for ski trails and powerlines.

Following are brief descriptions of each of the major plant communities:

Beech-Maple Mesic Forest. This is the community that occupies the largest area on the site, especially the areas below about 2400 feet MSL elevation in the eastern and northern parts of the site. Sugar maple and beech are dominant, along with variable quantities of paper birch, red maple, yellow birch, and red oak.

Hemlock-Northern Hardwood Forest. In this community, hemlock is codominant with deciduous trees such as sugar maple, beech, red maple, and yellow birch. A small area that is potentially of this forest type was identified in the southeastern part of the site. Other, smaller areas may be located through ground-level vegetation surveys.

Spruce-Northern Hardwood Forest. At its upper elevation, beech-maple forest grades into this forest type, which extends up to about 3200 feet MSL. Its composition includes red spruce, sugar maple, beech, yellow birch, white birch, red maple and balsam fir. Striped maple is a common understory tree.

Mountain Spruce-Fir Forest. The tops of the highest mountains, above 3100 feet MSL, are dominated by red spruce and balsam fir, along with some paper birch and mountain ash.

Successional Northern Hardwoods. A few small areas in the easternmost part of the Intensive Use Area, plus areas on neighboring lands, were logged in the recent past and have undergone succession to a young woodland. Trees in these, areas may include red maple, aspens, balsam poplar, paper birch, white pine, green ash, and American elm.

b. Wildlife

In addition to the five forest habitat types on the project site described above, other community types occur on the site in lesser amounts including Mowed Roadside/Pathway (ski trails) and Reservoir/Artificial Impoundment (North Creek Reservoir).


The on-site vegetation communities support a variety of wildlife species known to utilize these habitat types within the Central Adirondack Ecozone. A number of species which have been documented to historically occur in the Upper Hudson River Basin (Hudson River Fish and Wildlife Report, Hudson River Level B Study, prepared by New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and United States Fish and Wildlife Service, April 1978) in general, and of these a number are likely to commonly occur on the site based upon their habitat preferences. Mammalian species likely to be common on the site include deer mouse, white-footed mouse, pine vole, woodland jumping mouse, short-tailed shrew, eastern chipmunk, porcupine, coyote, red squirrel, northern flying squirrel, pine marten, snowshoe hare, red fox, black bear, and whitetail deer.

A number of avian species are also likely to occur commonly on the site, some throughout the year and some as migrants. Based upon the NYSDEC/USFWS study and the habitat types found on the site, the avian species most likely to commonly occur on the site at any one time include ruffed grouse, broad-winged hawk, yellowbellied sapsucker, American robin, red-eyed vireo, brown-headed cowbird, rosebreasted grosbeak, purple finch, dark-eyed junco, white-throated sparrow, blue jay, American crow, black-capped chickadee, and brown creeper. Previous reports have stated that bald eagles and golden eagles have been observed in flight around the ski center lands, but these reports also state that no nesting sites are known to occur on the site or its immediate surroundings. A check with the Endangered Species Unit of NYSDEC confirmed that occurrences in the Gore Mountain area are instances of migrating individuals and not resident individuals of these two species.

Common amphibian and reptilian species known to occur in the upper Hudson River Basin and likely to occur on the site include spotted salamander, red-spotted newt, northern dusky salamander, red-backed salamander, spring salamander, northern two-lined salamander, American toad, spring peeper, bullfrog, northern leopard frog, pickerel frog, snapping turtle, wood turtle, Eastern painted turtle, northern water snake, eastern garter snake and eastern milk snake. Of these species, the wood turtle is listed as a Special Concern species by the Natural Heritage Program of NYSDEC. As a special concern species, the wood turtle is not recognized as endangered or threatened, but documented concern exists for its continued welfare in New York.

Portions of the Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area at elevations above 2,800 feet are potential Bicknell's thrush habitat. See **Figure 21**, "Potential Bicknell's Thrush Habitat." Field studies were undertaken by the Wildlife Conservation Society (Saranac Lake) in 2004 and 2005 to determine if ski trail construction on Bear Mountain could potentially impact Bicknell's thrush. "Surveys involving playbacks conducted in 2004 and 2005 did not detect presence of Bicknell's thrush at Gore Mountain." See subsection "e" below regarding the Adirondack Sub-Alpine Forest Bird Conservation Area.

An inquiry to NY Natural Heritage Program resulted in a response that identified only Bicknell's thrush as being present at Gore Mountain IUA. No rare, threatened or endangered plant or



Legend

- Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area
- Mountain Spruce-Fir Forest
- Elevation Greater than 2,800'

animal species, or unique plant communities or habitats were identified by the Natural Heritage Program. See the letter in **Appendix 3**. Also see section “e. Critical Habitat” below.

c. Fisheries

The ski area property contains the headwaters of three tributaries of North Creek and a portion of North Creek which is tributary to the Hudson River. Straight Brook, Roaring Brook and an unnamed tributary all begin on the ski area property, and on the Gore lands Roaring Brook has been dammed to form the North Creek Reservoir. The North Creek Reservoir once provided water to the Village of North Creek but is now used by Gore Mountain Ski Center for snowmaking. North Creek and its tributaries which are on the site are designated as trout waters by the NYSDEC. This indicates that these waters, at least historically, supported native trout populations. Confirmation of the presence of native trout populations was not made as part of the study. However, it is known that North Creek receives annual stocking of trout (brown, brook, and rainbow) by both NYSDEC and Warren County.

While the goal of this stocking program is to perpetuate the put and take fishery in North Creek, carry-over between years has likely resulted in the establishment of a population of the stocked strain(s). Prior investigations have theorized that the on-site tributaries to North Creek support native brook trout populations. Other species likely to be found in the coldwater communities of North Creek and its tributaries include various cyprinids (i.e. blacknose dace, cutlips minnows), sculpins, and white suckers.

The impounded North Creek Reservoir could conceivably support a community dominated by coolwater species such as yellow perch, chain pickerel, and brown bullhead.

According to the 2005 VMWF UMP, there have been no biological surveys of Rabbit Pond. “However, based on its small size, 0.4 acres, Rabbit Pond probably supports minimal to no fish life.”

d. Unique Areas

No unique biological areas are known to occur on the ski center property or adjacent lands.

e. Critical Habitat

Adirondack Mountain summits above 2,800 feet in Clinton Essex, Franklin, Hamilton and Warren counties comprise the Adirondack Sub-alpine Forest Bird Conservation Area (BCA). More specifically, those summits above 2,800 feet with dense subalpine coniferous forests favored by Bicknell’s thrush and other neotropical bird species. **Appendix 4** contains NYSDEC’s full description of this BCA.

3. Visual Resources

Visual inventories and visual impact assessments were performed as part of the 1995 UMP and for the 2002 UMP. Views into the ski area of Gore Mountain are primarily limited to its south and east exposures. The views of the ski area from the north are blocked to a large degree by South and Pete Gay Mountains.

The views of Gore Mountain from the south are limited to primarily to NY Route 28 at a few locations between Wevertown and the hill leading down to Peaceful Valley Road. Some other locations from where the ski area is visible are Durkin Road and County Route 29 near Oven Mountain Road. The ski area is visible from the section of NY Route 28N heading south from Olmstedville towards North Creek. Views from these locations are oftentimes screened by intervening vegetation.

B. Human Resources

1. Transportation

The local roadway network which provides access to the ski center includes NY Route 28, County Route 29 (Peaceful Valley Road), and County Route 73 (Gore Mountain Road). **Figures 3 and 4** show the ski area in relation to these highways.

NY Route 28 is an east-west highway which is classified as a minor arterial. In the vicinity of Peaceful Valley Road, NY Route 28 is a two-lane facility providing 11 foot travel lanes and shoulders of four to six feet in width. The speed limit is posted at 55 MPH for travel in both directions.

Peaceful Valley Road is a two lane collector facility that intersects NY Route 28 from the south forming a T-intersection. Gore Mountain Road intersects Peaceful Valley Road from the west at nearly 90 degrees. Gore Mountain Road provides a circuitous alignment and is on a steady westbound upgrade approaching the ski area.

The NY Route 28/Peaceful Valley Road intersection provides an exclusive westbound left turn lane on NY Route 28 to turn onto Peaceful Valley Road. The approach to NY Route 28 on Peaceful Valley Road has right turn and left turn lanes with the right turn lane facilitating traffic flow back towards Warrensburg.

Saturday is consistently the busiest day of the week. There is a distinct morning arrival peak that occurs between 8:00 and 10:00 and a distinct afternoon departure peak between 3:00 and 5:00.

2. Community Services

Police Protection

The Warren County Sheriff's Office and the New York State Police provide police protection in the Town of Johnsbury.

Fire and Rescue Services

The Town of Johnsbury has multiple volunteer fire departments. The North Creek Fire House, located on Main Street, covers the Gore Mountain area.

The Johnsbury Volunteer Emergency Squad is located on Peaceful Valley Road and serves the Gore Mountain Area. In most instances the Gore Ski Patrol and first aid staff have patients stabilized for transport when the Emergency Squad arrives. A large number of Ski Patrol people and first aid staff are members of the Johnsbury or Minerva emergency squads.

Solid Waste Disposal

A private hauler takes refuse and recyclables from Gore Mountain to the Town of Johnsbury Recycling Center Transfer Station in North Creek where it is compacted and then disposed of through Warren county contracts with the incinerator in Hudson Falls.

Hospital and Physician Services

Most medical emergencies are transported to Glens Falls Hospital which is a travel time of approximately 45 minutes.

North Creek Health Center on Ski Bowl Road does provide emergency medical services, but they are only open certain hours of the day and are closed on Sunday.

The Warrensburg Health Center provided urgent care 7 days a week but only for certain hours of the day.

Schools

The Johnsbury Central School District incorporates most of the Town of Johnsbury and portions of the Towns of Chestertown and Thurman. The K-12 school is located in North Creek and graduated 14 students in 2016.

Water Supplies

The North Creek area is within the North Creek Water District which serves 355 structures or between 900 and 950 individuals. The water source is drilled wells. Those living outside the District rely on individual wells. Gore Mountain has its own water supply and distribution system and does not rely on the North Creek Water District (see section II.C.1.h, Potable Water).

Sewage

There is no public sewage treatment facility in Johnsbury. See section II.C1.i, Sanitary Wastewater.

Electric and Telecommunications

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation provides electric services to the Johnsbury area.

A number of “household” phone services are available in the Johnsbury area.

Cellphone service on the mountain and along NY Route 28 in the vicinity of the mountain is variable depending on the cell phone provider.

3. Local Land Use Plans

The Town of Johnsbury has a total land area of 204.6 square miles, representing 23.5 percent of all of Warren County lands, making it the largest township in the county. The town is entirely located in the Adirondack Park with approximately two-thirds of the land area designated as wilderness, wild forest or other public lands. As reported by the Adirondack Park Agency in June 2017, approximately 40% of lands in the Town of Johnsbury are privately owned and the other 60% is owned by the State of New York. These lands are distributed under the private and state land classification in the Table below.

Table 2
Town of Johnsbury Land Classifications

Land Use Classification	Acres	Percentage
PRIVATE LANDS		
Hamlet	1,911	3.6%
Resource Management	5,376	10%
Moderate Intensity	648	1.2%
Industrial Use	939	1.8%
Low Intensity	8,634	16.1%
Rural Use	36,111	67.4%
TOTAL	53,619	100%
STATE LANDS		
Wilderness	51,900	65.4%
Wild Forest	21,517	27.1%
Primitive	4	<1%
Intensive Use	3,844 (Gore Mt. Ski Resort)	4.8%
Pending State	173	<1%
Water	2,023	2.6%
TOTAL	79,288	100%

Source: Adirondack Park Agency

The Adirondack Park Agency regulates land uses within the boundaries of each of the above land classifications. In addition, the Town of Johnsbury regulates land use through its approved Local Land Use Program (LLUP) completed in 2007, which also serves as the Town of Johnsbury Zoning Law. The Johnsbury Zoning Law designates residential, business and mixed-use districts within the hamlet of North Creek. The remainder of land is classified as rural mixed use generally following the APA Land Use Classification boundaries and density requirements. The Zoning Law regulates land uses and area requirements and includes Commercial-Industrial Floating Zone, sign regulations, and special use and site plan review provisions.

The Town's LLUP received strong support from the 2005 Johnsbury Comprehensive Plan which is intended to serve as a guide for future growth, development, and preservation in the Town of Johnsbury. This plan was also intended to serve as the basis for requests for any requests to amend the Adirondack Park Land Use and Development Plan Map pursuant to Section 805, part 2, c, (3) of the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) Act. Specifically, it is meant to serve as the "comprehensive inventory and analysis of the natural resource, public, economic and other land use factors as may reflect the relative development amenability and limitations of the lands within the entire jurisdiction," as well as the formally adopted comprehensive master plan cited in the aforementioned section and part of the APA Act.

A goal of the plan is to promote tourism and recreation for all seasons in order to provide local employment opportunities. Specific policies supported in the LLUP are as follows:

- Support the Gore Mountain Unit Management Plan that proposes to link the Gore Mountain Ski Resort with the hamlet of North Creek.
- Pursue other enhancements for the North Creek hamlet area and Ski-Bowl Park as may be part of on-going implementation of the various plans prepared in the past.
- Continue to work with the Gore Mountain Region Chamber of Commerce, ORDA, and other interested groups to identify infrastructure improvements likely to be attractive to tourists.
- Identify appropriate locations for tourist and recreation businesses, and revise local zoning accordingly.

Other planning initiatives that support Gore Mountain improvements include:

- North Creek Action Plan (1993) dealt with economic development, hamlet revitalization, increasing tourism potential, and Main Street revitalization.
- Ski Bowl Park Enhancement Plan (1997) that provided details and cost estimates for needed facilities at the town owned and operated Ski Bowl Park.
- First Wilderness Heritage Corridor Plan (2001) for the rail corridor between Saratoga and North Creek was prepared. This plan established North Creek, Riparius, and The Glen as stops along the tourist railroad that began operation in 1999. Facilities constructed at each stop include parking, interpretative signs and small parks.

4. Historical and Archaeological Resources

There are no known historical or archeological resources present in the area proposed for the improvements.

C. Man-Made Facilities

1. Inventory of Constructed Facilities

a. Downhill Ski Slopes

A comprehensive inventory of existing downhill ski trails at Gore Mountain was undertaken for this 2018 UMP Amendment. See **Appendix 5**.

Figure 22, “Gore Mountain, Ski Trail Inventory,” illustrates the existing ski trails at Gore Mountain for the Winter 2016/2017 ski season.

Final trail length measurements were made electronically using AutoCAD Civil 3D-2014 and GIS software. **Table 1** in Appendix 5, “Gore Mountain Trail Inventory,” presents the results of the inventory and mileage measurement for each trail. The Table lists each trail by name, indicates if a ski lift and/or snowmaking exists on a trail, and presents lengths of each trail by width (less

Trail Name	Trail Length on "Intensive Use" Lands
1A	825
2B	357
3B	1,952
46ER	0
Bear Cub Run	608
Cedar's Traverse	3,514
Chatiemac	3,119
Cloud	3,486
Crystal	157
Cutoff	922
Dell	344
Double Barrel (Looker's Right)	780
Eagle's Nest Crossover	4,082
Echo	5,735
Farview	965
Foxlair	1,870
Hawkeye	1,939
Headwaters	2,740
Hedges	1,489
Hudson	0
Hullabloo	1,173
Jamboree	1,619
Jibland	318
Jug Handle	434
Lies	1,109
Little Cloud	364
Little Dipper	993
Little Gore Crossover	0
Lower Cloud Traverse	655
Lower Darby	1,019
Lower Sleighride	1,817
Lower Steilhang	1,246
Lower Sunway	3,769
Lower Uncus	794
Lower Wood In Traverse	1,115
Mica	444
Moxham	368
North Star	1,803
Open Pit	972
Otter Slide	407
Peaceful Valley	3,173
Pete Gay	3,976
Pine Knot	2,455
Pipeline Traverse	5,419
Pot Luck	723
Powder Pass	3,580
Quicksilver	2,036
Ruby Run	2,563
Sagamore	6,037
Santanoni	133
Showcase	5,928
Showoff	188
Sleeping Bear	2,796
Starting Gate	359
Sunway	5,047
Tahawus	4,184
Tannery	2,768
The Arena	991
The Glen	433
The Gully	730
The Loop	850
The Oak Ridge Trail	1,984
The Peace Pipe	918
The Rumor	1,260
Topridge	3,900
Tower 6	118
Twin Fawns	1,094
Twister	6,603
Twister's Little Sister	121
Uncas	1,833
Eagles Nest Bridge	620
Upper Darby	808
Upper Sleighride	1,727
Upper Steilhang	1,739
Upper Wood In	973
Village Slopes	0
Ward Hill	874
Wildair	4,980
Wood Lot North	924
Wood Lot South	1,163
Wood Out	2,340
Woodchuck	1,163
Totals (LF)	144,814
Totals (MILEAGE)	27.43

Glade Name	Calculated Length on "Intensive Use" Lands
Abenaki Glades	2,724
Barkeater Glades	0
Birch Bark Alley Glades	853
Boreas Glades	3,135
Cave Glades	1,017
Chatiemac Glades	635
Chatterbox Glades	3,388
Cirque Glades	1,522
Darby Woods Glades	325
Darkside Glades	848
Double Barrel Glades	0
Forever Wild Glades	1,877
Half 'N' Half Glades	305
High Pines Glades	0
Kill Kare Glades	1,147
MacIntyre Glades	485
Mineshaft Glades	271
Otter Slide Glades	947
Pinebrook Glades	944
Rabbit Run	840
Ridge Runner Glades	540
Sagamore Glades	2,029
Ski Bowl Glades	0
Straight Brook Glades	555
Tahawus Glades	0
The Narrows Glades	1,209
Twister Glades	0
Totals (LF)	25,596
Totals (Mileage)	4.85



than 30 feet wide, 30 feet to 120 feet wide and 120 feet to 200 feet wide. Key totals are summarized below:

1. Total constructed trail length 0-200 feet wide at Gore Mountain, including Ski Bowl Trails 29.9 miles. A breakdown by trail difficulty is as follows:

a) Easier	5.1 mi	17% of total
b) More Difficult	17.3 mi	58% of total
c) Most Difficult	6.5 mi	22% of total
d) Experts Only	1.0 mi	3% of total
2. Net constructed trail length for trails 0-200 feet wide on “Intensive Use” lands (excluding trails on Town Park lands in the North Creek Ski Bowl) is 27.43 miles.
3. Total trail length by width on “Intensive Use” lands is as follows:

a) Under 30 feet wide (on trail map and named)	1.31 miles
b) 30 feet to 120 feet wide	25.69 miles
c) 120 feet to 200 feet wide	0.42 miles
4. Total calculated length of previously approved, but not yet constructed trails on Intensive Use lands is 5.52 miles.
5. Total calculated length of Glades on Intensive Use lands at Gore Mountain is 4.85 miles.

As stated above, the total constructed trail length 0-200 feet wide on Intensive Use lands is 27.43 miles. Based on updated calculations using the rules and methodology presented in Sections 2 and 3 in Appendix 5, 32.95 miles are approved to be constructed.

Additional trails proposed in this UMP Amendment as New Management Actions and Conceptual Actions (see Section 4) total 1.30 miles. The addition of these trails to those described above would result in there being (32.95 + 1.30) 34.25 miles of trails.

It is important to clarify that the areas on the mountain approved for trail construction in the 2005 UMP have not changed. The calculation methodology, applied rules and criteria and high resolution aerial imagery used in the inventory in Appendix 5 are more detailed than those applied previously, and therefore have resulted in a different total mileage. The 2005 UMP only provides a ‘grand total’ mileage calculation, and does not document the mileage individually for each trail. The last time a detailed mileage calculation was performed on a ‘trail- by- trail’ basis was over 20 years ago in the 1995 UMP. Since that time, portions of some trails have been re-named, previously proposed trails have been abandoned and additional mountain areas have been approved and developed. As a result, a tabulation of mileage calculated for each trail in the 1995 UMP, along with each trail described in the current Trail Inventory in Appendix 5, would not provide comparable data.

b. Cross--country, Hiking and Mountain Bike Trails

Gore Mountain has approximately 14.6 miles of approved crosscountry ski trails averaging 12 feet in width, with terrain ranging from "easiest" to "most difficult." The trails form several loops located on the lower part of Gore Mountain, as illustrated on **Figure 7**, Existing Conditions (South).

The existing hiking trails at Gore Mountain, allowed by the 1995 UMP Amendment, are shown on **Figures 9 and 10**, Existing and Proposed Hiking and Biking Trails (South and North) These trails include a trail from the Ski Bowl (outside the Intensive Use Area) to the top of Gore Mountain, known as the Schaeffer Trail. (A portion of the Schaeffer Trail is also known as the Roaring Brook Trail which runs from Ives Dam to the intersection with the Rabbit Pond Trail.) There is also a looped trail for hikers that starts and ends near the top of the Northwoods Gondola. Hiking also occurs on mountain biking trails shown on Figures 9 and 10.

Existing trails for mountain biking are shown on **Figures 9 and 10**, Existing and Approved Hiking and Biking Trails (South and North). Trails are accessed from the base area or via the Northwoods Gondola during spring, summer and fall.

c. Lifts

There are 13 existing ski lifts at Gore Mountain. Lift locations are illustrated on **Figures 7 and 8**, Existing Conditions (South and North) Lift types and lift ages are listed below in Table 3, "Gore Mountain Lifts."

Table 3
Gore Mountain Lifts

1	2014 Poma	Quad	Adirondack Express II
2	1997 CTEC	Quad	North Quad
3	1986 Riblet	Double	Sunway Chair
4	1963 Hall	JBar	J-Bar
9d	2001 Sun Kid	Conveyor	Snow train
6	1967 Riblet	Double	Parts from 1987 Riblet & 1996 CTEC High Peaks Chair
7	1995 CTEC	Quad	Straightbrook Quad
8	1999 Poma	Gondola	Northwoods Gondola

9a	1997 Poma	Platter	Old lift modernized & installed by Gore Bear Cub Lift
9c	2013 Sun Kid	Conveyor	Greenway Conveyor
10	2002 CTEC	Triple	Topridge Triple
11	2008 Poma	Detachable	Burnt Ridge Quad
12	Poma	Triple	Hudson Chair (top only in IUA, rest in Ski Bowl)

The Adirondack Express II, Lift #1, runs from the base to an intermediate point on the mountain referred to as the Saddle. The North Quad, Lift #2, services the north side of the mountain and discharges passengers just above the Saddle area. Two lifts run from an intermediate point to the summit (High Peaks Chair - Lift #6 and the Straight Brook Quad - Lift #7). Only the Northwoods Gondola, Lift #8, runs directly from the base to the summit of Bear Mountain. The Sunway Chair, Lift #3, runs from the base to approximately the midpoint of the Sunway trail. The Bear Cub Poma, Lift #9 A, is a beginner facility located southwest of the base lodge. The J-Bar, Lift #4, is another beginner facility located to the east of the base lodge.

d. Parking

Skier and visitor parking are currently provided in five lots located adjacent to the base lodge and gondola area. Four of these lots are dedicated to cars and one to buses. There is also a 6th satellite parking lot located on the lower portion of the access roadway which is limited to employee parking and some overflow bus parking on busy days.

Using an industry standard range of 140 to 180 cars per acre of parking, Gore Mountain's parking facilities can handle between 1,736 and 2,232 cars. During a typical ski weekend, the resort also accommodates between 20 and 25 buses. At the present time, the current available parking area is adequate to handle the parking demand, except during periods of peak demand when parking overflows onto the access road. Such overflows occur 3-5 times per year.

e. Access Roads

No revision to this section is necessary, except to note that the access road now terminates in the redesigned entry, circulation and ski center arrival/drop-off area approved in the 1995 UMP. The entry road will become a one way circular roadway with 3 lanes available in the passenger vehicle drop-off area, and 2 lanes available in the drop off area for buses. The improved circulation and drop-off area will be a significant asset by improving the efficiency and safety of the ski center.

f. Buildings

The ski area has four lodges available for use by skiers and visitors. The main lodge and Northwoods lodge are located at the base of the mountain and the Saddle Lodge is located mid-way up the mountain. The warming hut located at the Straight Brook area has been supplemented with a new Straight Brook lodge in the old summit gondola building.

The main lodge has a total area of approximately 45,000 square feet and consists of two stories. Facilities in the main lodge include food and beverage services, restrooms, ski school, retail sales, ski rental, public lockers, ticket office, bar/lounge, and nursery.

A recent addition to the Northwoods Lodge offers extra space to the rental and repair shop, expansion to the space allotted to the children's Mountain Adventure programs and food service for the Snow Sports School, and improved arrival and registration process. Larger restrooms on the lower level include a "family restroom" to accommodate parents with young children.

There is a new mid-mountain experience at the Saddle Lodge. The size of the space has more than doubled to 7,125 square feet, and occupancy has increased from 100 people to 238. Services now include a full-service or food court style meal with dining in front of a spectacular showcase of the Adirondack High Peaks. Updates to the Saddle Lodge also include an attractively styled vernacular, an expanded and updated kitchen to serve a larger, more creative menu, new bathrooms, and an approachable façade and lobby area upon entry. The fully renovated Saddle Lodge offers guests an appealing lunch alternative to the Base Lodge Food Court and Tannery Pub & Restaurant.

Gore Mountain's guests also have a new summit place to warm up at the Straight Brook Lodge. A complete renovation of the original 1967 gondola unloading station has kept the original structure and most of the lift machinery intact while facilitating the basics of shelter, restrooms, and a place for socializing and camaraderie between skiers. Inside there is a warming room with tables and benches, vending machines, and eco-friendly composting toilets.

g. Maintenance Roads

Approximately 9 miles of maintenance roads traverse the ski area. These roads are used to accomplish summer maintenance of slopes and lifts and to access particular areas such as the saddle, the summit, pumphouse, reservoir, etc.

h. Potable Water

Potable water for the base area is provided by a drilled well located approximately 75 feet from the J-Bar lift. The well is 280 feet deep and has a capacity of 60 gpm at a depth of 46 to 48 feet. All water mains and hydrants are 6-inch cast iron. On demand, water is fed to a 100,000 gallon

holding tank located at the top of the J-Bar hill. From there, the system is gravity fed and metered as it enters the lodge. During periods of high water demand in the lodge, when the well pump is running, water is routed directly into the lodge's distribution system.

Water supply for the Saddle Lodge located at mid-mountain is now supplied by a new 6 inch diameter drilled well. It is located in the vicinity of the Saddle Lodge. The well is 180 feet deep and yields 6+ gpm. The water is transmitted via a new main to the existing 5000 gallon static storage tank and then pumped to an existing 600 gallon pressure tank.

i. Snowmaking

Snowmaking is provided on almost 100% of Gore Mountain's trail terrain which covers approximately 334 acres. Sixty-five all-new high-efficiency ground guns and another new tower gun were added to the mountain in 2016. A fresh fleet of high-efficiency towers was installed in 2015, primarily along Showcase and Wild Air, allowing existing guns to be utilized in other areas. Twenty-two new permanent, high-efficiency tower guns were added the Topridge trail in 2014. These guns require significantly less air than the more traditional ground guns, offsetting energy use. New snowmaking was also placed around the Pipeline Bridge to further improve the interconnect with the Historic North Creek Ski Bowl.

The total snowmaking system combines both air and airless snowmaking technology. The Ski Center has increased its water use from the snowmaking reservoir from 223 million gallons in 2009-2010, to 305 million gallons during the 2013-2014 season. Hours of snowmaking operation averaged approximately 1,450 over the past 5 seasons.

j. Grooming Equipment

Grooming of alpine and nordic trails is accomplished with a fleet of seven grooming machines. It is anticipated that as terrain is developed as a result of the New Actions, that a total of two new grooming machines will be purchased.

k. Water Supply for Snowmaking

Snowmaking water is stored and drawn from the former North Creek Reservoir located northwest of the base area. The reservoir has a storage capacity of approximately 20 million gallons of water and is capable of recharging itself approximately four times per ski season. The Hudson River intake and pipeline was constructed, as proposed in the 1995 UMP, and water is now pumped from the river to the reservoir, and distributed on the mountain. Refer to Table 4, "Snowmaking Utilization" for additional detail.

Table 4 Snowmaking Utilization

		System					
	Trails	Capabilities	Operations	Water Use	Water Use	Average	
	(Acres)	(gpm)	(hours)	(gal)	(ac-ft.)	gpm	Utilization
Long term GOAL	334	4800	1250	290,000,000	1,450	3,866.67	80.56%
2015/2016	334	4800	1384	276,000,000	1,380	3,323.70	69.24%
2014/2015	334	4800	1370	290,000,000	1,450	3,527.98	73.50%
2013/2014	334	4800	1520	305,000,000	1,525	3,344.30	69.67%
2012/2013	332	4800	1677	276,816,000	1,384	2,751.10	57.31%
2011/2012	331.12	4800	1307	208,835,252	1,044	2,663.04	55.48%
2010/2011	331.12	4800	1544	228,528,000	1,143	2,466.84	51.39%
2009/2010	323	4800	1544	222,960,000	1,115	2,406.74	50.14%

I. Sanitary Wastewater

Gore Mountain's base area wastewater treatment plant underwent a major upgrade in 1991-1992. During the winter season (peak use period), wastewater is treated by a microbiologically activated sludge process consisting of equalization/pre-treatment, oxidation ditch and a tertiary microscreen and post-aeration. The plant capacity is 65,000 gallons per day (gpd) and can accommodate all of the proposed improvements to the ski center which are included in this UMP (including the on-mountain lodges). During the off-season, the oxidation ditch is taken off-line and wastewater is treated in a sequencing batch reactor in an extended aeration mode using the activated sludge process. Effluent polishing in the tertiary stage is accomplished by microscreen. The upper limit capacity is 20,000 gpd.

m. Drainage

Gore Mountain's existing stormwater drainage at the base of the mountain (lodge and parking lots) consists of pocket ponds, porous gravel lots and vegetated swales. Erosion and sediment control on the mountain is provided by water bars discharging to wooded areas that prevent water from reaching erosive velocities as runoff travels down the mountain.

n. Electrical Distribution

Power is supplied by the Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation to the site and is distributed throughout the ski area via 34,500 volt and 4,800 volt aerial power lines. The Gore Mountain power station is set for a 34,500 volt power supply at a maximum demand load of 7.5 megavolt amperes (MVA). The current peak demand is approximately 7 MVA. Of the total MVA currently used during peak operational periods, 3 MVA operates the air compressors. Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation has allocated a peak load power demand of 7.5 MVA to Gore Mountain. All primary lines originate at a substation where 34,500 incoming volts are distributed. Distribution is then accomplished via 34,500 volt aerial lines to some parts of the mountain, and by 4,800 volt aerial lines to other parts of the mountain.

o. Solid Waste Management

Solid waste from the ski center is hauled by ski center employees to the transfer station in North Creek. The town then transports refuse to the Adirondack Resource Recovery Facility in Hudson Falls. Approximately 448 cubic yards of compacted waste per year is generated by the ski center.

p. Equipment Inventory

The ski area owns and maintains equipment ranging from office and computer equipment to furniture, carpentry equipment, trail grooming equipment, vehicles and snowmaking equipment. A complete listing of "Inventory Equipment" is available for review at ORDA headquarters in Lake Placid, New York.

2. Inventory of Systems

a. Management

Gore Mountain Ski Center was built in the early 1960's and was first opened to the public in 1964. Early management was under the direction of the Bureau of Winter Recreation, Conservation Department (now known as the Department of Environmental Conservation). On April 1, 1984, management was delegated to the Olympic Regional Development Authority (ORDA) through an agreement with DEC, authorized by Chapter 99 of the Laws of 1984 (Article 8, Title 28, Section 2614, Public Authorities Law).

This agreement transferred to ORDA the use, operation, maintenance and management of the ski area. DEC remains the statutory custodian of the state-owned ski area. Under the agreement, ORDA is to maintain the facility subject to DEC inspections; make capital improvements with DEC'S prior written approval; establish a sinking fund for capital improvements; continue the level of prior public recreation; comply with specified prior agreements; and cooperate with DEC in completion of a Unit Management Plan for the ski area.

In 1991 DEC and ORDA entered into a Memorandum of Understanding superseding a 1984 memorandum between the parties, establishing methods and procedures by which managerial requirements contained in the underlying DEC/ORDA management agreements are to be complied with, and setting forth requirements for the operation of ORDA facilities and detailing procedures on how Unit Management Plans for each of the ORDA facilities are to be implemented. The MOU, in particular, relates to requirements for notices of management actions described in Unit Management Plans; the need to adhere to the DEC tree cutting policy; and identifies those activities that need to be undertaken which are not described in Unit Management Plans. This 1991 MOU was incorporated into the current (2013) DEC/ORDA Consolidation Agreement that covers Whiteface, Gore, the Memorial Highway and Mount Van Hoevenberg. A copy of the 2013 Consolidation Agreement is in **Appendix 2** of this UMP. The 2013 Consolidation Agreement reestablishes the procedures for preparation of UMP's including such things as UMP content, UMP conformance with the APSLMP, and the roles of ORDA, DEC and the APA in preparation, review and approval of UMPs.


b. Organization

The New York State Olympic Regional Development Authority (ORDA) was created in 1981 by the State Legislature as a public authority to oversee and manage the Olympic facilities in an effort to insure continued use and enjoyment of the facilities by the public. ORDA is composed of twelve members, three of these the Commissioners of the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, Economic Development, and Parks & Recreation Departments, and the remaining seven appointed by the Governor of the State of New York. One of the appointed members, since the management of Gore Mountain was transferred to ORDA, must be a resident of Warren County. ORDA manages and operates the Gore Mountain Ski Center under its agreement with the Department of Environmental Conservation. The staff is led by the Authority's President and Chief Executive Officer.

c. Operations

Personnel employed at Gore Mountain Ski Center vary with the season. During the winter season there are approximately 47 permanent and 453 seasonal staff. The ski school employs approximate one year-round, 4 full-time seasonal and 189 part-time personnel. The ski patrol operates with 45 staff and approximately 90 volunteers. During the summer months, there are approximately 37 fulltime staff and a maintenance crew which totals approximately 70 personnel.

Figure 23
Organizational Structure
Gore Mountain Ski Area



d. Contractual Arrangements

On July 16, 2011, the Authority entered into a 10 year agreement with Centerplate whereby the Authority granted Centerplate a license to have exclusive rights to furnish and install certain equipment and improvements and to manage and operate the food, beverage, catering and merchandise services, equipment rental/ski touring concessions including liquor/sales, food, and retail services at all ORDA Olympic facilities on a year-round basis. Per the Agreement, the license is valid until July 15, 2021 with an option to renew for another 10 years upon the mutual written consent of both parties.

Under the terms of the Agreement, Centerplate's exclusive rights are subject to certain other contracts existing with the Authority, including: for Whiteface: the summer mountain bike rental concession agreement with High Peaks Cyclery of Lake Placid, New York.

Part and parcel to the Agreement is Centerplate's obligation to comply with all present and future federal and state laws, codes and regulations applicable to the conduct of the activities authorized, including all other applicable governmental regulations affecting the ORDA and the

Olympic facilities in regard to the sale, use and storage of materials. Centerplate is also responsible for procuring, at its own expense, all permits, licenses or other approvals necessary for the performance of its duties under the terms of the License.

Snowmaking Water Supply - In accordance with the management agreement with DEC, ORDA continues to abide by the license granted by the Town of Johnsbury for the use of water in the North Creek Reservoir in connection with snowmaking operations at Gore Mountain Ski Center.

D. Public Use of the Ski Center

1. Ski Season Use

In **Table 5**, Winter Public Use of Gore Mountain Ski Center, it can be seen that there was no clear trend in the number of ticketed visits between 2005/2006 and this past winter (2016-2017). Average annual ticketed visits to the Ski Center during this time period was 137,090.

Similarly, there was no clear trend over time for the number of annual season pass holder visits. Average annual passholder visits for the period was 78,174.

The peak ticketed days of attendance used to always be within the February Presidents' Week. Since the last UMP Amendment, this has changed. President's Week continues to be the time of highest attendance with 8 of the 12 years reported below occurring during this February holiday. For two of the years below, the peak attendance day occurred in January during the Martin Luther King holiday weekend period. In one year (2012-2013) peak attendance occurred during the week of Christmas on December 28th. Last season's peak day attendance of 7,225 was the highest for the 2005-2017period.

Table 5
Winter Public Use of Gore Mountain Ski Center
from 2005-2006 until 2016-2017 (includes passholders)

Snow Season	Ticketed Visits	Passholder Visits	Total Visits
05-06	164,363	69,930	234,293
06-07	127,277	74,820	202,097
07-08	147,960	82,275	230,235
08-09	141,134	82,488	223,622
09-10	133,772	84,000	217,772
10-11	131,824	80,463	212,287
11-12	119,288	74,115	193,403
12-13	148,264	70,740	219,004
13-14	161,757	79,695	241,452
14-15	154,217	82,815	237,032
15-16	78,314	82,170	160,484
16-17	136,907	74,580	211,487

Snow Season	Peak Day	Ticketed Visits
05-06	2/18/2006	4,417
06-07	2/14/2007	5,989
07-08	2/16/2008	6,002
08-09	2/14/2009	5,414
09-10	2/13/2010	6,520
10-11	1/15/2011	5,476
11-12	2/18/2012	5,405
12-13	12/28/2012	5,763
13-14	2/16/2014	5,919
14-15	1/18/2015	5,428
15-16	1/17/2016	4,753
16-17	2/19/2017	7,225

Snow Season	President's Holiday Week (Ticketed Visits)
05-06	31,662
06-07	35,537
07-08	31,390
08-09	31,955
09-10	33,446
10-11	31,134

11-12	29,358
12-13	28,302
13-14	32,636
14-15	25,450
15-16	20,004
16-17	32,748

2. Non-Ski Season Use

The summer and fall season program centers around hiking, mountain biking (including mountain bike racing), educational interpretive opportunities and nature-oriented activities. Gore Mountain hosts an annual fall festival. The gondola is operated as a tourist attraction year-round. Hunting, trapping and fishing are prohibited at the Gore Mountain Ski Center. Only non-consumptive use of wildlife resources is permitted on Ski Center lands.

Use data for mountain biking, scenic rides, hiking, and base area activities have all been collected since the 2012-2013 season and those data are presented in the table below. During this period there has been a decline in mountain biking by almost 2/3. There was no real trend over the years for the number of gondola riders/hikers with the average for the 5-year period being 9,565. There is a decreasing trend in the number of base area activities participants, but not a consistent trend through the 5 year period.

Table 6
Non-winter Public Use of Gore Mountain Ski Center
(2012-2013 to 2016-2017)

	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	2012-13
Summer / Fall Visits	Visits	Visits	Visits	Visits	Visits
Mountain Biking	134	212	248	257	391
Scenic Rides/Hiking	7780	10,088	8,442	11,615	9,899
Other (disc golf, bungee, etc.)	614	869	843	1,037	936
	8,528	11,169	9,533	12,909	11,226

SECTION III MANAGEMENT AND POLICY

A. Orientation and Evolution of Management Philosophy

ORDA's central management goal and management philosophy as stated in the 1987 UMP:

"The Olympic Regional Development Authority will continue to provide a safe, quality, recreational experience to the public and promote both local and regional economic benefits through its responsibility to manage and operate the Gore Mountain Ski Center to the highest standard."

ORDA's goals and management philosophy have evolved since its inception following the 1980 Olympic Games. Originally created as a management organization with a priority of providing a safe, quality, recreational experience, ORDA has expanded its operational philosophy to encompass business strategies that are similar to leaders in the ski resort and sports industry. It is recognized that ORDA's unique portfolio of assets have an ability to positively impact the economies in which it operates. In addition, ORDA's sporting events, attractions, and training facilities enhance people's lives.

Today, ORDA continues to build on the foundation of its mission and is deploying a philosophy that will allow the organization to be sustainable long into the future. This will be accomplished through strategic planning and open communication both internally and externally with all constituents. The business priorities are organized into three categories:

- 1.) Revenue Growth and Opportunities
- 2.) Capital Projects and Development
- 3.) Organizational Excellence

Within each of these categories, ORDA's centralized team works with management teams to develop strategic business plans for each venue that are in line with ORDA's goals and objectives. Short descriptions of these priorities are as follows:

Revenue Growth and Opportunities

Each year, management teams evaluate short term and long term concepts to increase revenue. Additionally, they explore opportunities in hosting major events, creating new partnerships that amplify ORDA's offerings, and overall, provide guests with the best experience. ORDA measures success through end of the year evaluations in specific revenue segments, visitation numbers, event profit and loss statements, and NPS (Net Promoter Score). (NPS is system utilized by leading resort operators in the industry and has been directly correlated with the ability to increase visitation and revenue.)

Capital Projects and Environment

Capital projects will be initiated through management and in line with ORDA's strategic plans. General priorities include refurbishment of outdated structures for safety, development or improvement of attractions or infrastructure that enhance the guest experience or allows ORDA to increase visitation and revenue.

Many ORDA venues exist within the boundaries of State protected lands and the impact of climate change on our environment is recognized. ORDA will be a leader in environmental stewardship with consistent commitment to sustainability, responsible development practices, and continuous communication with DEC, APA, and other regulatory agencies to ensure we are taking the appropriate measures.

Organizational Excellence

ORDA will strive for organizational excellence in every facet of its operation. From financial management, team building, communication, education, strategic planning, to overall safety, organizational excellence is a vision where every employee focuses on ways to improve or positively influence our operations.

B. Regulatory Issues

1. New York State Constitution Article 14

Article 14 of the State Constitution defines the intended "Forever Wild" character of Forest Preserve lands and establishes authorized uses and exceptions. Significant issues with respect to Gore Mountain are as follows:

a. Ski Trails

Article 14 establishes allowable limits for timber cutting to construct ski slopes on Forest Preserve lands at certain specified lengths and widths. As originally promulgated, Article 14 allowed up to thirty (30) miles of ski-trails from thirty (30) to eighty (80) feet in width on the slopes of Gore and Pete Gay Mountains in the Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area. In 1987, Article 14 was amended to allow up to forty (40) miles of trails and to increase the maximum allowable width of ski trails on the slopes of Gore and Pete Gay Mountains from 80 feet to 200 feet, provided that no more than eight miles of such trails are in excess of 120 feet wide. Based on Attorney General and NYSDEC legal reviews, the cross-country trails are not considered a part of the 40 mile limit. The 1987 Constitutional Amendment removed South Mountain from the Gore Mountain Ski Center.

The construction of cross country ski trails was authorized by an Attorney General's Opinion dated January 18, 1934. These trails are allowed on Forest Preserve land when the cutting of

trees "to any material degree" will not be necessary, and the character of the preserve is not impaired.

The Constitution, while it establishes a limit for the width of ski trails, infers that these trails will be separated by buffer strips. There are no specific guidelines for widths of buffer zones that separate ski trails from other trails, lifts, access roadways, snowmaking facilities and buildings.

Buffer zone widths are influenced by variations in topography, drainage patterns, rock outcrops, soil stabilization concerns, safety considerations, machinery requirements and visual aesthetics.

b. Vegetative Cutting

Article 14 states that Forest Preserve land, as currently fixed by law, either presently owned or acquired in the future by the State, will be kept forever as wild forest lands. As such, Forest Preserve lands cannot be leased, sold, or exchanged, or be taken by any public or private corporation. Timber on Forest Preserve land cannot be removed, sold or destroyed. In the interest of public safety and in consideration of the development of protective and recreational facilities, it has been necessary for the Department of Environmental Conservation, as the managing authority for Forest Preserve lands, to periodically ascertain the limitations of legislative intent from the State Attorney General pertaining to the cutting, removal and destruction of trees.

In instances where cutting has not been sanctioned by constitutional amendment, the opinion and interpretation of the State's Attorney General has been sought on allowable cutting activities. One such opinion, dated January 18, 1934, pertaining to ski trail construction stated; "ski-trails (cross-country) may be constructed by the Conservation Department in the Forest Preserve when cutting trees to any material degree, will not be necessary and the wild forest character of the Preserve will not be impaired."

In addition, trees may be removed for several other purposes. An Attorney General's opinion dated February 5, 1935 authorizes the removal of trees in the Forest Preserve that endanger public safety. An Attorney General's opinion dated September 20, 1934 allows the use or removal of vegetation for surveying triangulation stations, where these stations serve as an aid to the conservation work of the State, and where the number of small trees used or removed for the work appear immaterial.

The cutting of trees to establish scenic vistas is addressed in an Attorney General's opinion of January 17, 1935. In this opinion, vistas may be established as long as the work is "carried on with care in order that the tree removal may not be sufficient to pass the point of immateriality."

Before the creation of a vista, alternate locations in the area and alternate methods of achieving the view must be considered. For example, a more sparsely wooded site might be found, or an observation platform erected.

The salvage of windfall timber is authorized when it is determined that it represents a fire hazard in an opinion dated July 26, 1945. Salvaged timber cannot be sold or given away to anyone who may sell it, but it can be used for any project under Department of Environmental Conservation jurisdiction.

A June 24, 1986 Attorney General Opinion (No. 86-F3) addresses the issue of whether the DEC may cut live-standing trees for use in the maintenance of existing trails in the forest preserve. The opinion concludes that: "The carefully planned and supervised selective cutting in the forest preserve of only those few scattered trees necessary for the maintenance of popular and steep trails to lessen soil compaction, erosion and the destruction of vegetation may be conducted consistent with the 'forever wild' provisions of the State Constitution, as long as it does not occur to any material degree." The Gore Mountain Unit Management Plan and supporting GEIS provides the necessary framework and procedures to ensure compliance with this standard.

Adherence to the DEC Commissioner's Tree Cutting Policy (Organization and Delegation Memorandum 84-06) is mandated in the 1991 DEC/ORDA Memorandum of Understanding for the implementation of Unit Management Plans. The Memorandum of Understanding requires approval of the DEC Director of the Division of Lands and Forest for the cutting of any vegetation at the State Facilities under ORDA's control. The request for approval to cut trees for the purposes of new construction, expansion or modification of projects must be submitted in writing and include specifically required detailed information. Furthermore, the DEC policy and procedures were amended in 1986 to include the requirement for adequate notice in the Environmental Notice Bulletin to the public as to the number of trees proposed to be cut and the size of the land involved on specific projects.

These requirements combine to assure that the test for "carefully planned and supervised selective cutting" will be met. In addition to authorizing tree cutting for ski trails, Article 14 permits cutting for appurtenances associated with the trails. ORDA, as did the previous DEC management, considers appurtenances to the ski trails to be those improvements and structures necessary to operate a modern, state-of-the-art ski center for safe, enjoyable skiing. Generally, these include such facilities as ski lifts, lodges, service roadways, parking lots, utility and water lines and other buildings and improvements needed for the operation and management of the ski center. Appurtenances are constructed on a case-by-case basis based upon criteria of effective use, safe engineering design and minimum disturbance to vegetation and other natural features. They are performed in accordance with this UMP and the 2013 DEC/ORDA Consolidation Agreement, as well as in accordance with the guidelines and criteria expressed in the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan.

DEC'S established policy regarding cutting, removal and destruction of trees and other vegetation on all forest preserve lands is found in the Policies and Procedures of the Commissioner of Environmental Conservation (Organization and Delegation Memorandum #84-06 as amended). This policy recognizes the tree cutting sanctioned through constitutional amendment (e.g. ski trails) and by the Attorney General's Opinions above. Adherence to the commissioner's tree cutting policy is mandated in the DEC/ORDA Memorandum of Understanding of 1991 that is part of the 2013 DEC/ORDA Consolidation Agreement. All vegetation cutting at the Gore Mountain Ski Center must be in accordance with this policy.

The removal of cut trees may be done in any manner consistent with the guidelines of DEC Policy LF-91-2, the UMP and Article 8 of the ECL.

c. Non-Alienation

Article 14 of the State Constitution provides that Forest Preserve Lands "...shall not be leased, sold or exchanged to any corporation public or private".

In the case of *Slutsky vs. Cuomo et.al.*, the DEC management agreement with ORDA was challenged as violative of the non-alienation of State Forest Preserve land provisions in Article 14. The Appellate Division, Third Department, affirmed a lower court decision and upheld the constitutionality of this statutorily mandated agreement. On June 10, 1986, the Court of Appeals dismissed the Appellants appeal on the ground that no substantial constitutional ground was involved in the matter.

2. Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan

The APSLMP classifies State Lands in the Forest Preserve according to their character and capacity to withstand use and sets forth general guidelines and criteria for the management and use of state lands. The APSLMP classifies the Gore Mountain Ski Center as an Intensive Use Area. Intensive Use Areas are defined as follows:

"An Intensive Use Area is an area where the state provides facilities for intensive forms of outdoor recreation by the public. Two types of Intensive Use Areas are defined by this plan: campground and day use areas."

"These areas provide overnight accommodations or day use facilities for a significant number of visitors to the Park and often function as a base for use of wild forest, wilderness, primitive and canoe areas."

Guidelines for management and use which apply to Intensive Use Areas, including Gore Mountain, include:

- "The primary management guideline for Intensive Use Areas will be to provide the public opportunities for family group camping, developed swimming and boating, downhill skiing, cross country skiing under competitive or developed conditions on improved cross country

ski trails, visitor information and similar outdoor recreational pursuits in a setting and on a scale that are in harmony with the relatively wild and undeveloped character of the Adirondack Park.

- "All intensive use facilities should be located, designed and managed so as to blend with the Adirondack environment and to have the minimum adverse impact possible on surrounding state lands and nearby private holdings. They will not be situated where they will aggravate problems on lands already subject to or threatened by overuse, such as the eastern portion of the High Peaks Wilderness, the Pharaoh Lake Wilderness or the St. Regis Canoe Area or where they will have a negative impact on competing private facilities. Such facilities will be adjacent to or serviceable from existing public road systems or water bodies open to motorboat use within the Park."
- "Construction and development activities in Intensive Use Areas will:
 - avoid material alteration of wetlands;
 - minimize extensive topographic alterations;
 - limit vegetative clearing; and,
 - preserve the scenic, natural and open space resources of the Intensive Use Area."
- "Priority should be given to the rehabilitation and modernization of existing Intensive Use Areas and the complete development of partially developed existing Intensive Use Areas before the construction of new facilities is considered."
- "No new structures or improvements at any Intensive Use Area will be constructed except in conformity with a final adopted unit management plan for such area. This guideline will not prevent the ordinary maintenance rehabilitation or minor relocation of conforming structures or improvements."
- "Since the concentrations of visitors at certain intensive use facilities often pose a threat of water pollution, the state should set an example for the private sector by installing modern sewage treatment systems with the objective of maintaining high water quality. Standards for the state should in no case be less than those for the private sector and in all cases any pit privy, leach field or seepage pit will be at least 150 feet from the mean high water mark of any lake, pond, river or stream."

There is one management guideline specific to Gore Mountain in the APSLMP:

"Existing downhill ski centers at Gore and Whiteface should be modernized to the extent physical and biological resources allow. Cross country skiing on improved cross-country ski trails may be developed at these downhill ski centers."

The APSLMP provides that Unit Management Plans be developed by the DEC in consultation with the APA for management of state lands. Such management plans shall conform to the

general guidelines and criteria set forth in the APSLMP. UMPs are also to be amended from time to time. The responsibility for preparation of the Gore Mountain UMP has been delegated to ORDA, as discussed below.

3. 2005 Unit Management Plan Amendment

The following is a summary of the current status of management action that have changed since the 2005 UMP Amendment. The status of all actions is included in **Table 1** in Section 1 of this UMP/GEIS.

New Trails and Crossovers

- 12-A Pipeline Access to Gore Base is now 30% complete
- 12-B Oak Ridge access to Pipeline Trail is now 50% complete

Existing Trail Widening

- 1-F Upper Twister 80% is now complete
- 1-F Lower Twister 80% is now complete

Lifts – Lift #1 has been constructed

Lodges and Buildings

- Entry Drive/Drop off/Parking Renovation is now 50% complete
- Learning Center is completed

Trail Markers and Interpretive Systems – Interpretive Systems are now 25% complete

Parking Lots – New Passenger Car Lots are now 50% complete.

4. Environmental Conservation Law

Section 9-09031 of the Environmental Conservation Law places the "care, custody and control" of the Gore Mountain Ski Center with the Department of Environmental Conservation.

5. Olympic Regional Development Authority Act

The Olympic Regional Development Act (Article 8, Title 28, NYS Public Authorities Law) establishes the Olympic Regional Development Authority (ORDA) and sets forth its responsibilities, functions and duties. The management of the Gore Mountain Ski Center was transferred to ORDA pursuant to Chapter 99 of the Laws of 1984. This authority was implemented by an agreement between the DEC and ORDA on April 1, 1984.

6. DEC - ORDA Memorandum of Understanding and Consolidation Agreement

The DEC and ORDA implement their mutual responsibilities for management of Gore through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated March 8, 1991. The MOU sets forth mutually agreeable methods and procedures by which managerial requirements are implemented. The MOU also establishes the means by which the existing UMP is implemented. Such means generally involve notification, inspection and review of actions to ensure compliance with the UMP and applicable regulations.

In 2013 DEC and ORDA entered into a Consolidation Agreement that, in part, incorporates the 1991 MOU. A copy of this *Agreement Consolidating the Management Agreements for the Gore Mountain Ski Center, the Whiteface Mountain Ski Center and Memorial Highway, and the Mount Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area* is in **Appendix 2**. The 2013 Consolidation Agreement reestablishes the procedures for preparation of UMP's including such things as UMP content, UMP conformance with the APSLMP, and the roles of ORDA, DEC and the APA in preparation, review and approval of UMPs.

C. Management Goals and Objectives

Gore Management has established goals and objectives in line with ORDA's key priorities:

- 1.) Revenue Growth and Opportunities
- 2.) Capital Projects and Environment
- 3.) Organizational Excellence

Revenue Growth and Opportunities

- a. Gore Mountain will seek to modernize facilities at Gore in order to enhance the guest experience, improve skier safety, and increase local and regional economic benefits, while maintaining environmental quality.
- b. Gore Mountain will seek to develop new summer and fall usage of the Ski Center to provide greater year-round use of the facility by the public, consistent with Article 14 and the APSLMP.
- c. Gore Mountain will work closely with the North Creek community and Town of Johnsbury to provide information to visitors about the area and to cooperate in the establishment of a shuttle link between the Ski Center and North Creek and a physical ski link to Ski Bowl Park in order that public use may better help promote the economy of the area.

Capital Projects and Environment

- a. Gore Mountain Ski Center is a participator in Sustainable Slopes, which is the environmental charter for ski areas compiled by the National Ski Areas Association. Ski areas provide a quality outdoor recreation experience in a manner that complements the natural and aesthetic qualities that draws skiers to the mountains. Gore Mountain Ski Center is committed to improving environmental performance in all aspects of its operations and managing the area to allow for continued enjoyment by future generations.
- b. Gore Mountain will seek to increase the capacity of the ski area in concert with other modernization objectives in order to provide a higher quality skiing experience.
- c. Gore Mountain will implement a capital improvements program to achieve the above objectives. Specific elements are discussed in Section IV below.

Organizational Excellence

- a. Gore Mountain management will seek to establish annual budgets and schedules in support of the proposed capital improvements plan and other management objectives.
- b. Gore Mountain will seek to improve infrastructure reliability in order to reduce the high frequency of breakdown, excessive staffing requirements and consequent financial drain.
- c. Gore Mountain will seek to reduce its operations and maintenance costs by replacing outdated and aged equipment.
- d. Gore Mountain will seek to improve its economic return by making the mountain more attractive to skiers, and thus increasing ticket sales.
- e. Gore Mountain will seek to improve skier safety and enjoyment by widening certain trails and improving certain trail intersections.
- f. Gore Mountain will seek to improve trail selection and create a better balance among trails in order to appeal to a greater cross-section of the skiing market by increasing the number of trails for the beginning and advanced skier.
- g. Gore Mountain will continue to develop informational and interpretive graphics and displays which will educate the ski center's users to the historical, cultural and environmental conditions in the North Creek area as well as the Adirondack Park in general.

SECTION IV PROPOSED MANAGEMENT ACTIONS AND PROJECTED USE

A. Proposed Management Actions to be Undertaken after Acceptance and Adoption of this UMP and Conceptual Management Actions

1. General

ORDA proposes to undertake a number of management actions to further its goals for the future of Gore Mountain. Those goals include the following.

- Make Gore Mountain more desirable for recreational guests, athlete training and hosting premier events.
- Modernize aging facilities and infrastructure
- Continue energy efficiency improvements
- Improve operational efficiency
- Increase competitiveness in the marketplace
- Explore potential for, and increase development of year-round and summer attractions
- Improve quality and diversity of recreational facilities
- Attract more visitors, including the younger generation/next generation

2. New Downhill Trails and Lifts

a. Widen Non-Beginner Trails

Trail Widening is proposed for Twister and for Echo.

The plan for Twister is to build upon previously approved widening efforts and widen portions less than 120 feet wide to 120 feet to achieve consistent width along the entire trail.

The bottom of the Echo trail it is proposed be widened to 120 feet to accommodate the new trail connection from Burnt Ridge and to better accommodate existing ski racing on Echo.

b. Add new triple or quad chair (Lift 9B), from Northwoods Lodge up Lower Sunway to just past the bend in Lower Sunway

Sunway/Lower Sunway is the longest beginner ski trail on Gore Mountain. The trail extends from its top near the Saddle Lodge down to the Northwoods Lodge. While the trail as a whole is rated as a beginner/easiest trail, different sections of the trail have different levels of difficulty.

Beginning skiers will typically progress from starting with the surface lifts on Bear Cub Run and the J-bar lift at Starting Gate to riding the existing Sunway Chair. This progression of terrain difficulty is sometimes too challenging for the beginning skier.

By adding this additional lift that puts beginning skiers lower on Lower Sunway where terrain is less challenging, there can be a more gradual progression of terrain difficulty for beginning skiers.

c. Widen Sunway and other green trails served by Lift 3

Figure 1, 2018 New Management Actions (South), shows the areas of trail widening.

- Sunway above and below the relocated Sunway lift
- Otter Slide
- 3B
- Cutoff
- Ward Hill
- Lower Sunway
- Little Dipper
- Jamboree

Trail widening in these areas will lessen congestion and provide for more enjoyable and safer skiing conditions on this beginner and intermediate terrain.

d. Construct Trails 11-O and 12-O

Trail 11-O is a new intermediate-level trail that will connect the Burnt Ridge portion of Gore Mountain with the base lodge area. Trail 11-O will start off of the existing Sagamore trail on skier's right. The upper portion of this trail will be constructed on the location of previously approved Trail 11-J that is currently part of the Cirque Glades. The trail will then turn to the south and connect with the base lodge area just downhill of the existing Echo ski trail.

Trail 12-O will be constructed in the area that is currently the Half-and-Half Glade. Half of this new trail will be within the Intensive Use Area and the other half will be within the North Creek Ski Bowl on Town of Johnsburg lands. This trail will connect the existing Oak Ridge Trail near its intersection with the Peaceful Valley Trail with the Moxham Trail in the Ski Bowl.

3. Snowmaking - Enlarge snowmaking reservoir

During periods of optimal snowmaking weather, the capacity of the existing snowmaking reservoir can limit the ski trail snowmaking capability on Gore Mountain.

The primary snowmaking water source for Gore Mountain is its intake on the Hudson River near the North Creek train station. Gore Mountain is permitted to withdraw 4,800 gallons per minute at its Hudson River intake (2014 NYSDEC Water Withdrawal Permit). Water that is

withdrawn from the Hudson River is pumped up to the existing snowmaking reservoir near the Pipeline Traverse.

There is a snowmaking pumphouse located adjacent to the reservoir that pumps water from the reservoir up to the mountain snowmaking system. Pumping capacity at the pumphouse is permitted for 6,800 gpm (2005 UMP).

Thus, the withdrawal capacity from the reservoir can exceed the supply capacity from the Hudson River by 2,000 gpm. This 2,000 gpm can be considered as a “supply deficit.”

The snowmaking reservoir has a surface area of +/- 5.2 acres and a storage capacity of +/- 19,000,000 gallons (19 Mgal). See **Figure 24**, Existing Snowmaking Reservoir.

With a supply deficit of 2,000 gpm, the reservoir can be emptied in times of peak snowmaking in approximately 6 ½ days of continuous peak withdrawal snowmaking.

Providing more storage volume would extend the time period when Gore Mountain can make snow during optimal snowmaking conditions.


Various options were examined for expanding the storage capacity of the snowmaking reservoir.


Option 1 involves excavating out portions of the reservoir within its existing footprint. By creating 3:1 sideslopes around the perimeter of the reservoir down to the depth of the reservoir intake, the volume of the reservoir could be increased from 19 Mgal to 23.5 Mgal (+4.5 Mgal).

Other options involve expanding the footprint of the existing reservoir.

Examination of these options included delineation of wetlands. The APSLMP Guidelines for Management and Use of Intensive Use Areas include avoidance of material alteration of wetlands from construction and development activities. Identified wetlands included a complex located on the west end along the main reservoir inlet and a coniferous wetland located on a topographic bench between the Pipeline Traverse and the south shore of the reservoir.

Figure 25, Snowmaking Reservoir Expansion, illustrates an option for expanding the reservoir that avoids material alteration of wetlands. Under this option the reservoir snowmaking water supply storage capacity increases from 19 Mgal to 30.1 Mgal. This additional 11.1 Mgal would provide for an additional 92 continuous hours of peak snowmaking water supply from the reservoir.





4. Buildings

a. Expand NYSEF building

Two additions will be built on the NYSEF building. See **Figure 14**, 2018 Master Plan – Approved and Proposed Actions (Base Area).

The first will be a 2,350 square feet (25 x 47) addition. This may be one story or it may be two stories.

The second addition will be 775 square feet (31 x 25) and will be one story.

These additions will house administrative space, expanded and improved restrooms, expanded ski tuning area, an event registration room, ski and equipment storage, and meeting space.

b. Reconfigure 1995 UMP-approved maintenance area to locate groomer garage and fueling adjacent to existing ski trail

Figure 14, 2018 Master Plan – Approved and Proposed Action (Base Area), illustrates the location of the garage where Gore Mountain groomers are stored and maintained as well as the location of the fuel pumps used to fuel the groomers.

These locations do not have direct access to and from ski trails and present operational issues when grooming takes place. Groomers are forced to travel over areas without snow cover to get in and out of the garage and to get fuel. This results in damage to groomer tracks and cleats that must be repaired and groomers being out of service during repairs. In addition, groomers currently track dirt/mud onto the ski trails after they refuel and go back onto the mountain.

Figure 14, 2018 Master Plan – Approved and Proposed Action (Base Area), illustrates the location of a new groomer garage building located in a currently wooded area adjacent to the Sunway trail. There are existing work roads on the east and south sides of the proposed new garage.

The 75 feet by 120 feet garage building will be able to house 9 groomers. There will be garage doors on the north and south ends of the building. Attached to the garage would be a 20 feet by 40 feet area for office/shop uses.

Groomers would come off a lower section of the new lift 9B and onto the upper section of the existing work road. Snowmaking will be added to the section of the work road leading up to the garage. A new fuel tank will be located adjacent to the snow covered work road. Groomers would then proceed up to the garage building. When exiting the building and going on-

mountain, groomers would take the other existing work road, which will have snowmaking, onto the Sunway Trail.

5. Mountain Bike Trail - Single track bike trail at top of Little Gore

See **Figure 10**, Existing and Proposed Hiking and Mountain Bike Trails (North). Currently there is a mountain bike trail located on Town property in the Ski Bowl that switches back between the Oak Ridge and Moxham trails. The trail currently extends just a short distance onto the Intensive Use Area where it ends. It is proposed that a single track mountain bike trail be provided from where the existing trail currently ends, to the top of the existing Lift 12 (the 46er lift). As shown on **Figure 10**, the trail would generally follow the route of the Oak Ridge Trail, switching back a number of times including some crossings of the Oak Ridge Trail as well as the upper part of the Moxham Trail.

6. Vehicle Access-modify 1995 UMP-approved shuttle lane separated from and independent of main traffic circulation route and parking

Figure 32 of the 1995 UMP included a plan for a shuttle path that started at the lower parking lots, ran to the west of the entry road and parking, and had a circular drop-off at the Northwoods Lodge.


The 1995 plan has been modified and is shown on **Figure 26**, Shuttle Lane Plan. A two way shuttle lane, separate from general traffic would begin along the section of the access road that is widened and allows for parallel parking along the access road. The shuttle lane would then loop through Lot G, cross the access road, parallel the east side of the road, pass through Lot E, and then continue past Lot D and Lot A to a drop-off and turnaround at the Main Base Lodge. This modified shuttle plan also includes optional loops into Lot B and into Lot F for less busy days when the shuttle does not need to return to the starting point as quickly.

Designated pick up/drop off points will be established along the separated shuttle lane in order increase shuttle efficiency. Shuttle stop locations will be clearly identified through simple signage. Related amenities such as ski racks and/or shelters may be installed at shuttle stop locations. Shuttle stops may be equipped with call buttons linked to the shuttle vehicles to alert shuttle drivers to waiting skiers.







7. Land reclassification involving Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area, Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild Forest and Siamese Ponds Wilderness Area which could allow the historic Rabbit Pond trail to be reclaimed and used winter and summer (Conceptual Action)


See **Figure 27**, Suggested Land Reclassification Map. This UMP Amendment proposes that 33

Prepared by: MARK TABER
File Name: G:\Projects\2018\Gore Mountain\20180115\20180115_01\Work\Gore and Ski Bowl\20180115\20180115\Gore Mountain\20180115\20180115_SHUTTLE.dwg
Date: 01/15/2018



LEGEND

-  SHUTTLE STOP
-  DEDICATED SHUTTLE LANE
-  2-WAY SHUTTLE CIRCULATION IN MIXED TRAFFIC
-  1-WAY SHUTTLE CIRCULATION IN MIXED TRAFFIC
-  PROPOSED CONTOUR
-  EXISTING CONTOUR



acres in the Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area becomes part of the abutting Siamese Pond Wilderness Area. In addition, 159 acres of Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild Forest would be added to the Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area. This land reclassification would require an APA process separate from this UMP.

The Adirondack Park Agency cannot find that a UMP Amendment proposing management actions on lands to be reclassified conforms to the APSLMP before the land is reclassified. First, the Agency must receive a request to reclassify, accompanied by a UMP for the proposed Intensive Use lands. The Agency must follow SEQRA regulations regarding public notice and comment and must hold hearings inside and outside the Adirondack Park on the request to reclassify, pursuant to the APSLMP. After notice, comment and hearings, the reclassification proposals would be presented to the Agency for a recommendation to the Governor for approval of the classification. The process culminates in the Governor's action on that recommendation. This UMP Amendment does not assume that a reclassification request will be approved and does not authorize any actions on lands to be reclassified, based on a proposed future classification. The actual request for reclassification and a UMP Amendment for those actions on the lands proposed for reclassification would be presented separately from this UMP Amendment. Discussion of actions on those lands in this is conceptual only, and those actions cannot be authorized by this UMP Amendment.

Intensive Use Area to Wilderness Area

The lands on the top of Gore Mountain that would go into the Siamese Ponds Wilderness are at elevations 2,785 to 3,585 feet and are predominantly mountain spruce-fir forest with some beech-maple mesic forest at the lower elevations. This area is part of the Adirondack Sub Alpine Forest Bird Conservation Area and the dense subalpine coniferous forest is favored by Bicknell's thrush and other neotropical bird species.

Wild Forest to Intensive Use Area

There are trails in the vicinity of Rabbit Pond (Roaring Brook, Rabbit and Oak Ridge trails) that were presumably built in connection with ski use of Little Gore, perhaps as early as the 1920's (Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild Forest (VMWF) UMP, 2005). In the middle of the twentieth century, a network of ski trails was operated on and around Gore Mountain and Peter Gay Mountain on state and private land. Some of these trails on private land were eventually closed, and other became part of Little Gore (also known as North Creek Ski Bowl) (Ibid.). A Management Action proposed in the 2005 VMWF UMP involved the construction of the Raymond Brook nordic ski trail that would connect a new trailhead off of NY Route 28 with trails in the Siamese Pond Wilderness Area. See **Appendix 6** for text and map excerpts from the 2005 VMWF UMP. This trail has been constructed.

This UMP management action also included: “If an agreement can be reached with the neighboring private owner(s), a short trail will connect from Forest Preserve to existing ski trails on Little Gore (see map). The Town of Johnsbury has indicated that they have arranged for permission to cut and mark ski/hiking trails from the North Creek Ski Bowl across this private land to the state boundary.” This connection (Ski Bowl Connection) has also been constructed.

ORDA has been long time proponent of making a strong connection between the IUA and North Creek. ORDA’s dedication to strengthening this connection is evidenced by past and present UMP Management Actions to link Gore Mountain, the Ski Bowl and North Creek.

See **Figure 2**, 2018 New Management Actions (North), Adding the area around Rabbit Pond into the Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area would provide the opportunity for ORDA to construct a ski lift from the base of the Ski Bowl to a point high enough on Little Gore that would allow skiers to ski to the west to the Rabbit Pond Trail, ski on a section of the Rabbit Pond Trail and then tie into trails that return to the base of the Ski Bowl. This ski connection would make use of currently approved, but not yet constructed ski trails on Town of Johnsbury lands. The connection would also require some new sections of trail on private lands that would need to get subdivided out of the private lands and transferring these lands to the Town of Johnsbury. A similar transfer of lands to the Town would be required for the upper portion of the lift that is located on currently private lands. See **Figure 2**. The owner of these private lands has indicated to ORDA their willingness to convey these lands to the Town.

APSLMP Intensive Use Area Guidelines

The following 10 numbered items and the language that follows them demonstrate how the suggested reclassification of existing lands from Wild Forest to Intensive Use Area comply with the 10 applicable Intensive Use Area guidelines in the APSLMP.

- 1. The primary management guideline for Intensive Use Areas will be to provide the public opportunities for family group camping, developed swimming and boating, downhill skiing, cross country skiing under competitive or developed conditions on improved cross country ski trails, visitor information and similar outdoor recreational pursuits in a setting and on a scale that are in harmony with the relatively wild and undeveloped character of the Adirondack Park.*

The proposed reclassification will provide public opportunities for downhill skiing, cross country skiing under competitive or developed conditions on improved cross-country skill trails in a setting and on a scale that are harmony with the relatively wild and undeveloped character of the Adirondack Park.

The involved lands are currently on outer edge of the VMWF in close proximity to the hamlet of

North Creek. The involved lands have contained ski trails dating back to the 1940s and possibly as far back as the 1920's. The involved lands are bounded on three sides by ski area development from the Gore Mountain Ski Area and the Town of Johnsburg Ski Bowl Park.

The possible activities involve installing a chairlift that would roughly parallel an existing Ski Bowl Chair lift and terminate at its top, just inside of the new Intensive Use Area lands. Potential ski trails in the additional Intensive Use Area would extend to from the upper lift terminal to a portion of the historic Rabbit Pond Trail. The remaining western portion of the Rabbit Pond trail in the Intensive Use Area would be actively maintained for cross country skiing and hiking.

2. *All intensive use facilities should be located, designed and managed so as to blend with the Adirondack environment and to have the minimum adverse impact possible on surrounding state lands and nearby private holdings. They will not be situated where they will aggravate problems on lands already subject to or threatened by overuse, such as the eastern portion of the High Peaks Wilderness, the Pharaoh Lake Wilderness or the St. Regis Canoe Area or where they will have a negative impact on competing private facilities. Such facilities will be adjacent to or serviceable from existing public road systems or water bodies open to motorboat use within the Park.*

The reclassification would result in an addition to an existing Intensive Use Area that is compatible with the character of the Adirondack environment and surrounding land uses. The suggested reclassification is not in the vicinity of areas of potential overuse, including the aforementioned units.

3. *Construction and development activities in Intensive Use Areas will:*
 - *minimize extensive topographic alterations;*
 - *limit vegetative clearing; and,*
 - *preserve the scenic, natural and open space resources of the Intensive Use Area.*

Minimal topographic alteration would be required to construct the upper lift terminal and possibly a lift tower or two below the upper terminal. Limited alpine trail construction would follow existing fall lines and would require minimal topographic alteration.

Vegetative clearing would be limited to only that needed to construct the lift and limited alpine trails. The cross-country ski/hiking trail would just require brushing and blowdown removal from the historic Rabbit Pond trail.

Only the very eastern edge of the Intensive Use Area lands would experience any disturbance.

4. *Day use areas will not provide for overnight camping or other overnight*

accommodations for the public.

No overnight accommodations, including camping would occur.

5. *Priority should be given to the rehabilitation and modernization of existing Intensive Use Areas and the complete development of partially developed existing Intensive Use Areas before the construction of new facilities is considered.*

The action would involve the slight expansion of an existing Intensive Use Area into an area that has historically been used for skiing. The action promotes the ongoing goal of providing for a better connection between the Intensive Use Area and North Creek.

6. *Additions to the intensive use category should come either from new acquisitions or from the reclassification of appropriate wild forest areas, and only in exceptional circumstances from wilderness, primitive or canoe areas.*

The suggested addition would come from the reclassification of a small outlying area of the VMWF.

7. *Any request for classification of a new acquisition or reclassification of existing lands from another land use category to an Intensive Use Area will be accompanied by a draft unit management plan for the proposed Intensive Use Area that will demonstrate how the applicable guidelines will be respected.*

The 10 applicable guidelines are being evaluated in this 2018 UMP Amendment for the Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area.

8. *No new structures or improvements at any Intensive Use Area will be constructed except in conformity with a final adopted unit management plan for such area. This guideline will not prevent the ordinary maintenance, rehabilitation or minor relocation of conforming structures or improvements.*

The only structures being contemplated in this UMP Amendment are the upper lift terminal and possibly a lift tower or two below the terminal. Likewise, the only other improvements being considered are some limited amounts of alpine ski trail to connect with previously approved ski trails at the North Creek Ski Bowl.

9. *Since the concentrations of visitors at certain intensive use facilities often pose a threat of water pollution, the state should set an example for the private sector by installing modern sewage treatment systems with the objective of maintaining high water quality. Standards for the state should in no case be less than those for the private sector and in all cases any pit privy, leach field or seepage pit will be at*

least 150 feet from the mean high water mark of any lake, pond, river or stream.

No sewage treatment systems would be proposed.

- 10. Any new, reconstructed or relocated buildings or structures located on shorelines of lakes, ponds, rivers or major streams, other than docks, primitive tent sites not a part of a campground (which will be governed by the general guidelines for such sites set forth elsewhere in this master plan) boat launching sites, fishing and waterway access sites, boathouses, and similar water related facilities, will be set back a minimum of 150 feet from the mean high water mark and will be located so as to be reasonably screened from the water body to avoid intruding on the natural character of the shoreline and the public enjoyment and use thereof.*

The only involved shoreline is that of Rabbit Pond. The nearest structure would be the upper lift terminal located over 1,000 feet from the shoreline of Rabbit Pond.

8. Rabbit Pond Trail Activities (Conceptual Action)

As shown on **Figure 2**, 2018 New Management Actions (North), a new ski trail is proposed along +/- 600 feet of the existing Rabbit Pond Trail.

The Rabbit Pond Trail was among the early ski trails created in the North Creek/North River area in the 1930's and 1940's. A circa 1940's map entitled 'Precise Ski Data of North Creek, N.Y., A Stone's Throw from Train to Tow' (see Figure 27A) shows the intermediate Rabbit Pond Trail located at the "Village Slopes". The trail and Rabbit Pond itself also appear on the 1958 USGS map of the area shown on Figure 27B.


Figure 27C shows the current mapping of the Rabbit Pond Trail, the 1958 USGS mapping of the Rabbit Pond Trail and the UMP-proposed ski trail. Mapping of the current Rabbit Pond Trail on Figure 27C was produced from GPS data collected by Wilderness Property Management Inc. (Steve Ovitt) and mapped by Warren County GIS Department (Ski Bowl Park 2017 Smart Growth Grant Long Trail to Little Gore Summit). Approximately 600 feet of the existing Rabbit Pond Trail would be within or very near the proposed ski trail.

Figure 27D shows how this section of the existing Rabbit Pond Trail could be easily relocated slightly to the north and away from the proposed ski trail where it would pass over terrain similar to what is currently crossed. Figure 27D shows the area within which the trail could be relocated. ORDA will work with NYSDEC, Steve Ovitt and members of the local hiking and backcountry skiing community to select the best Rabbit Pond Trail location within this area, including a location that provides adequate setbacks from the proposed ski trail.


Creation of the alpine trail and relocation of the section of Rabbit Pond Trail are not anticipated to cause any significant adverse impacts to the ecology of Rabbit Pond. Water quality within





Precise Ski Data of North Creek, N. Y.



“A Stone’s Throw From Train to Tow”







the pond will not be impacted. Data in previous UMP's have demonstrated that creation of ski trails in previously wooded areas do not impact nutrient and solids levels in nearby receiving waters. Data in previous UMP's have also demonstrated that snowmaking within a drainage basin does not significantly alter rates of stormwater runoff. The pond itself will not be physically affected. The mapping in Figure 4 shows that both the ski trail and the hiking trail will be no closer to the pond than what currently exists.

From the overall perspective of the attractiveness of the area's backcountry character and the benefits that are derived therefrom, ORDA believes that the relocation of +/- 600 feet of one trail within a network that consists of miles of interconnected trails will not cause a significant impact. ORDA believes that the proposed conceptual action will not cause significant economic or experiential issues.

B. Projected Use

As per attendance figures previously provided in Section 2, ticketed and passholder ski visits are expected to fluctuate around the 215,200 per year average.

Peak day attendance is expected to range from 5,000 to 6,000 ski visits with peak day attendance over 7,000 being possible. President's Day weekend is expected to be the most likely time of peak day attendance.

Off-season visits for things such as mountain biking, gondola rides, hiking etc. are expected to average 11,000 per year.

C. Actions Approved in Previous UMP/EIS which are Part of the Foregoing 5-year Plan

Table 1 in Section 1 previously presented an accounting of management actions from previous UMP/EIS documents. Included in this accounting were categories for previously approved management actions that are partially completed and management actions that were approved and for which construction is pending.

These categories include the following which will continue to be part of the foregoing 5-year plan.

- Continued trail development
- Ongoing trail widening
- Lift improvements
- Lodge improvements and expansion
- Parking development
- Snowmaking modernization/improvements

- Continued infrastructure and energy efficiency improvements
- Continue to develop/improve compatible recreation amenities and public access
- Continue to develop/improve strong connections between Gore, the Ski Bowl and North Creek

D. Prioritization of Management Actions

The following is a listing of new management actions by priority.

Top Priority

- Replace and relocate Sunway Lift
- Add new lift from Northwoods Lodge to Lower Sunway
- Widen Sunway and other green trails served by these lifts
- Snowmaking - enlarge snowmaking reservoir
- Dedicated shuttle circulation

Moderate Priority

- Reconfigure groomer garage and fueling

Lower Priority

- Expand NYSEF building
- Single track bike trail on Little Gore

SECTION V POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

A. Physical Resources

1. Geology

Bedrock is at or near the ground surface in many locations in the Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area.

Bedrock may be encountered when constructing a portion of the dedicated shuttle lane. There is an area of Lyman-Rock Outcrop soils between parking lot E and the base lodge. It may be necessary to blast some bedrock to create the shuttle lane through this area. It is also possible that blasting may be necessary as part of some of the trail creation or trail widening management actions. Bedrock may also be encountered when enlarging the snowmaking reservoir which could also necessitate blasting. Hermon-Lyman-Rock Outcrop soils are mapped on the north and south sides of the reservoir.

As described previously in Section 2, the landform that is Gore Mountain, including the Barton garnet mine that is located on the north side of the mountain, is considered a unique geologic feature (<http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/53858.html>). These deposits will not be affected by the construction activities associated with the shuttle lane or the snowmaking reservoir which are both located at low elevations on the mountain.

Mitigation Measures

ORDA will employ the services of a professional, licensed and insured blasting company to perform any needed blasting. Blasters in New York State are required to possess a valid NY State Department of Labor issued Explosive License and Blaster Certificate of Competence. The Explosives License permits the licensee to purchase, own, possess or transport explosives. The Blaster Certificate of Competence permits the use of explosives.

If it is determined that blasting will be required, a written blasting plan will be developed and approved prior to the commencement of blasting. In general, the blast plan will contain information about the blasting methods to be employed, measures to be taken to protect the safety of the public, and how the applicable rules and regulations will be complied with. If, during the evolution of the project, there are significant changes in the blast design a new blast plan will be required. A test shot will be required for the first shot after the approval of each blast plan.

While each blast plan is tailored to meet the specific needs of a particular project, they all contain certain elements. Typically the general information provided will include: the blasting contractor; the project blaster; locations of blasting; the duration of blasting operations;

locations of offsite receptors; location of any nearby utilities; the drill hole pattern; the explosives and detonation systems to be employed; the proposed loading of the holes; the maximum weight of explosives to be detonated in any delay period; measures to be taken to minimize the offsite impacts of blasting; traffic control and warning signs; the sequence and type of blasting warning signals; location of seismographs to monitor blast induced vibrations; what, if any local permits are required; will pre-blast surveys be performed, and if so where; and other information as necessary.

In addition, prior to the commencement of blasting, a pre-blast meeting will be held with the blaster, project manager, and other interested parties.

A record of each blast should be made by the blaster, and a copy provided to and retained by the project, which contains at a minimum the following information:

- Name of the operator and/or contractor conducting the blast.
- The location, date and time of the blast.
- Name, signature and identification number of the blaster (certificate of competency number, as issued by the Department of Labor).
- Type of material to be blasted.
- Diagram of shot including number of holes, depth of holes, diameter of holes, burden, spacing, and face orientation.
- Location and distance of nearest non-company owned structure.
- A record of the shot including amount of subdrilling, decking, stemming height and type, quantity and type of explosive, quantity and type of detonator, weather conditions (including wind speed and direction), type of initiation system and all delay periods progressively, in milliseconds. A drill log reviewed and signed by the licensed blaster and company supervisor including date, time, location, shot number, number of holes, hole depth, average face height, burden, spacing, diameter and any potential problem areas such as seams, cracks, voids and water.

The following techniques and control measures will be considered in blast design to reduce ground vibration:

- Adjusting the blast hole pattern
- Reducing the pounds of explosive per delay:
 - use of smaller diameter blast holes
 - reduce bench height
 - use of decking
- Avoiding overly confined charges (e.g. excessive burden).
- Avoiding excessive subdrilling.

- Strict control over spacing and orientation of blast holes.
- Borehole deviation monitoring.
- If possible, designing the blast sequence to direct vibration away from structures of concern.

A properly designed blast will give lower vibrations per pound of explosive. Close to the blast, the ground vibration character is affected by factors of blast design and rock geometry, particularly charge weight per delay, delay interval, and to some extent direction of initiation, burden, and spacing.

Additionally, to reduce the public's concern regarding ground vibrations:

- Blasts will be scheduled for the same time of day whenever possible.
- Blasts will be scheduled for periods of high local activity.
- Blasts will not be scheduled for quiet periods.
- Neighbors will be notified of the blast schedule in advance.

2. Soils

Potential Impacts

Soil Erodibility (K) Factors were discussed previously in Section 2.A.1.b. “K” is one factor used to calculate potential soil loss using the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE). Other factors in RUSLE include slope length (L) and slope steepness (S).

See **Figure 28**, Soils Map and Management Actions.

Construction of most new Management Actions is proposed on soils with an “E” slope category. E soils are described as steep. Some new management actions are proposed on soils with a “C” slope category. C soils are described as sloping (Soils Survey of Warren County, 1989)

Disturbance of areas of steep slopes during construction can lead to an increased vulnerability of the soils to erosion. Suitable measures must be implemented to first prevent soil erosion and then second to make sure that any soils that are eroded are contained and prevented from causing sedimentation in receiving waters.

ORDA will implement proper erosion and sediment control practices when undertaking construction practices at their venues that oftentimes involve construction on steep slopes. These proper practices are set forth in the *New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control* (last updated November 2016). These standards and specifications will be used to develop Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) for construction activities in accordance with NYSDEC’s *SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharge from Construction Activity, GP-0-15-002*.

SWPPPS will detail those measures that will be implemented during construction to mitigate potential soil erosion and surface water sedimentation. SWPPP content will include such things as construction sequencing and phasing, temporary and permanent stabilization, structural erosion control practices and vegetative control practices. SWPPPs will include provisions for monitoring, inspections, data collection, and compliance documentation.

Mitigation measures that ORDA commonly and successfully employs during ski area construction activities include the following that will be incorporated into pre-construction SWPPP plans and specifications.

Mitigation Measures

Construction Road Stabilization – site access will be achieved using existing work roads, ski trails, driveways and parking areas. At this time, no new disturbance is anticipated for site access, material storage areas or other construction uses.

Concrete Washout – Concrete truck washouts will be provided in existing parking areas located in proximity to the Base Area.

Protecting Vegetation to Remain – clearing limits will be marked with flagging tape, paint or other suitable means prior to the felling of trees for lift line and ski trail construction. ORDA is particularly sensitive to adhering to clearing limits on the Forest Preserve lands on which they operate their venues.

Runoff Control

- **Water Bars** – Water bars shall be installed during construction of the ski slopes and lift lines. They are to be placed across the slope to reduce the potential for erosion, with diversion into stable vegetated areas or other stabilized outlet. All water bars shall be installed at a 2% slope and particular attention shall be paid to proper spacing specifications as follows:

Slope (%)	Water Bar Spacing (ft.)
<5	125
5 to 10	100
10 to 20	75
20 to 35	50
>35	25

(Source: New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control, 2016)

Rock outlet protection using construction-generated rock will be installed at the ends of water bars when natural areas appear not to be adequate.

- **Trench Plugs** – Sand bags or gravel bags will be employed in open utility trenches longer than 300 feet. Compost filter socks of suitable size are an acceptable alternative to sand bags or gravel bags.

Soil Stabilization

- **Temporary Seeding** - Seed and mulch inactive areas with bare soil within 3 days of disturbance unless construction will resume in that area within 2 days. Seed with annual rye mixture at 30 pounds per acre. For late fall or early winter seeding seed with winter rye at a rate of 100 pounds per acre. Mulch areas with straw at a rate of 2 tons per acre.
- **Permanent Seeding and Mulching** - Maintain existing vegetation outside of marked limits of disturbance. Soils disturbed for construction of ski trails and lifts shall be permanently stabilized by successfully establishing an herbaceous ground cover.

Seeding – A commercially available native seed mixture appropriate to the climate shall be used to stabilize disturbed areas to be re-vegetated. Seed may be applied by a number of suitable means including broadcasting, hydro-seeding, or incorporated as part of a geotextile (i.e. Green & Bio Tech SureTurf 1000 and 4000 Seeded Mat System[®], BIOMAT[®] seeded mats).

Mulching – Broadcast seeded areas shall also be mulched. Broadcast seeded areas shall be mulched with invasive species free hay or straw at a rate of 2 to 3 bales per thousand square feet (100-120 bales per acre). Mulch shall be secured in place by either driving over the mulched area with a tracked vehicle or by applying a non-asphaltic tackifier.

Hydro-seeded areas shall contain a mix of wood cellulose mulch applied during the hydro-seeding process. Wood cellulose mulch shall be applied at a rate of 35 pounds per thousand square feet (2,000 pounds per acre). A non-asphaltic tackifier will be included with the hydro-mulch application.

Soil Restoration

As directed by the Qualified Inspector, areas of compacted soils that are to be seeded should be restored to improve the quality of the seed bed. The top four (4) to six (6) inches of soil shall be loosened using hand or mechanical means prior to applying seed. Also, as directed by the Qualified Inspector, finished grades consisting of exposed subsoils may require soil amendment or topsoil in order to provide a suitable seed bed.

Sediment Control

- **Silt Fence** – Where appropriate, silt fence (standard or reinforced) shall be installed along topographic contours. Use of silt fence is appropriate where there is no concentration of water flowing to the barrier and where the drainage area for overland flow does not exceed ½ acre per 100 feet of fence. Additionally, maximum allowable slope lengths contributing runoff to a silt fence shall be as follows:

Slope Steepness	Standard Maximum Slope Length (ft.)	Reinforced Maximum Slope Length (ft.)
<50:1	300	N/A
50:1 to 10:1	125	250
10:1 to 5:1	100	150
5:1 to 3:1	60	80
3:1 to 2:1	40	70
>2:1	20	30

(Source: New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control, 2016)

- Silt fence structures should be installed anywhere sediment retention is needed in and around a construction site.
- Perpendicular to slopes or parallel to contour.
- At the toe of highly erodible slopes.
- Around culverts and storm water drainage systems.
- Adjacent to lakes, streams or creeks.

Maintenance – Silt fences should be inspected periodically for damages such as tearing by equipment, animals, or wind and for the amount of sediment which has accumulated. Removal of the sediment is generally necessary when it reaches 1/3 the height of the silt fence. In situations where access is available, machinery can be used; otherwise, it must be removed manually. The key elements to remember are:

- The sediment deposits should be removed when heavy rain or high water is anticipated.
- The sediment removed should be placed in an area where there is no danger of erosion.
- The silt fence should not be removed until adequate vegetation ensures no further erosion of the disturbed slopes. Generally, the fabric is cut at ground level, the wire and posts removed, the sediment spread, and seeding and mulch is applied immediately.

Reinforced silt fence should be installed at the base of temporary stockpiles. The reinforced silt fence is designed to hold heavier loads. Falling debris from stockpiles may be caught by the reinforced silt fence where standard silt fence could fail.

- **Straw Bale Dikes** – Straw bale dikes may be used as a substitute for silt fence ONLY where shallow depth to rock precludes the proper installation of silt fence. Straw bale dikes shall NOT be used where there is concentrated flow. Straw bale dikes shall NOT be used where more than 3 months of erosion and sediment control is required unless bales are replaced or an additional parallel row of bales is installed prior to the original straw bales being in place for 3 months. Length of slope above the straw bale dike shall not exceed the following:

Slope Steepness	Maximum Slope Length (ft.)
2:1	25
3:1	50
4:1	75

(Source: New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control, 2016)

Straw bale dikes require more maintenance and degrade much more rapidly. Straw bale dikes offer a more standalone practice that may be less dependent on the required staking. Staking is required for both silt fence and straw bale dikes. Both practices are required to be buried in the ground, although silt fence is required a six inch burial as opposed to a four inch burial trench for straw bale dikes. If neither application is applicable, sediment may be captured by using aproned Triangular Silt Dikes.

Installation specifications:

- Each bale shall be embedded in the soil a minimum of 4 inches.
- Bales shall be placed in a row with ends tightly abutting the adjacent bales.
- Bales shall be securely anchored in place by stakes driven through the bales. The first stake in each bale shall be driven toward the previously laid bale to force bales together.
- Inspection shall be frequent, and repair or replacement shall be made promptly as needed.

Ski Trail Construction

Erosion and sediment control practices for trail construction will be conducted similarly as it has been done in previous trail construction projects with much success. ORDA staff is experienced in ski trail and lift construction including erosion control techniques. They will use the following measures to mitigate the potential impacts of trail

construction.

- Limit individual disturbance areas to less or equal to 1 acre at any time.
- Tree trunks will be removed and used on site either as part of trail construction or cut up and used for firewood.
- Logs will be used on constructed trails to create cribbing to help stabilize the down gradient slope.
- Where possible, tree stumps will be cut flush to the ground to minimize the impact to the existing root systems and to allow the quick establishment of vegetation. Emphasis to minimize cutting, filling and grubbing operations on slopes over 25 percent will be made.
- Grubbed stumps will be buried within the trail as part of trail construction (filling low spots, etc.)
- Branches and tops will be chipped with chips broadcast into adjoining wooded areas. Chip piles shall not be created in wooded areas.
- Install sediment and erosion control practices.
- On constructed trails, which involved cut/fill operations, exposed earth areas will be contained by diverting clean runoff from the uphill side with water bars as much as practicable.
- Silt fence and/or chip berms on the downhill side will be utilized to filter the runoff from the raw site.
- During final grading, all water bars will be repaired in order to effectively intercept and divert water from new trails and lift areas.
- Areas where finish grade has been established will be seeded and mulched within 3 days. No areas shall be left with raw earth exposed for more than 7 days.

Lift Terminals Construction

Lift terminal construction is located in flat to low slope areas and are limited to approximately ¼ acre in size. E&SC practices include silt fence, upgradient water bars, and vegetative stabilization. RECP will be installed on the graded outruns of the upper lift terminals.

Lift Line Construction

The scope of lift line construction operations is similar, but less intense, than most trail clearing operations. Construction of the lift line corridors will involve:

- Cutting trees to provide a 60 feet wide area with sufficient clearance.
- Stumps are cut flush to the ground.

- Grading operations are limited to the areas immediately around lift tower footings and where vehicle access is required. In these locations E&SC practices include silt fence, upgradient water bars, and vegetative stabilization.
- Ground cover vegetation will be undisturbed to the extent possible.
- Areas requiring site disturbance will be stabilized using practices described above.
- Wooded areas which are cut will be allowed to naturally fill in with brushy type growth where no ski trails or service driveways are to be created.

Linear Utilities

Linear utilities include underground water pipe, air lines, and electric lines. Erosion from pipeline construction will be minimized by limiting the length of the open trench to 1200' for a period not to exceed 10 days. Sand or gravel bags trench plugs will be placed in sloped trenches at a minimum of 300' intervals to slow the velocity of stormwater runoff that may enter the trench.

Areas where finish grade has been established will be seeded and mulched within 3 days. No areas shall be left with raw earth exposed for more than 10 days.

3. Topography and Slope

Potential Impacts

See **Figure 29**, Topography and Management Actions.

Very limited grading is required for new ski trails, trail widening or ski lifts. Trails are laid out to follow natural fall lines. Lift grading is limited to the upper and lower terminals and at the tower foundations.


Grading will be required to create the building pad for the groomer garage as well as for sections of the shuttle lane. See **Figure 14** Master Plan – Approved and Proposed Actions (Base Lodge) and **Figure 26**, Shuttle Lane Plan.

Significant grading (excavation) is proposed for the enlargement of the snowmaking reservoir.

Impacts associated with grading involve erosion and sediment control (see the previous section) and protection of water resources (see the following sections).

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures beyond those described in the previous section and in the following section are required.



**Gore Mountain
Intensive Use Area**

GORE MOUNTAIN INTENSIVE USE AREA
LAND REQUESTED TO BE CLASSIFIED
WILDERNESS (CONCEPTUAL ACTION)

TRAIL
WIDENING

NEW LIFT 9B, BEGINNER
TRIPLE OR QUAD CHAIR LIFT

RECONFIGURE MAINTENANCE AREA TO
LOCATE GROOMER GARAGE & FUELING
ADJACENT TO EXISTING SKI TRAIL

RECONFIGURE DROP OFF
AREA TO ACCOMMODATE
SHUTTLE LOOP

EXPANSION OF
NYSEF BUILDING

NEW TRAIL

NEW TRAIL

ENLARGE
SNOWMAKING
RESERVOIR



VANDERWHACKER MOUNTAIN WILD
FOREST LAND REQUESTED TO BE
RECLASSIFIED INTENSIVE USE AREA
(CONCEPTUAL ACTION)

NEW TRAIL

REPLACE LIFT 12 WITH
A HIGH SPEED QUAD & RELocate

NOTE: PROPOSED ACTIONS ON TOWN-OWNED LANDS
AND VANDERWHACKER MOUNTAIN WILD FOREST
ARE INCLUDED IN THIS UMP FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

Legend

-  Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area
-  20 Foot USGS Contour Line

4. Water Resources

Potential Impacts

See **Figure 30**, Surface Water, Wetland Resources, and Proposed Actions.

Identified potential impacts to surface water are (1) sedimentation of eroded soils, (2) increased stormwater runoff with accompanying loadings (nutrients, dissolved solids, etc.), and (3) exposure of disturbed soils in the snowmaking reservoir expansion area along with separating clean inflow waters from the active construction areas during reservoir excavation.

Mitigation Measures


Those measures that will be implemented to prevent erosion and subsequent sedimentation were described previously in the Soils section.

The new management actions include only two actions that will introduce significant amounts of new impervious surfaces that will increase stormwater runoff. These are the new groomer garage and those portions of the shuttle lane that will be outside of existing parking areas and drives. A Stormwater Management Report has been prepared for these two actions. See **Appendix 7**.

The Project has been designed in accordance with Chapter 4 of the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual (SWMDM), and NYSDEC's General Permit GP-0-15-002 for construction activities. Stormwater calculations were performed utilizing widely accepted engineering methodologies, including TR-55, and the stormwater modeling computer program HydroCAD (version 10.00) produced by HydroCAD Software Solutions, LLC.

Under the watershed's proposed condition, all stormwater from the Project will continue to discharge to the same point as in the existing condition (Analysis Points 1 & 2). The total watershed has generally remained unchanged, as is shown on the drawing "W-2 Proposed Conditions Watershed Map" contained in **Appendix 7**. To meet NYSDEC requirements (see Section 5.0 NYSDEC Design Criteria in **Appendix 7**) a bioretention basin and wet swale have been incorporated into the stormwater management design to mitigate the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff discharged from the Project Site.

For the snowmaking reservoir expansion, see **Figure 31**, Snowmaking Reservoir Construction Sequencing. First the reservoir will be fully drained. See the photo below.



- CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCING:**
1. INSTALL CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE AT SOUTH EDGE OF EXISTING DAM.
 2. CONSTRUCT TEMPORARY RIP RAP STREAM CHANNEL AND EROSION CONTROL BERM. PLACE OVERFLOW WEIRS ON EACH BERM.
 3. CONSTRUCT 24' WIDE HAUL ROADS ALONG THE NORTH AND SOUTH EDGE OF THE RESERVOIR.
 4. BEGIN EXCAVATION AT WEST END OF RESERVOIR WORKING BACK TO CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE ALONG EACH HAUL ROAD.
 5. CLOSE POND DRAIN TO RESTORE WATER LEVEL.



Mostly drained snowmaking reservoir September 9, 2017

Once the reservoir is drained a haul road stabilized outlet will be created in the southeast corner of the reservoir where remnants of a haul road currently exist. Next, a rip rap stream channel will be constructed to convey water from the main reservoir stream inlet to the outlet structure. The intent is to isolate and pass through reservoir inflow from the inlet while the reservoir is being excavated. Two 24 foot wide haul roads would then be constructed in order to remove excavated materials from the north and south ends of the reservoir. Excavation work will proceed from west to east. Material used to construct the haul roads will be removed prior to refilling the reservoir. The removed material will either be temporarily stockpiled or used as fill material as part of undertaking proposed management actions. Material will be stabilized in accordance with practices described in section V.A.2 that provide details of sediment and erosion control practices that will be employed, and that will be included in stormwater pollution prevention plans (SWPPPs) developed for construction activities. Once excavation is complete, the outlet valve will be closed, and the reservoir will be allowed to gradually fill. This gradual filling should allow for the settling of solids that become suspended during pond refilling. Exposed soils will be mostly fine sands that will tend not to stay in suspension as

compared to silts or clays.

5. Wetlands

Potential Impacts

None of the new management actions proposed in the UMP Amendment will impact wetlands. Avoidance of wetland impacts in the areas of the grooming garage, the shuttle lane and the snowmaking reservoir was accomplished by field evaluation for the presence of wetlands and then designing these components to avoid wetlands. Periphery wetlands at the snowmaking reservoir will experience temporary hydrological alteration when the reservoir is emptied. This will not significantly impact wetlands since the effects will be temporary and since these wetlands have persisted when the reservoir has regularly been emptied in the past for inspection and maintenance purposes. Additional information regarding wetland avoidance can be found in Section 6, Alternatives.

Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts have been identified, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

6. Climate and Air Quality

Potential Impacts

No new permanent sources of air emissions are proposed as part of this UMP.

Gore Mountain Ski Center has a current NYSDEC Air Quality Permit for which they are compliant.

Construction activities that can take place after this UMP amendment is adopted may result in localized increases in dust levels. However, areas of proposed construction are located within the interior of the Intensive Use Areas, so no offsite areas will be affected.

Many ORDA venues exist within the boundaries of State protected lands and the impact of climate change on our environment is recognized. ORDA will be a leader in environmental stewardship with consistent commitment to sustainability, responsible development practices, and continuous communication with DEC, APA, and other regulatory agencies to ensure we are taking the appropriate measures.

Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts have been identified, therefore, no mitigative measures are necessary.

B. Biological Resources

1. Vegetation

Potential Impacts

See **Figure 32**, Vegetation and Management Actions.


Tree clearing associated with the new management actions includes 18.1 acres for downhill ski trails (9.4 on the current Intensive Use Area lands and 8.7 acres in the lands that would be added from the VMWF reclassification (conceptual), 9.2 acres for trail widening, 3.1 acres for ski lifts, 0.8 acres for the groomer garage, and 6.5 acres for the shuttle lane. An area around maintenance and Lifts 9A and 9B previously approved in 1995 is no longer proposed. The 7.3 acres of clearing in this area is no longer proposed.

Appendix 8 contains an accounting of the numbers of trees proposed to be cut. These data are summarized in **Table 7** below.

Table 7
Tree Cutting by Location and Community Type

Location	Community	Action(s)	Acreage	Total Trees
Gore Mtn IUA	B (mixed hardwood)	Burnt Ridge Trail (partial)	4.2	1,565
Gore Mtn IUA	E (mixed hardwood)	Burnt Ridge Trail (partial) + Trails 11A, 1N-P	6.9	4,447
Gore Mtn IUA	Q (pioneer hardwood)	Twister Widening	1.1	415
Gore Mtn IUA	P (northern hardwood)	Various	15.4	3315
			SUBTOTAL	9,742
Land Reclassif. (conceptual)	E (mixed hardwood)	Lift 12 and Trails 12	10.2	6,574
			TOTAL	16,316

A total of 9,742 trees are proposed to be cut on lands that are currently classified as Intensive Use Area. Approximately 25% of these will be 3-4" dbh and the remainder will be >4" dbh.



(Gore Mountain UMP documents, starting with the 1995 Update and Amendment (in Appendix 21), have used the 3-4" and >4" breakdown of trees to be cut.)

Activities shown on lands that could get added to the Intensive Use Area from VMWF (conceptual action) would require the cutting of 6,574 trees. Approximately 44% of these would be 3-4" dbh and the remainder would be >4" dbh.

To put these tree cutting numbers in perspective, the total amount of lands affected in the table above is 10.2 acres in the intensive use area which totals approximately 3,755 acres. The amount of affected land is less than 1% (0.7%).

There is no tree cutting proposed above 2,800 feet in elevation or in any areas of Mountain Spruce-fir forest.

All tree cutting will be done in compliance with the DEC tree cutting policy LF-91-2.

No rare, threatened or endangered plant species will be impacted.

Mitigation Measures

Only areas absolutely necessary for construction of ski trails, ski lifts, and other proposed improvements will be cleared of vegetation. All other areas will be maintained in a natural state.

Erosion control measures will be used on cleared areas with disturbed soils to avoid affecting adjacent vegetation by erosion or siltation. Erosion-control devices to be used will include filter fabric fences and staked straw bale filters.

Upon the completion of clearing of new ski trails and ski lift corridors, they will be seeded with grass mixtures to promote rapid revegetation. Areas disturbed for any other improvements will also be landscaped and revegetated as soon as practicable.

Plants used to revegetate disturbed areas and planted as part of landscaping will be species which are indigenous to the region.

No clear-cutting of trees to develop panoramic views is proposed. Views will be framed or filtered by existing vegetation.

Continue to train staff working at Gore Mountain unit to identify and document the location of key invasive plant species.

Work towards a complete comprehensive inventory of the presence and extent of invasive plants in the unit.

Eliminate any identified populations of invasive plant species that are discovered in the unit.

These actions may be carried out by DEC personnel or by members of APIPP or other volunteers under supervision of DEC through an Adopt-a-Natural Resource Agreement.

All equipment brought onto the site for earth moving, grading or excavating shall be washed off-site with high pressure hoses and hot water prior to being brought onto the site. The contractor shall provide Certifications of Washing to the SWPPP Qualified Inspector before such equipment can be used on site. The SWPPP Qualified Inspector will have the authority to refuse the off-loading of any earthwork equipment brought onto the site that they determine to be not sufficiently cleaned.

2. Wildlife

Potential Impacts

The actions proposed in this UMP are expected to have minimal impacts on wildlife. Proposed management actions are spread over the landscape of the existing developed ski trails and lifts. New management actions are proposed at low elevations on the mountain.

Trail widening projects, including the green trails, involve existing trails. This will result in the loss of some currently treed areas along the edge of existing ski trails and move the forest edge slightly outward.

Replacing and relocation the Sunway Lift will occur in the immediate vicinity of the existing lift.

The new lift 9B will parallel the existing Lower Sunway trail and much of it will occur in an already cleared area.

Enlarging the snowmaking reservoir will entail converting 1.6 acres of shoreline wooded areas to open water.

The new groomer garage will require some tree removal in an area that has existing work roads on two sides and an existing ski trail on a third side.

The NYSEF building expansion will occur in a grassy area immediately adjacent to the existing building.

The improvements associated with the dedicated shuttle lane take place in and around existing parking areas and the existing access road and will have minimal wildlife habitat impact.

Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts have been identified, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

3. Fisheries

Potential Impacts

The only proposed management action that involves aquatic resources is the expansion of the snowmaking reservoir.

Significant adverse impacts to fisheries resources are not expected to occur as a result of reservoir drawdown for construction of the expansion. There may be some temporary short-term impacts to the fisheries resource within the reservoir proper, but these resources have developed and persisted while the reservoir is regularly drained for inspection and maintenance activities. Downstream fisheries will not be impacted since water will continue to pass through the pond as described previously above and in Section 4.

Mitigation Measures

See the earlier section entitled Water Resources for a description of how the flow of clean inflow through the pond will be maintained in the snowmaking reservoir during the expansion process. The same section describes how the reservoir will be allowed to fill gradually after expansion is complete in order to allow for settling out of suspended solids within the reservoir before the reservoir begins to flow over the spillway.

4. Unique Areas

Potential Impacts

There are no unique biological areas present.

Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts have been identified, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.


5. Critical Habitat

Potential Impacts

See **Figure 33**, Potential Bicknell's Thrush Habitat and Management Actions. No new management actions are proposed to occur above 2,800 feet in elevation. There will no impact to the Adirondack Sub Alpine Forest Bird Conservation Area.

Mitigation Measures

Any carryover actions from previous UMPs that require construction activities above 2,800 feet in elevation will not commence prior to August 1 of any year.



Legend

- Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area
- Mountain Spruce-Fir Forest
- Elevation Greater than 2,800'
- Proposed Action

NOTE: PROPOSED ACTIONS ON TOWN-OWNED LANDS AND VANDERWHACKER MOUNTAIN WILD FOREST ARE INCLUDED IN THIS UMP FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

C. Human Resources

1. Visual Resources

Potential Impacts

The actions proposed in this UMP are expected to have minimal visual impacts. The existing ski area is already visible from some area roadways. Proposed actions are spread across the landscape of the existing developed ski trails and lifts. New management actions are proposed at low elevations on the mountain.

Trail widening projects involve existing trails. For any trails that are currently visible from off site, the visual effect of minor widenings will be essentially imperceptible.

Replacing and relocating the Sunway Lift will occur in the immediate vicinity of the existing lift.

The new lift 9B will be low on the mountain and will parallel the existing Lower Sunway trail. The widening of the green trails will occur at low elevations not visible from off site.

The snowmaking reservoir is not visible from outside the Intensive Use Area.

The new groomer garage will be located in a low elevation wooded area. Although it will be visible on-site, it will not be visible from off site

The NYSEF building is not visible from off site.

The improvements associated with the dedicated shuttle lane take place in and around existing parking areas and the existing access road that are not visible from off site.

Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts have been identified, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

2. Transportation

Potential Impacts

The proposed management actions do not include any significant expansion of mountain facilities, such as the addition of a new pod of ski trails, that would result in significant increases in peak hour traffic generation.

Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts have been identified, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

3. Community Services

Potential Impacts

The project primarily involves improvements to existing facilities designed to retain the existing skier base and increase the future number of skiers, hikers and bikers at Gore Mountain. It is anticipated that there will be a minor incremental increase in demand for community services such as fire, police, rescue, solid waste and health care due to the gradual increase in the number of visitors to the mountain. Many of the improvements are designed to build visitation during the off-seasons of spring, summer and fall thereby distributing the potential impacts over a 12 month period. The Ski Center presently makes very little demand on most services and the increase in such demand is anticipated to be small and can be accommodated by the service providers.

The North Creek Health Center was developed, and the Warrensburg Health Center was recently expanded to respond to the growing need for services in local communities and businesses in the region. The potential long-term and incremental increase in visitors may increase the demand for medical care slightly and these facilities are capable of meeting any increased demand. The Glens Falls Hospital is also prepared to handle a minor increase in patients to the emergency room.

The extra revenue derived from EMS calls from skiers, hikers and mountain bikers helps offsets the year-round costs and therefore has a positive impact on the people who live and pay taxes in Johnsbury.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary since no negative impacts have been identified.

4. Local Land Use Plans

Potential Impacts

The actions in the UMP Update are consistent with local planning documents including the 2005 Johnsbury Comprehensive Plan and the 2007 Town of Johnsbury Zoning Law/LLUP that serve to guide community planning. Both documents seek to forge stronger links between the Gore Mountain Ski Resort, the North Creek Ski Bowl, and the hamlet of North Creek, all of which are goals of Gore Mountain, ORDA and this UMP Amendment.

The UMP Amendment contains specific actions designed to encourage skiers to use both ski areas thereby increasing the overall number of skiers at both Gore Mountain and the Ski Bowl. ORDA has cooperated with North Creek in developing hiking, cross-country ski and mountain bike trails with the goal of connecting Ski Bowl Park and Gore Mountain lands.

The actions on State land authorized by this UMP Amendment will not have any effects on adjoining or nearby private lands inconsistent with local land use controls such as the Johnsbury Zoning Law and the North Creek Action Plan that serve to guide community planning. The districts and densities outside of the hamlet are exactly matched to the official APA Land Use Map. Gore Mountain Ski Center is entirely within the Intensive Use Area which was created intentionally for such a special use. Both documents seek to forge stronger links between the ski center and community, which are also goals of ORDA and this UMP Update.

While the improvements and expansion of skier facilities on the mountain will not directly affect planning and zoning in the community, it will create the potential for new skiers who will require services in and around the hamlet of North Creek and some may choose to buy or build a second home in the area. Linkage and added amenities at Gore Mountain and Ski Bowl will also stimulate additional skier visits to the area and ultimately increase the number of consumers at local businesses. These are potential positive impacts for the local economic base and will serve to stabilize certain businesses, expand some businesses and create new businesses.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary since no negative impacts have been identified.

5. Historical and Archaeological Resources

Potential Impacts

Appendix 3 contains a November 9, 2017 letter from NYS Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation stating that there will be no impacts to archeological or historic resources.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary since no negative impacts have been identified.

SECTION VI ALTERNATIVES

A. Alternative Trail Improvements

There are limited alternatives to the trail construction and trail widening proposed within this UMP Amendment.

When evaluating potential trail connections that would provide an alternative intermediate route from Burnt Ridge back to the Base Area on days when Echo is closed due to ski racing, three (3) separate alternatives were considered before determining the preferred route. The first alternative considered starting the new trail from the top part of Echo on skiers left, then running it generally parallel to Echo before connecting back to Echo at the bottom where the trail turns north into the base area. This alternative was not pursued primarily due to the frequency of steep and difficult terrain. The terrain was not suitable as intermediate terrain and would have resulted in extensive construction efforts to achieve a desired grade and alignment.

The second alternative considered starting the new trail from the top part of Echo, on skier's right at the first bend, then running southeast and connecting to Twister. While the terrain in this area was suitable as intermediate terrain with appropriate construction efforts, the trail would not have been able to be open on days where ski race training was occurring on Twister, which closes Twister to the skiing public. As a result, this trail would not have provided a reliable intermediate connection from Burnt Ridge to the Base Area, and the length of new trail would've been shorter than desired, providing only a short section of new skiing terrain.

The third and preferred alternative connects from the top of Sagamore on skier's right, and continues southeast to the bottom of Echo where it turns towards the base area. This alternative was selected due to the suitability of terrain as intermediate terrain, the ability to connect to and utilize a previously approved trail (not yet constructed), that provides an option to ski back to the bottom of Burnt Ridge, the length of new skiing terrain offered by this alignment, and ability to provide the desired connection from the top of Burnt Ridge back to the base area on days when Echo is closed due to racing.

B. Alternative Lift Configurations

The expanded beginner terrain could conceivably be served by just the replacement and relocation of the Sunway Lift (lift 3) with the addition of the new lift 9B.

The relocated Sunway lift, in and by itself, could continue to serve the existing beginner terrain along with those beginner trail improvements proposed in this UMP Amendment. However, beginner skiers would still be faced with terrain that they may find too challenging. As discussed previously in this document, skiers that offload at the top of the Sunway Lift, even though it is being relocated primarily for skier safety reasons, need to begin skiing on more challenging (steeper) terrain than what is present lower on the Sunway trails.

By providing the new Lift 9B which offloads lower on the mountain, the beginning skier has the option of choosing this lift as the first one they ride, as opposed to using the Sunway lift. By using Lift 9B and skiing the easier terrain on Lower Sunway, beginning skiers can then gain confidence and experience that they may otherwise need to ski the terrain served by the higher up Sunway Lift.

C. Alternative Parking/Circulation Improvements

An alternative to the currently proposed shuttle system was proposed in the 2005. The currently proposed shuttle route involves less construction in currently wooded areas and would be less impacting than the alternative proposed in 2005. The 2005 alternative include more “overland” travel between the parking lots and the base lodge than what is currently proposed. The current alternative more closely follows the existing access roads and perimeters of the existing parking lots.

D. Alternative Appurtenances

The primary new management action appurtenances in this UMP Amendment are the relocated groomer garage and an expanded snowmaking reservoir.

Groomer Garage

The alternative of locating the new garage to the east and downhill of the existing work road, which would place it slightly closer to the existing maintenance complex, was examined. Field study showed that there are wetlands and some surface waters south of the work road which make this alternative location undesirable.


The alternative of locating the groomer garage a little more to the south was also examined in the field. This area has slightly steeper and irregular topography in comparison to the proposed location. This would likely result in a greater area of site disturbance in order to construct the garage. This alternative location would also increase the overall footprint of the maintenance complex which would result in a slight decrease in operational efficiency.

Snowmaking Reservoir

Figures 34 through 39 illustrate the options (alternatives) that were evaluated. Each alternative is described below.

The existing snowmaking reservoir covers approximately 5.2 acres with approximately 19 Mgal of storage.

Alternative 1 (**Figure 34**) involves maintaining the existing 5.2 acre foot print and grading the reservoir sideslopes to all be 3:1. This would increase the storage capacity by 4.5 Mgal to 23.5 Mgal.



Alternative 2 (**Figure 35**) involves the 3:1 slopes from Alternative 1 and expanding the pond to the west in the area of the primary inlet. This would be the one of most “constructable” alternatives. This expansion would have increased the reservoir surface by approximately 2.6 acres and added an additional storage volume of 15.3 Mgal for a total reservoir volume of 38.8 Mgal, close to the desired 40 Mgal. However, as shown on **Figure 35**, this alternative would require some extensive material alteration to the wetlands delineated around the reservoir.

Alternative 3 (**Figure 36**) is a variation on Alternative 2 and would have involved additional expansion in the southwest corner of the reservoir. This alternative would provide to 40.8 Mgal of storage, but would continue to require material alteration of wetlands.

Alternative 4 (**Figure 37**) is another variation on Alternative 2 and would have involved additional expansion in the northwest portion of the reservoir. The results would have been a storage capacity of 39.6 Mgal and material alteration of wetlands.

Alternative 5 (**Figure 38**) is a variation of Alternative 2 that only involves the expansion on the northwest corner of the reservoir. Storage volume would be 33.3 Mgal, it would avoid the wetlands in the main inlet area, but there are wetlands separate from and to the south of the reservoir that would be affected.


Alternative 6 (**Figure 39**) is a variation on Alternatives 1, 3 and 4. Under this alternative the storage volume would be increased to 30.1 Mgal and material alteration of wetlands is avoided.


E. The No-Action Alternative


If the no-action alternative were pursued, none of the new management actions proposed in this UMP Amendment would be given consideration. Any management actions approved in earlier adopted UMPs, but not yet constructed/implemented, could remain in effect and can continue to be implemented.


The no-action alternative could mean that the following goals set by ORDA for Gore Mountain may not be attainable:

- Gore Mountain will seek to modernize facilities at Gore in order to enhance the guest experience, improve skier safety, and increase local and regional economic benefits, while maintaining environmental quality.
- Gore Mountain will seek to increase the capacity of the ski area in concert with other modernization objectives in order to provide a higher quality skiing experience.
- Gore Mountain will seek to improve its economic return by making the mountain more attractive to skiers, and thus increasing ticket sales.









- Gore Mountain will seek to improve skier safety and enjoyment by widening certain trails and improving certain trail intersections.
- Gore Mountain will seek to improve trail selection and create a better balance among trails in order to appeal to a greater cross-section of the skiing market by increasing the number of trails for the beginning and advanced skier.
- Gore Mountain will seek to develop new summer and fall usage of the Ski Center to provide greater year-round use of the facility by the public, consistent with Article 14 and the APSLMP.
- Gore Mountain will implement a capital improvements program to achieve the above objectives.
- Gore Mountain will seek to improve infrastructure reliability in order to reduce the high frequency of breakdown, excessive staffing requirements and consequent financial drain.
- Gore Mountain will seek to reduce its operations and maintenance costs by replacing outdated and aged equipment.

SECTION VII SUMMARY OF UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Some of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project cannot be prevented or reasonably avoided.

7.1 Construction Phase

Construction activities inevitably result in temporary impacts including: visual, noise, vibrations, dust, fumes and odors.

During construction, while vegetation is disturbed there is an increased risk of erosion during stormwater events and a resulting adverse impact in surface water quality. As a result, the water quality in nearby receiving waters may be impacted during the course of construction due to possible erosion of excavated areas. Preparation of project-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction activities using the mitigation measures described in Section V.A.2 will minimize these impacts.

Construction will involve clearing of vegetation for the construction of trails, buildings, shuttle lanes and other proposed facilities. Clearing results in habitat loss that could increase runoff and adversely impact wildlife. (See Section 2 for an explanation of the Environmental Setting, and Section 5 for Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures.) While there will be tree cutting required for ski trails, tree cutting is minimized to the extent feasible and the footprint of the proposed trails are within State constitutional limits.

There may be a localized impact to air quality from dust during construction, however, this potential impact will be temporary and will not extend outside of the Intensive Use Area.

7.2 Operational Phase

There will be an incremental increased use of surface water resources for snowmaking water supply. Previous UMP studies have demonstrated that the Hudson River source capacity can easily provide additional water without any significant adverse impacts.

Wildlife may be impacted as a result of permanent removal of vegetation. As previously stated, tree cutting required for the construction of new ski trails and for trail widening is within constitutional limits.

Slightly increased attendance and operational activities as a result of the project will cause a corresponding slight increase in traffic levels, but peak hour traffic is not expected to significantly increase. The use of the shuttle system could also possible counteract slight increases in attendance by extending the duration of arrival and departures thus reducing peak traffic levels.

SECTION VIII IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

The extent to which a proposed action may cause permanent loss of one or more environmental resources should be identified as specifically as possible based upon available information. Resources which should be considered include natural and man-made resources that would be consumed, converted or made unavailable for further uses due to construction, operation, or use of the proposed project, whether those losses would occur in the immediate future, or over the long term.

The management actions contained in this UMP Amendment do not involve any significant, irreversible or irretrievable commitment of natural resources under the footprint of the proposed new or widened ski trails or the new or relocated ski lifts. The footprint of the new groomer garage and expansion of the NYSEF building represent a small commitment of these areas to built structures.

Site work would involve the removal of existing vegetation and would disturb on-site soils. It is not believed that such impacts are significant. No rare, threatened or endangered species are known to inhabit the site.

There would be a commitment of raw materials for construction of the structures, including concrete, steel, gravel, and wood. Energy resources would be required for the construction, operation and maintenance of the expanded facility.

SECTION IX GROWTH INDUCING, SECONDARY AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This section evaluates the effects of the proposed ski area improvements as they relate to the potential for such improvements to stimulate secondary impacts including an increase in local population, demand for support facilities and commercial and residential development. These secondary impacts would occur if the economic stimuli from the project generated economic activity that would result in significant growth in local populations, labor pools or demands on local services which is not expected to occur.

While the economic effect of the proposed management actions is expected to be positive, growth inducing and secondary impacts are expected to be minimal. The proposed management actions are not geared towards significantly increasing attendance at Gore Mountain. Instead, the proposed improvements are aimed retaining existing skiers and at enhancing beginner facilities to introduce more people to skiing and snowboarding and hopefully recruiting new future participants in the sports at Gore Mountain. Other improvements are geared to improving existing guest services and improving mountain operations which are not necessarily intended to cause significant increases in attendance. Spending in the local community by an increased number of patrons will provide a positive economic stimulus, but since most of the skiers will be day-visitors, the level of spending would not result in the increase in local business that occurred after the major expansion from the activities included in the 1995 UMP.

The proposed project may have some minor influence on the second home market in the nearby towns. The improvements at the Ski Center may improve the desirability of second homes in the area. This increase in desirability may translate to a slight increase in demand for, and price of, vacation homes in the area. However, this increase in demand is expected to be very minor because the Ski Center has already been in operation for many years and the incremental change in recreational facilities as a result of this project will be relatively small.

ORDA is currently contemplating simultaneous improvements on Town of Johnsbury owned lands at the North Creek Ski Bowl, outside of the Intensive Use Area. Because these actions are not within the Intensive Use Area, they are not covered within this UMP Amendment. Instead, these actions will be subject to APA review under section 814 of the Adirondack Park Agency Act and also subject to review under SEQRA. In order to make the requisite assessment of cumulative impacts, this UMP Amendment/GEIS is accompanied by two companion documents which will be referred to as Part B and Part C (Part A being the UMP/GEIS). Part B is the Notice of Intent to the APA required under section 814 APA Act, including accompanying SEQRA documentation. Part C is the cumulative impact assessment of the actions proposed within the Intensive Use Area and the actions proposed at the Ski Bowl.

SECTION X EFFECTS ON THE USE AND CONSERVATION OF ENERGY

Recent past activities and future activities being undertaken at Gore Mountain will have a positive effect on the use and conservation of energy.

In the construction phase, additional energy will be consumed primarily in the form of fossil fuels to power the required construction equipment and to transport construction workers to and from the site. This will result in a temporary increase in the use of energy.

Gore is contracting two 25-year solar power purchase agreements, which combine into a massive 5.325 MW system. Using remote net metering, 85% of Gore's electrical is poised to be offset. In cooperation with Borrego Solar, Gore Mountain is efficiently harvesting sunlight for its energy needs, utilizing 14,589 ground-mounted solar panels across 20 acres of otherwise fallow farmland. The electricity generated credits Gore's meter at a rate higher than power that is traditionally produced, while providing a cleaner, more sustainable source of energy to its electric distribution zone. The agreement is projected to save Gore Mountain approximately \$10 million over the life of the contract, while offsetting 113,919 tons of carbon dioxide, 71,634 pounds of nitrogen oxide emissions, and 131,835 pounds of sulfur. Gore's purchase agreement received support from Governor Cuomo's NY-Sun incentive through the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA).

In June 2016 Gore Mountain issued a Sustainability Analysis a copy of which is in **Appendix 9**. This analysis contained a section on electricity and fuel, including the following.

Diesel is used for powering maintenance equipment, snowmaking compressors and grooming equipment and for operating ski lifts during power outages. Trucks and buses are also fueled by diesel. Off-road diesel use has been reduced significantly over the last 8 years and that trend will continue. On-road diesel has had a slight average increase over the past 8 years due, primarily, to an increase in vehicles, including the shuttle bus fleet which has been accommodating the growing number of guests. Gore is actively investigating modernization of existing fleets with new technologies including electric grooming machines and hybrid buses.

Gasoline is used to operate snowmobiles for ski patrol and snowmaking as well as vehicles for travel to trade shows, meetings and conferences. There has been a slight downward trend in gasoline use over the last 8 years.

Gore Mountain propane usage had a dramatic increase after the 2007/2008 fiscal year due to the addition of the Northwoods Lodge, conversion of the base lodge's heat from fuel oil, and the addition of two more commercial kitchens. Propane is used to heat almost all of Gore Mountain's buildings, with the exception of Saddle Lodge which uses a wood stove and electric heat. The usage trend for propane is relatively flat and primarily dependent on the weather. A green heat initiative is targeted for future improvement in propane use reduction.

While electricity powers the lifts at Gore Mountain, the largest use of it is for snowmaking compressors and pumps. Gore has substantially reduced the amount of kilowatt hours (kWh) used during the last four fiscal years and the plan is to maintain this trend by continuing to replace traditional snowmaking with modernized, high efficiency guns. Gore is also modernizing their compressors with improved, more efficient drives and changing most lighting to motion sensing and high efficiency bulbs or LEDs.

Appendix 1
SEQRA Full Environmental Assessment Form Parts 1, 2 and 3

Full Environmental Assessment Form
Part 1 - Project and Setting

Instructions for Completing Part 1

Part 1 is to be completed by the applicant or project sponsor. Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification.

Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information; indicate whether missing information does not exist, or is not reasonably available to the sponsor; and, when possible, generally describe work or studies which would be necessary to update or fully develop that information.

Applicants/sponsors must complete all items in Sections A & B. In Sections C, D & E, most items contain an initial question that must be answered either "Yes" or "No". If the answer to the initial question is "Yes", complete the sub-questions that follow. If the answer to the initial question is "No", proceed to the next question. Section F allows the project sponsor to identify and attach any additional information. Section G requires the name and signature of the project sponsor to verify that the information contained in Part 1 is accurate and complete.

A. Project and Sponsor Information.

Name of Action or Project: Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area 2017 Unit Management Plan (UMP) Amendment		
Project Location (describe, and attach a general location map): Peaceful Valley Road, T/O Johnsburg, Warren County		
Brief Description of Proposed Action (include purpose or need): The following new Management Actions will be included in the UMP: Widen Sunway and other green trails served by Lift 3, Widen Headwaters at the bottom of Rumor from Lies to the other side of Hawkeye, Create a beginner/intermediate trail on Echo connecting to the base area in the cut above Gully, Create a beginner/intermediate trail connection in the vicinity of the Abenaki and Barkeater Glades, Reestablish alpine skiing on a portion of Rabbit Pond Trail, Verify current mileage of existing ski trails, Add new triple or quad chair (Lift 9B) from Northwoods Lodge up Lower Sunway to just past the bend in Lower Sunway, Replace and relocate existing Sunway Lift (Lift 3) with a triple or quad to the south along the old Gondola line extending the upper terminal to land past the top of Otter Slide, Modify 1995-approved shuttle lane separated from and independent of main traffic route and circulation route and parking, Expand NYSEF building, Reconfigure 1995-approved maintenance complex to locate groomer garage and fueling adjacent to Sunway trail, Examine the possibility of enlarging the snowmaking reservoir, Install new 24 inch gravity water line from the snowmaking reservoir to the pump house, Construct a single track bike trail loop for Town trail at the top of Little Gore, Develop a hiking center, Land classification exchange between Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area, Vanderwhacker Wild Forest and Siamese Wilderness which could allow the historic Rabbit Pond Trail to be reused winter and summer		
Name of Applicant/Sponsor: NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority	Telephone: (518) 302-5332 E-Mail: bhammond@orda.org	
Address: Olympic Center, 2634 Main Street		
City/PO: Lake Placid	State: NY	Zip Code: 12946
Project Contact (if not same as sponsor; give name and title/role): Robert Hammond, Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction	Telephone: E-Mail:	
Address:		
City/PO:	State:	Zip Code:
Property Owner (if not same as sponsor): State of New York	Telephone: (518) 402-9405 E-Mail: LF.Lands@dec.ny.gov	
Address: Governor Alfred E Smith Office Building		
City/PO: Albany	State: NY	Zip Code: 12239

B. Government Approvals

B. Government Approvals, Funding, or Sponsorship. (“Funding” includes grants, loans, tax relief, and any other forms of financial assistance.)

Government Entity	If Yes: Identify Agency and Approval(s) Required	Application Date (Actual or projected)
a. City Council, Town Board, <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No or Village Board of Trustees		
b. City, Town or Village <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Planning Board or Commission		
c. City Council, Town or <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Village Zoning Board of Appeals		
d. Other local agencies <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
e. County agencies <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
f. Regional agencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	NYS APA - APSLMP Compliance	2017
g. State agencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	NYSDEC - UMP Approval	2017
h. Federal agencies <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
i. Coastal Resources. i. Is the project site within a Coastal Area, or the waterfront area of a Designated Inland Waterway? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No ii. Is the project site located in a community with an approved Local Waterfront Revitalization Program? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No iii. Is the project site within a Coastal Erosion Hazard Area? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		

C. Planning and Zoning

C.1. Planning and zoning actions.

Will administrative or legislative adoption, or amendment of a plan, local law, ordinance, rule or regulation be the only approval(s) which must be granted to enable the proposed action to proceed? ☐ Yes ☒ No

- If Yes, complete sections C, F and G.
- If No, proceed to question C.2 and complete all remaining sections and questions in Part 1

C.2. Adopted land use plans.

a. Do any municipally- adopted (city, town, village or county) comprehensive land use plan(s) include the site where the proposed action would be located? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, does the comprehensive plan include specific recommendations for the site where the proposed action would be located? ☒ Yes ☐ No

b. Is the site of the proposed action within any local or regional special planning district (for example: Greenway Brownfield Opportunity Area (BOA); designated State or Federal heritage area; watershed management plan; or other?) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, identify the plan(s):

Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan

c. Is the proposed action located wholly or partially within an area listed in an adopted municipal open space plan, or an adopted municipal farmland protection plan? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, identify the plan(s):

C.3. Zoning

a. Is the site of the proposed action located in a municipality with an adopted zoning law or ordinance. ☒ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, what is the zoning classification(s) including any applicable overlay district?

N/A, lands of NYS

b. Is the use permitted or allowed by a special or conditional use permit? N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No

c. Is a zoning change requested as part of the proposed action? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes,

i. What is the proposed new zoning for the site? _____

C.4. Existing community services.

a. In what school district is the project site located? Johnsburg Central

b. What police or other public protection forces serve the project site?

NYS Police, Warren County Sheriff

c. Which fire protection and emergency medical services serve the project site?

Johnsburg FD

d. What parks serve the project site?

Adirondack State, Town Ski Bowl

D. Project Details

D.1. Proposed and Potential Development

a. What is the general nature of the proposed action (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial, recreational; if mixed, include all components)? Recreational

b. a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? +/-3,766 acres

b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? +/- 39 acres

c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor? +/-3,766 acres

c. Is the proposed action an expansion of an existing project or use? ☒ Yes ☐ No

i. If Yes, what is the approximate percentage of the proposed expansion and identify the units (e.g., acres, miles, housing units, square feet)? % <5 Units: _____

d. Is the proposed action a subdivision, or does it include a subdivision? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes,

i. Purpose or type of subdivision? (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial; if mixed, specify types)

ii. Is a cluster/conservation layout proposed? ☐ Yes ☐ No

iii. Number of lots proposed? _____

iv. Minimum and maximum proposed lot sizes? Minimum _____ Maximum _____

e. Will proposed action be constructed in multiple phases? ☒ Yes ☐ No

i. If No, anticipated period of construction: 60 months

ii. If Yes:

• Total number of phases anticipated 5

• Anticipated commencement date of phase 1 (including demolition) April month 2018 year

• Anticipated completion date of final phase Nov month 2023 year

• Generally describe connections or relationships among phases, including any contingencies where progress of one phase may determine timing or duration of future phases: _____

Sequence of implementing management actions will be contingent upon funding availability and ORDA construction priorities at the time. _____

f. Does the project include new residential uses? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
If Yes, show numbers of units proposed.				
	<u>One Family</u>	<u>Two Family</u>	<u>Three Family</u>	<u>Multiple Family (four or more)</u>
Initial Phase	_____	_____	_____	_____
At completion	_____	_____	_____	_____
of all phases	_____	_____	_____	_____

g. Does the proposed action include new non-residential construction (including expansions)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes, New groomer garage and expansion of NYSEF building	
i. Total number of structures <u>2</u>	
ii. Dimensions (in feet) of largest proposed structure: <u>1</u> story height; <u>75</u> width; and <u>120</u> length	
iii. Approximate extent of building space to be heated or cooled: <u>12,125 total</u> square feet	

h. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that will result in the impoundment of any liquids, such as creation of a water supply, reservoir, pond, lake, waste lagoon or other storage? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes, Project includes expansion of an existing reservoir used for snowmaking	
i. Purpose of the impoundment: <u>enlarge existing impoundment to store additional water for snowmaking</u>	
ii. If a water impoundment, the principal source of the water: <input type="checkbox"/> Ground water <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Surface water streams <input type="checkbox"/> Other specify: <u>upper reaches of Roaring Brook plus pump storage of water withdrawn from the Hudson River</u>	
iii. If other than water, identify the type of impounded/contained liquids and their source. _____	
iv. Approximate size of the proposed impoundment. Volume: <u>increase by 11</u> million gallons; surface area: <u>increase by 7.5</u> acres	
v. Dimensions of the proposed dam or impounding structure: <u>32, exists</u> height; <u>100, exist</u> length	
vi. Construction method/materials for the proposed dam or impounding structure (e.g., earth fill, rock, wood, concrete): <u>earth (exists)</u>	

D.2. Project Operations

a. Does the proposed action include any excavation, mining, or dredging, during construction, operations, or both? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
(Not including general site preparation, grading or installation of utilities or foundations where all excavated materials will remain onsite)	
If Yes:	
i. What is the purpose of the excavation or dredging? <u>enlarge snowmaking reservoir</u>	
ii. How much material (including rock, earth, sediments, etc.) is proposed to be removed from the site?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume (specify tons or cubic yards): <u>54,000 cy (will remain within the intensive use area)</u> • Over what duration of time? <u>6-8 months</u> 	
iii. Describe nature and characteristics of materials to be excavated or dredged, and plans to use, manage or dispose of them. <u>Soil and rock will be removed. Excavated material will be used as general fill within the intensive use area.</u>	
iv. Will there be onsite dewatering or processing of excavated materials? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If yes, describe. _____	
v. What is the total area to be dredged or excavated? <u>7.5</u> acres	
vi. What is the maximum area to be worked at any one time? <u>1</u> acres	
vii. What would be the maximum depth of excavation or dredging? <u>30</u> feet	
viii. Will the excavation require blasting? <u>possibly</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
ix. Summarize site reclamation goals and plan: <u>Reservoir will be drained prior to starting excavation.</u>	
<u>Reservoir will allowed to slowly refill after excavation is completed. There will be no outflow from the reservoir until it is full.</u>	

b. Would the proposed action cause or result in alteration of, increase or decrease in size of, or encroachment into any existing wetland, waterbody, shoreline, beach or adjacent area? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes:	
i. Identify the wetland or waterbody which would be affected (by name, water index number, wetland map number or geographic description): <u>Existing snowmaking reservoir at Gore Mountain. Formerly the North Creek Reservoir. Outflow from the reservoir forms Roaring Brook. Wetland impacts avoided.</u>	

ii. Describe how the proposed action would affect that waterbody or wetland, e.g. excavation, fill, placement of structures, or alteration of channels, banks and shorelines. Indicate extent of activities, alterations and additions in square feet or acres:
Excavation within the existing reservoir and beyond the existing footprint to increase current storage capacity from 19 Mgal to 30 Mgal.

iii. Will proposed action cause or result in disturbance to bottom sediments? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, describe: _____

iv. Will proposed action cause or result in the destruction or removal of aquatic vegetation? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes:

- acres of aquatic vegetation proposed to be removed: _____
- expected acreage of aquatic vegetation remaining after project completion: _____
- purpose of proposed removal (e.g. beach clearing, invasive species control, boat access): _____
- proposed method of plant removal: _____
- if chemical/herbicide treatment will be used, specify product(s): _____

v. Describe any proposed reclamation/mitigation following disturbance: _____

Gradually refilling the reservoir allowing suspended solids to settle out prior to discharge from the reservoir.

c. Will the proposed action use, or create a new demand for water? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes:

i. Total anticipated water usage/demand per day: _____ gallons/day

ii. Will the proposed action obtain water from an existing public water supply? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes:

- Name of district or service area: _____
- Does the existing public water supply have capacity to serve the proposal? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Is the project site in the existing district? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Is expansion of the district needed? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Do existing lines serve the project site? ☐ Yes ☐ No

iii. Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to supply the project? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes:

- Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project: _____
- Source(s) of supply for the district: _____

iv. Is a new water supply district or service area proposed to be formed to serve the project site? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If, Yes:

- Applicant/sponsor for new district: _____
- Date application submitted or anticipated: _____
- Proposed source(s) of supply for new district: _____

v. If a public water supply will not be used, describe plans to provide water supply for the project: _____

vi. If water supply will be from wells (public or private), maximum pumping capacity: _____ gallons/minute.

d. Will the proposed action generate liquid wastes? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes: Sanitary wastewater generation is not expected to exceed current levels.

i. Total anticipated liquid waste generation per day: _____ gallons/day

ii. Nature of liquid wastes to be generated (e.g., sanitary wastewater, industrial; if combination, describe all components and approximate volumes or proportions of each): _____

iii. Will the proposed action use any existing public wastewater treatment facilities? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes:

- Name of wastewater treatment plant to be used: _____
- Name of district: _____
- Does the existing wastewater treatment plant have capacity to serve the project? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Is the project site in the existing district? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Is expansion of the district needed? ☐ Yes ☐ No

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do existing sewer lines serve the project site? • Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to serve the project? <p>If Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project: _____ 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
iv. Will a new wastewater (sewage) treatment district be formed to serve the project site?	
If Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant/sponsor for new district: _____ • Date application submitted or anticipated: _____ • What is the receiving water for the wastewater discharge? _____ 	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
v. If public facilities will not be used, describe plans to provide wastewater treatment for the project, including specifying proposed receiving water (name and classification if surface discharge, or describe subsurface disposal plans):	
vi. Describe any plans or designs to capture, recycle or reuse liquid waste:	
e. Will the proposed action disturb more than one acre and create stormwater runoff, either from new point sources (i.e. ditches, pipes, swales, curbs, gutters or other concentrated flows of stormwater) or non-point source (i.e. sheet flow) during construction or post construction?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes:	
i. How much impervious surface will the project create in relation to total size of project parcel?	
_____ Square feet or <u>1.3</u> acres (impervious surface)	
_____ Square feet or <u>3766</u> acres (parcel size)	
ii. Describe types of new point sources. <u>N/A</u>	
iii. Where will the stormwater runoff be directed (i.e. on-site stormwater management facility/structures, adjacent properties, groundwater, on-site surface water or off-site surface waters)?	
<u>on-site stormwater management practices</u>	
• If to surface waters, identify receiving water bodies or wetlands:	
• Will stormwater runoff flow to adjacent properties?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
iv. Does proposed plan minimize impervious surfaces, use pervious materials or collect and re-use stormwater?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
f. Does the proposed action include, or will it use on-site, one or more sources of air emissions, including fuel combustion, waste incineration, or other processes or operations?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes, identify: Fuel combustion is not expected to exceed current levels	
i. Mobile sources during project operations (e.g., heavy equipment, fleet or delivery vehicles)	
ii. Stationary sources during construction (e.g., power generation, structural heating, batch plant, crushers)	
iii. Stationary sources during operations (e.g., process emissions, large boilers, electric generation)	
g. Will any air emission sources named in D.2.f (above), require a NY State Air Registration, Air Facility Permit, or Federal Clean Air Act Title IV or Title V Permit?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes:	
i. Is the project site located in an Air quality non-attainment area? (Area routinely or periodically fails to meet ambient air quality standards for all or some parts of the year)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
ii. In addition to emissions as calculated in the application, the project will generate:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) • _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Nitrous Oxide (N₂O) • _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) • _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF₆) • _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide equivalent of Hydroflourocarbons (HFCs) • _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) 	

<p>h. Will the proposed action generate or emit methane (including, but not limited to, sewage treatment plants, landfills, composting facilities)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes: Existing sewage treatment plant emissions are not anticipated to increase.</p> <p>i. Estimate methane generation in tons/year (metric): _____</p> <p>ii. Describe any methane capture, control or elimination measures included in project design (e.g., combustion to generate heat or electricity, flaring): _____</p>			
<p>i. Will the proposed action result in the release of air pollutants from open-air operations or processes, such as quarry or landfill operations? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes: Describe operations and nature of emissions (e.g., diesel exhaust, rock particulates/dust): _____</p>			
<p>j. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels or generate substantial new demand for transportation facilities or services? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p>i. When is the peak traffic expected (Check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Morning <input type="checkbox"/> Evening <input type="checkbox"/> Weekend <input type="checkbox"/> Randomly between hours of _____ to _____.</p> <p>ii. For commercial activities only, projected number of semi-trailer truck trips/day: _____</p> <p>iii. Parking spaces: Existing _____ Proposed _____ Net increase/decrease _____</p> <p>iv. Does the proposed action include any shared use parking? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>v. If the proposed action includes any modification of existing roads, creation of new roads or change in existing access, describe: _____</p> <p>vi. Are public/private transportation service(s) or facilities available within ½ mile of the proposed site? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>vii. Will the proposed action include access to public transportation or accommodations for use of hybrid, electric or other alternative fueled vehicles? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>viii. Will the proposed action include plans for pedestrian or bicycle accommodations for connections to existing pedestrian or bicycle routes? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>			
<p>k. Will the proposed action (for commercial or industrial projects only) generate new or additional demand for energy? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No N/A, not commercial or industrial</p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p>i. Estimate annual electricity demand during operation of the proposed action: _____</p> <p>ii. Anticipated sources/suppliers of electricity for the project (e.g., on-site combustion, on-site renewable, via grid/local utility, or other): _____</p> <p>iii. Will the proposed action require a new, or an upgrade to, an existing substation? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>			
<p>l. Hours of operation. Answer all items which apply.</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>i. During Construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday - Friday: _____ 6:00 - 6:00 • Saturday: _____ 6:00 - 6:00 • Sunday: _____ 6:00-6:00 • Holidays: _____ 6:00-6:00 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>ii. During Operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday - Friday: _____ 6:00-8:00 • Saturday: _____ 6:00-8:00 • Sunday: _____ 6:00-8:00 • Holidays: _____ 6:00-8:00 </td> </tr> </table>		<p>i. During Construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday - Friday: _____ 6:00 - 6:00 • Saturday: _____ 6:00 - 6:00 • Sunday: _____ 6:00-6:00 • Holidays: _____ 6:00-6:00 	<p>ii. During Operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday - Friday: _____ 6:00-8:00 • Saturday: _____ 6:00-8:00 • Sunday: _____ 6:00-8:00 • Holidays: _____ 6:00-8:00
<p>i. During Construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday - Friday: _____ 6:00 - 6:00 • Saturday: _____ 6:00 - 6:00 • Sunday: _____ 6:00-6:00 • Holidays: _____ 6:00-6:00 	<p>ii. During Operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday - Friday: _____ 6:00-8:00 • Saturday: _____ 6:00-8:00 • Sunday: _____ 6:00-8:00 • Holidays: _____ 6:00-8:00 		

<p>m. Will the proposed action produce noise that will exceed existing ambient noise levels during construction, operation, or both? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes:</p> <p>i. Provide details including sources, time of day and duration:</p> <p>Construction noise from vehicles and power equipment. Construction will be during daytime hours and will occur in spring, summer and fall.</p>	
<p>ii. Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a noise barrier or screen? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Describe: _____</p>	
<p>n.. Will the proposed action have outdoor lighting? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes:</p> <p>i. Describe source(s), location(s), height of fixture(s), direction/aim, and proximity to nearest occupied structures:</p> <p>Building mounted exterior lighting at the one story groomer garage to light immediate surroundings. nearest occupied structures are outside of the 3,766 acre intensive use area</p>	
<p>ii. Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a light barrier or screen? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Describe: _____</p>	
<p>o. Does the proposed action have the potential to produce odors for more than one hour per day? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes, describe possible sources, potential frequency and duration of odor emissions, and proximity to nearest occupied structures: _____</p>	
<p>p. Will the proposed action include any bulk storage of petroleum (combined capacity of over 1,100 gallons) or chemical products 185 gallons in above ground storage or any amount in underground storage? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes: A new diesel fuel storage tank will be installed near the relocated groomer garage.</p> <p>i. Product(s) to be stored <u>diesel fuel</u></p> <p>ii. Volume(s) <u>8,000</u> per unit time <u>week (winter)</u> (e.g., month, year)</p> <p>iii. Generally describe proposed storage facilities: _____</p> <p><u>above ground with containment</u></p>	
<p>q. Will the proposed action (commercial, industrial and recreational projects only) use pesticides (i.e., herbicides, insecticides) during construction or operation? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p>i. Describe proposed treatment(s): _____</p>	
<p>ii. Will the proposed action use Integrated Pest Management Practices? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>r. Will the proposed action (commercial or industrial projects only) involve or require the management or disposal of solid waste (excluding hazardous materials)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>N/A, not commercial or industrial</p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p>i. Describe any solid waste(s) to be generated during construction or operation of the facility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction: _____ tons per _____ (unit of time) • Operation : _____ tons per _____ (unit of time) <p>ii. Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of materials to avoid disposal as solid waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction: _____ • Operation: _____ <p>iii. Proposed disposal methods/facilities for solid waste generated on-site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction: _____ • Operation: _____ 	

s. Does the proposed action include construction or modification of a solid waste management facility? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes:

i. Type of management or handling of waste proposed for the site (e.g., recycling or transfer station, composting, landfill, or other disposal activities): _____

ii. Anticipated rate of disposal/processing:

- _____ Tons/month, if transfer or other non-combustion/thermal treatment, or
- _____ Tons/hour, if combustion or thermal treatment

iii. If landfill, anticipated site life: _____ years

t. Will proposed action at the site involve the commercial generation, treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous waste? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes:

i. Name(s) of all hazardous wastes or constituents to be generated, handled or managed at facility: _____

ii. Generally describe processes or activities involving hazardous wastes or constituents: _____

iii. Specify amount to be handled or generated _____ tons/month

iv. Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of hazardous constituents: _____

v. Will any hazardous wastes be disposed at an existing offsite hazardous waste facility? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes: provide name and location of facility: _____

If No: describe proposed management of any hazardous wastes which will not be sent to a hazardous waste facility: _____

E. Site and Setting of Proposed Action

E.1. Land uses on and surrounding the project site

a. Existing land uses.

i. Check all uses that occur on, adjoining and near the project site.

☐ Urban ☒ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☐ Residential (suburban) ☒ Rural (non-farm)

☒ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☒ Other (specify): Town Park

ii. If mix of uses, generally describe: _____

b. Land uses and covertypes on the project site.

Land use or Covertypes	Current Acreage	Acreage After Project Completion	Change (Acres +/-)
• Roads, buildings, and other paved or impervious surfaces	34.2	35.5	+1.3
• Forested	2844	2845	-39
• Meadows, grasslands or brushlands (non-agricultural, including abandoned agricultural)	273.7 (ski trails)	301.0	+27.3
• Agricultural (includes active orchards, field, greenhouse etc.)	0	0	0
• Surface water features (lakes, ponds, streams, rivers, etc.)	19 (reservoir)	30	+11
• Wetlands (freshwater or tidal)	180	180	0
• Non-vegetated (bare rock, earth or fill)	375 (rock)	375 (rock)	0
• Other Describe: _____			

Page 10 of 13

v. Is the project site subject to an institutional control limiting property uses? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If yes, DEC site ID number: _____ • Describe the type of institutional control (e.g., deed restriction or easement): _____ • Describe any use limitations: _____ • Describe any engineering controls: _____ • Will the project affect the institutional or engineering controls in place? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No • Explain: _____ _____ 													
E.2. Natural Resources On or Near Project Site													
a. What is the average depth to bedrock on the project site? _____ 0->6 feet													
b. Are there bedrock outcroppings on the project site? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, what proportion of the site is comprised of bedrock outcroppings? _____ 10-20 %													
c. Predominant soil type(s) present on project site: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;">Hermon-Lymon- Rock Outcrop</td> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: right;">50 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marlow bouldery fine loamy sand</td> <td style="text-align: right;">15 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>multiple others</td> <td style="text-align: right;">35 %</td> </tr> </table>		Hermon-Lymon- Rock Outcrop	50 %	Marlow bouldery fine loamy sand	15 %	multiple others	35 %						
Hermon-Lymon- Rock Outcrop	50 %												
Marlow bouldery fine loamy sand	15 %												
multiple others	35 %												
d. What is the average depth to the water table on the project site? Average: _____ >6 feet													
e. Drainage status of project site soils: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well Drained:</td> <td style="width: 40%; text-align: right;">20 % of site</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moderately Well Drained:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20 % of site</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poorly Drained</td> <td style="text-align: right;">60 % of site</td> </tr> </table>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well Drained:	20 % of site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moderately Well Drained:	20 % of site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poorly Drained	60 % of site						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Well Drained:	20 % of site												
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moderately Well Drained:	20 % of site												
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poorly Drained	60 % of site												
f. Approximate proportion of proposed action site with slopes: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0-10%:</td> <td style="width: 40%; text-align: right;"><5 % of site</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10-15%:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">15 % of site</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15% or greater:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">>80 % of site</td> </tr> </table>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0-10%:	<5 % of site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10-15%:	15 % of site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15% or greater:	>80 % of site						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0-10%:	<5 % of site												
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10-15%:	15 % of site												
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15% or greater:	>80 % of site												
g. Are there any unique geologic features on the project site? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, describe: <u>Gore Mountain, Barton Garnet Mine - Gore Mountain</u> _____													
h. Surface water features.													
i. Does any portion of the project site contain wetlands or other waterbodies (including streams, rivers, ponds or lakes)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No													
ii. Do any wetlands or other waterbodies adjoin the project site? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No													
If Yes to either <i>i</i> or <i>ii</i> , continue. If No, skip to E.2.i.													
iii. Are any of the wetlands or waterbodies within or adjoining the project site regulated by any federal, state or local agency? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No													
iv. For each identified regulated wetland and waterbody on the project site, provide the following information: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">• Streams:</td> <td style="width: 40%;">Name <u>941-1261, 941-759.1, 941-1256, 941-1257, 941-12...</u></td> <td style="width: 50%;">Classification <u>C(T), A(T)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Lakes or Ponds:</td> <td>Name <u>Former North Creek Reservoir</u></td> <td>Classification _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Wetlands:</td> <td>Name <u>Federal Waters, Federal Waters, Federal Waters,...</u></td> <td>Approximate Size <u>APA Wetland (in a...</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Wetland No. (if regulated by DEC)</td> <td colspan="2">_____</td> </tr> </table>		• Streams:	Name <u>941-1261, 941-759.1, 941-1256, 941-1257, 941-12...</u>	Classification <u>C(T), A(T)</u>	• Lakes or Ponds:	Name <u>Former North Creek Reservoir</u>	Classification _____	• Wetlands:	Name <u>Federal Waters, Federal Waters, Federal Waters,...</u>	Approximate Size <u>APA Wetland (in a...</u>	• Wetland No. (if regulated by DEC)	_____	
• Streams:	Name <u>941-1261, 941-759.1, 941-1256, 941-1257, 941-12...</u>	Classification <u>C(T), A(T)</u>											
• Lakes or Ponds:	Name <u>Former North Creek Reservoir</u>	Classification _____											
• Wetlands:	Name <u>Federal Waters, Federal Waters, Federal Waters,...</u>	Approximate Size <u>APA Wetland (in a...</u>											
• Wetland No. (if regulated by DEC)	_____												
v. Are any of the above water bodies listed in the most recent compilation of NYS water quality-impaired waterbodies? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, name of impaired water body/bodies and basis for listing as impaired: _____ _____													
i. Is the project site in a designated Floodway? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No													
j. Is the project site in the 100 year Floodplain? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No													
k. Is the project site in the 500 year Floodplain? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No													
l. Is the project site located over, or immediately adjoining, a primary, principal or sole source aquifer? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes:													
i. Name of aquifer: <u>Principal Aquifer</u>													

<p>m. Identify the predominant wildlife species that occupy or use the project site:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">small and large mammals</td> <td style="width: 33%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">resident bird species</td> <td style="width: 33%; border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">migratory bird species</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;">reptiles and amphibians</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black;"></td> </tr> </table>	small and large mammals	resident bird species		migratory bird species	reptiles and amphibians		
small and large mammals	resident bird species						
migratory bird species	reptiles and amphibians						
<p>n. Does the project site contain a designated significant natural community? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">i. Describe the habitat/community (composition, function, and basis for designation): _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">ii. Source(s) of description or evaluation: _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">iii. Extent of community/habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently: _____ acres Following completion of project as proposed: _____ acres Gain or loss (indicate + or -): _____ acres 							
<p>o. Does project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by the federal government or NYS as endangered or threatened, or does it contain any areas identified as habitat for an endangered or threatened species? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>							
<p>p. Does the project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by NYS as rare, or as a species of special concern? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>							
<p>q. Is the project site or adjoining area currently used for hunting, trapping, fishing or shell fishing? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, give a brief description of how the proposed action may affect that use: _____</p> <p>No affect on recreation on adjoining forest preserve land recreation. _____</p>							
<p>E.3. Designated Public Resources On or Near Project Site</p>							
<p>a. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in a designated agricultural district certified pursuant to Agriculture and Markets Law, Article 25-AA, Section 303 and 304? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes, provide county plus district name/number: _____</p>							
<p>b. Are agricultural lands consisting of highly productive soils present? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">i. If Yes: acreage(s) on project site? _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">ii. Source(s) of soil rating(s): _____</p>							
<p>c. Does the project site contain all or part of, or is it substantially contiguous to, a registered National Natural Landmark? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">i. Nature of the natural landmark: <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Community <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Feature</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">ii. Provide brief description of landmark, including values behind designation and approximate size/extent: _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">_____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">_____</p>							
<p>d. Is the project site located in or does it adjoin a state listed Critical Environmental Area? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If Yes:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">i. CEA name: _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">ii. Basis for designation: _____</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">iii. Designating agency and date: _____</p>							

e. Does the project site contain, or is it substantially contiguous to, a building, archaeological site, or district which is listed on, or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on, the State or National Register of Historic Places?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Nature of historic/archaeological resource: <input type="checkbox"/> Archaeological Site <input type="checkbox"/> Historic Building or District ii. Name: _____ iii. Brief description of attributes on which listing is based: _____ 	
f. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
g. Have additional archaeological or historic site(s) or resources been identified on the project site?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Describe possible resource(s): _____ ii. Basis for identification: _____ 	
h. Is the project site within five miles of any officially designated and publicly accessible federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Identify resource: NYSAPA Scenic Vistas: (1) Back to Sodom Road, North Creek; Goodman Road, Bakers Mills ii. Nature of, or basis for, designation (e.g., established highway overlook, state or local park, state historic trail or scenic byway, etc.): NYSAPA Scenic Vista iii. Distance between project and resource: 1 mile, 3 miles respectively miles. 	
i. Is the project site located within a designated river corridor under the Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers Program 6 NYCRR 666?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Identify the name of the river and its designation: _____ ii. Is the activity consistent with development restrictions contained in 6NYCRR Part 666? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 	

F. Additional Information

Attach any additional information which may be needed to clarify your project.

If you have identified any adverse impacts which could be associated with your proposal, please describe those impacts plus any measures which you propose to avoid or minimize them.

G. Verification

I certify that the information provided is true to the best of my knowledge.

Applicant/Sponsor Name ROBERT V. HANNAH Date 11/15/17

Signature [Signature] Title Dir. Engr, P&E, C&T



Disclaimer: The EAF Mapper is a screening tool intended to assist project sponsors and reviewing agencies in preparing an environmental assessment form (EAF). Not all questions asked in the EAF are answered by the EAF Mapper. Additional information on any EAF question can be obtained by consulting the EAF Workbooks. Although the EAF Mapper provides the most up-to-date digital data available to DEC, you may also need to contact local or other data sources in order to obtain data not provided by the Mapper. Digital data is not a substitute for agency determinations.



B.i.i [Coastal or Waterfront Area]	No
B.i.ii [Local Waterfront Revitalization Area]	No
C.2.b. [Special Planning District]	Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
E.1.h [DEC Spills or Remediation Site - Potential Contamination History]	Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
E.1.h.i [DEC Spills or Remediation Site - Listed]	Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
E.1.h.i [DEC Spills or Remediation Site - Environmental Site Remediation Database]	Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
E.1.h.iii [Within 2,000' of DEC Remediation Site]	No
E.2.g [Unique Geologic Features]	Yes
E.2.g [Unique Geologic Features]	Gore Mountain, Barton Garnet Mine - Gore Mountain
E.2.h.i [Surface Water Features]	Yes
E.2.h.ii [Surface Water Features]	Yes
E.2.h.iii [Surface Water Features]	Yes - Digital mapping information on local and federal wetlands and waterbodies is known to be incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
E.2.h.iv [Surface Water Features - Stream Name]	941-1261, 941-759.1, 941-1256, 941-1257, 941-1254, 941-1253, 941-764, 941-1270
E.2.h.iv [Surface Water Features - Stream Classification]	C(T), A(T)
E.2.h.iv [Surface Water Features - Wetlands Name]	Federal Waters, APA Wetland

E.2.h.iv [Surface Water Features - Wetlands Size]	APA Wetland (in acres):6.21409633, APA Wetland (in acres):4.01067418, APA Wetland (in acres):0.22157542, APA Wetland (in acres):4.79873642, APA Wetland (in acres):0.97567625, APA Wetland (in acres):0.11314292, APA Wetland (in acres):3.68782457, APA Wetland (in acres):6.65199621, APA Wetland (in acres):0.24311211, APA Wetland (in acres):0.40255622, APA Wetland (in acres):2.75641089, APA Wetland (in acres):0.15746727, APA Wetland (in acres):3.09193233, APA Wetland (in acres):1.34746798, APA Wetland (in acres):0.62714323, APA Wetland (in acres):0.17833215, APA Wetland (in acres):1.51840244, APA Wetland (in acres):0.80906611, APA Wetland (in acres):0.55871848, APA Wetland (in acres):1.24054127, APA Wetland (in acres):0.41207746, APA Wetland (in acres):1.37974599, APA Wetland (in acres):0.29332836, APA Wetland (in acres):15.67060385, APA Wetland (in acres):0.76184601, APA Wetland (in acres):0.56578412, APA Wetland (in acres):1.0484485, APA Wetland (in acres):0.36642493, APA Wetland (in acres):1.589638, APA Wetland (in acres):0.6375525, APA Wetland (in acres):1.2665104, APA Wetland (in acres):1.33784635, APA Wetland (in acres):0.80596187, APA Wetland (in acres):2.31191642, APA Wetland (in acres):0.14664101, APA Wetland (in acres):0.54190766, APA Wetland (in acres):0.37089597, APA Wetland (in acres):0.55721268, APA Wetland (in acres):1.28966872, APA Wetland (in acres):1.83390842, APA Wetland (in acres):0.9355604, APA Wetland (in acres):0.27407738, APA Wetland (in acres):0.41316627, APA Wetland (in acres):0.37432455, APA Wetland (in acres):1.38920545, APA Wetland (in acres):0.35867203, APA Wetland (in acres):0.1619306, APA Wetland (in acres):1.36115911, APA Wetland (in acres):0.73720507, APA Wetland (in acres):0.63016253, APA Wetland (in acres):0.37274925, APA Wetland (in acres):0.1242549, APA Wetland (in acres):0.48752152, APA Wetland (in acres):4.1326897, APA Wetland (in acres):2.81783178, APA Wetland (in acres):0.30088049, APA Wetland (in acres):3.15834936, APA Wetland (in acres):0.45882653, APA Wetland (in acres):1.64958399, APA Wetland (in acres):0.42384581, APA Wetland (in acres):0.24173759, APA Wetland (in acres):0.57013933, APA Wetland (in acres):0.50012385, APA Wetland (in acres):0.33871835, APA Wetland (in acres):0.2844326, APA Wetland (in acres):3.46936112, APA Wetland (in acres):0.51559104, APA Wetland (in acres):1.52953758, APA Wetland (in acres):1.73979253, APA Wetland (in acres):0.62014708, APA Wetland (in acres):0.54571461, APA Wetland (in acres):1.99393168, APA Wetland (in acres):1.12631727, APA Wetland (in acres):1.97217877, APA Wetland (in acres):0.33797703, APA Wetland (in acres):9.61072382, APA Wetland (in acres):1.42821706, APA Wetland (in acres):2.0867271, APA Wetland (in acres):0.76699659, APA Wetland (in acres):0.9157071, APA Wetland (in acres):0.49486516, APA Wetland (in acres):0.33066429, APA Wetland (in acres):0.37044037, APA Wetland (in acres):2.15380822, APA Wetland (in acres):2.50434125, APA Wetland (in acres):0.43595393, APA Wetland (in acres):1.30837915, APA Wetland (in acres):0.36661026, APA Wetland (in acres):0.37403111, APA Wetland (in acres):1.17826324, APA Wetland (in acres):0.79432479, APA Wetland (length in ft):907.29263884, APA Wetland (length in ft):535.72856263
E.2.h.v [Impaired Water Bodies]	No
E.2.i. [Floodway]	Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
E.2.j. [100 Year Floodplain]	Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
E.2.k. [500 Year Floodplain]	Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
E.2.l. [Aquifers]	Yes
E.2.l. [Aquifer Names]	Principal Aquifer
E.2.n. [Natural Communities]	No
E.2.o. [Endangered or Threatened Species]	No

E.2.p. [Rare Plants or Animals]	Yes
E.3.a. [Agricultural District]	No
E.3.c. [National Natural Landmark]	No
E.3.d [Critical Environmental Area]	No
E.3.e. [National Register of Historic Places]	Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
E.3.f. [Archeological Sites]	Yes
E.3.i. [Designated River Corridor]	No

Project : Date :

Part 2 is to be completed by the lead agency. Part 2 is designed to help the lead agency inventory all potential resources that could be affected by a proposed project or action. We recognize that the lead agency's reviewer(s) will not necessarily be environmental professionals. So, the questions are designed to walk a reviewer through the assessment process by providing a series of questions that can be answered using the information found in Part 1. To further assist the lead agency in completing Part 2, the form identifies the most relevant questions in Part 1 that will provide the information needed to answer the Part 2 question. When Part 2 is completed, the lead agency will have identified the relevant environmental areas that may be impacted by the proposed activity.

If the lead agency is a state agency **and** the action is in any Coastal Area, complete the Coastal Assessment Form before proceeding with this assessment.

Tips for completing Part 2:

- Review all of the information provided in Part 1.
- Review any application, maps, supporting materials and the Full EAF Workbook.
- Answer each of the 18 questions in Part 2.
- If you answer “**Yes**” to a numbered question, please complete all the questions that follow in that section.
- If you answer “**No**” to a numbered question, move on to the next numbered question.
- Check appropriate column to indicate the anticipated size of the impact.
- Proposed projects that would exceed a numeric threshold contained in a question should result in the reviewing agency checking the box “Moderate to large impact may occur.”
- The reviewer is not expected to be an expert in environmental analysis.
- If you are not sure or undecided about the size of an impact, it may help to review the sub-questions for the general question and consult the workbook.
- When answering a question consider all components of the proposed activity, that is, the “whole action”.
- Consider the possibility for long-term and cumulative impacts as well as direct impacts.
- Answer the question in a reasonable manner considering the scale and context of the project.

1. Impact on Land			
Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site. (See Part 1. D.1)		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
<i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - j. If “No”, move on to Section 2.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may involve construction on land where depth to water table is less than 3 feet.	E2d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater.	E2f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may involve construction on land where bedrock is exposed, or generally within 5 feet of existing ground surface.	E2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material.	D2a	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases.	D1e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result in increased erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment by herbicides).	D2e, D2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action is, or may be, located within a Coastal Erosion hazard area.	B1i	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: <u>none identified</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Impact on Geological Features

The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g., cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves). (See Part 1. E.2.g)

☐ NO☒ YES

If "Yes", answer questions a - c. If "No", move on to Section 3.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Identify the specific land form(s) attached: _____ Gore Mountain	E2g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may affect or is adjacent to a geological feature listed as a registered National Natural Landmark. Specific feature: _____	E3c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Other impacts: <u>none identified</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Impacts on Surface Water

The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds or lakes). (See Part 1. D.2, E.2.h)

☐ NO☒ YES

If "Yes", answer questions a - l. If "No", move on to Section 4.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may create a new water body.	D2b, D1h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in an increase or decrease of over 10% or more than a 10 acre increase or decrease in the surface area of any body of water.	D2b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may involve dredging more than 100 cubic yards of material from a wetland or water body.	D2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve construction within or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body.	E2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may create turbidity in a waterbody, either from upland erosion, runoff or by disturbing bottom sediments.	D2a, D2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may include construction of one or more intake(s) for withdrawal of water from surface water.	D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may include construction of one or more outfall(s) for discharge of wastewater to surface water(s).	D2d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action may cause soil erosion, or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of receiving water bodies.	D2e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. The proposed action may affect the water quality of any water bodies within or downstream of the site of the proposed action.	E2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The proposed action may involve the application of pesticides or herbicides in or around any water body.	D2q, E2h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The proposed action may require the construction of new, or expansion of existing, wastewater treatment facilities.	D1a, D2d	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I. Other impacts: <u>none identified</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

4. Impact on groundwater The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer. (See Part 1. D.2.a, D.2.c, D.2.d, D.2.p, D.2.q, D.2.t) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 5.</i>			
		<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may require new water supply wells, or create additional demand on supplies from existing water supply wells.	D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Water supply demand from the proposed action may exceed safe and sustainable withdrawal capacity rate of the local supply or aquifer. Cite Source: _____	D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may allow or result in residential uses in areas without water and sewer services.	D1a, D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may include or require wastewater discharged to groundwater.	D2d, E2l	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in the construction of water supply wells in locations where groundwater is, or is suspected to be, contaminated.	D2c, E1f, E1g, E1h	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may require the bulk storage of petroleum or chemical products over ground water or an aquifer.	D2p, E2l	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may involve the commercial application of pesticides within 100 feet of potable drinking water or irrigation sources.	E2h, D2q, E2l, D2c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: <u>none identified</u>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Impact on Flooding The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding. (See Part 1. E.2) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", move on to Section 6.</i>			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in development in a designated floodway.	E2i	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in development within a 100 year floodplain.	E2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in development within a 500 year floodplain.	E2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in, or require, modification of existing drainage patterns.	D2b, D2e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may change flood water flows that contribute to flooding.	D2b, E2i, E2j, E2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. If there is a dam located on the site of the proposed action, is the dam in need of repair, or upgrade?	E1e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--------------------------

6. Impacts on Air The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. (See Part 1. D.2.f., D.2.h, D.2.g) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", move on to Section 7.</i>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur		
a. If the proposed action requires federal or state air emission permits, the action may also emit one or more greenhouse gases at or above the following levels:					
i. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide (CO ₂)	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
ii. More than 3.5 tons/year of nitrous oxide (N ₂ O)	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
iii. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon equivalent of perfluorocarbons (PFCs)	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
iv. More than .045 tons/year of sulfur hexafluoride (SF ₆)	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
v. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide equivalent of hydrochloroflourocarbons (HFCs) emissions	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
vi. 43 tons/year or more of methane	D2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. The proposed action may generate 10 tons/year or more of any one designated hazardous air pollutant, or 25 tons/year or more of any combination of such hazardous air pollutants.	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. The proposed action may require a state air registration, or may produce an emissions rate of total contaminants that may exceed 5 lbs. per hour, or may include a heat source capable of producing more than 10 million BTU's per hour.	D2f, D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
d. The proposed action may reach 50% of any of the thresholds in "a" through "c", above.	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
e. The proposed action may result in the combustion or thermal treatment of more than 1 ton of refuse per hour.	D2s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

7. Impact on Plants and Animals The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. (See Part 1. E.2. m.-q.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 8.</i>				<input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur		
a. The proposed action may cause reduction in population or loss of individuals of any threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2o	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any rare, threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the federal government.	E2o	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. The proposed action may cause reduction in population, or loss of individuals, of any species of special concern or conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2p	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
d. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any species of special concern and conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government.	E2p	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

e. The proposed action may diminish the capacity of a registered National Natural Landmark to support the biological community it was established to protect.	E3c	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result in the removal of, or ground disturbance in, any portion of a designated significant natural community. Source: _____	E2n	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may substantially interfere with nesting/breeding, foraging, or over-wintering habitat for the predominant species that occupy or use the project site.	E2m	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action requires the conversion of more than 10 acres of forest, grassland or any other regionally or locally important habitat. Habitat type & information source: _____	E1b	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Proposed action (commercial, industrial or recreational projects, only) involves use of herbicides or pesticides.	D2q	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Other impacts: <u>none identified</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Impact on Agricultural Resources The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. (See Part 1. E.3.a. and b.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 9.</i>			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System.	E2c, E3b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc).	E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land.	E3b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District.	E1b, E3a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land management system.	E1 a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development potential or pressure on farmland.	C2c, C3, D2c, D2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed project is not consistent with the adopted municipal Farmland Protection Plan.	C2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource. (Part 1. E.1.a, E.1.b, E.3.h.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", go to Section 10.</i>			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Proposed action may be visible from any officially designated federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource.	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the obstruction, elimination or significant screening of one or more officially designated scenic views.	E3h, C2b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may be visible from publicly accessible vantage points: i. Seasonally (e.g., screened by summer foliage, but visible during other seasons) ii. Year round	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
d. The situation or activity in which viewers are engaged while viewing the proposed action is: i. Routine travel by residents, including travel to and from work ii. Recreational or tourism based activities	E3h E2q, E1c	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may cause a diminishment of the public enjoyment and appreciation of the designated aesthetic resource.	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. There are similar projects visible within the following distance of the proposed project: 0-1/2 mile 1/2 -3 mile 3-5 mile 5+ mile	D1a, E1a, D1f, D1g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. (Part 1. E.3.e, f. and g.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 11.</i>			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, any buildings, archaeological site or district which is listed on or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on the State or National Register of Historic Places.	E3e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory.	E3f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an archaeological site not included on the NY SHPO inventory. Source: _____	E3g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If any of the above (a-d) are answered “Moderate to large impact may occur”, continue with the following questions to help support conclusions in Part 3:</p> <p>e.</p> <p>i. The proposed action may result in the destruction or alteration of all or part of the site or property.</p> <p>ii. The proposed action may result in the alteration of the property’s setting or integrity.</p> <p>iii. The proposed action may result in the introduction of visual elements which are out of character with the site or property, or may alter its setting.</p>	<p>E3e, E3g, E3f</p> <p>E3e, E3f, E3g, E1a, E1b</p> <p>E3e, E3f, E3g, E3h, C2, C3</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p>11. Impact on Open Space and Recreation</p> <p>The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan. (See Part 1. C.2.c, E.1.c., E.2.q.) <i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - e. If “No”, go to Section 12.</i></p>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur		
a. The proposed action may result in an impairment of natural functions, or “ecosystem services”, provided by an undeveloped area, including but not limited to stormwater storage, nutrient cycling, wildlife habitat.	D2e, E1b E2h, E2m, E2o, E2n, E2p	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. The proposed action may result in the loss of a current or future recreational resource.	C2a, E1c, C2c, E2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. The proposed action may eliminate open space or recreational resource in an area with few such resources.	C2a, C2c E1c, E2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
d. The proposed action may result in loss of an area now used informally by the community as an open space resource.	C2c, E1c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
e. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

<p>12. Impact on Critical Environmental Areas</p> <p>The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area (CEA). (See Part 1. E.3.d) <i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - c. If “No”, go to Section 13.</i></p>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur		
a. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quantity of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quality of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

13. Impact on Transportation

The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems.

☒ NO

☐ YES

(See Part 1. D.2.j)

If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 14.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network.	D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles.	D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action will degrade existing transit access.	D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action will degrade existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations.	D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people or goods.	D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. Impact on Energy

The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy.

☐ NO

☒ YES

(See Part 1. D.2.k)

If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 15.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action will require a new, or an upgrade to an existing, substation.	D2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action will require the creation or extension of an energy transmission or supply system to serve more than 50 single or two-family residences or to serve a commercial or industrial use.	D1f, D1q, D2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may utilize more than 2,500 MWhrs per year of electricity.	D2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building area when completed.	D1g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other Impacts: none identified _____ _____		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light

The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting.

☒ NO

☐ YES

(See Part 1. D.2.m., n., and o.)

If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 16.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may produce sound above noise levels established by local regulation.	D2m	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in blasting within 1,500 feet of any residence, hospital, school, licensed day care center, or nursing home.	D2m, E1d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in routine odors for more than one hour per day.	D2o	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d. The proposed action may result in light shining onto adjoining properties.	D2n	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in lighting creating sky-glow brighter than existing area conditions.	D2n, E1a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. Impact on Human Health

The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. (See Part 1.D.2.q., E.1. d. f. g. and h.)

☒ NO

☐ YES

If "Yes", answer questions a - m. If "No", go to Section 17.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action is located within 1500 feet of a school, hospital, licensed day care center, group home, nursing home or retirement community.	E1d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The site of the proposed action is currently undergoing remediation.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. There is a completed emergency spill remediation, or a completed environmental site remediation on, or adjacent to, the site of the proposed action.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The site of the action is subject to an institutional control limiting the use of the property (e.g., easement or deed restriction).	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may affect institutional control measures that were put in place to ensure that the site remains protective of the environment and human health.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action has adequate control measures in place to ensure that future generation, treatment and/or disposal of hazardous wastes will be protective of the environment and human health.	D2t	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action involves construction or modification of a solid waste management facility.	D2q, E1f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action may result in the unearthing of solid or hazardous waste.	D2q, E1f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The proposed action may result in an increase in the rate of disposal, or processing, of solid waste.	D2r, D2s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The proposed action may result in excavation or other disturbance within 2000 feet of a site used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste.	E1f, E1g E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The proposed action may result in the migration of explosive gases from a landfill site to adjacent off site structures.	E1f, E1g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. The proposed action may result in the release of contaminated leachate from the project site.	D2s, E1f, D2r	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Other impacts: _____ _____			

17. Consistency with Community Plans

The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans.
(See Part 1. C.1, C.2. and C.3.)

☒ NO☐ YES

If “Yes”, answer questions a - h. If “No”, go to Section 18.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action’s land use components may be different from, or in sharp contrast to, current surrounding land use pattern(s).	C2, C3, D1a E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action will cause the permanent population of the city, town or village in which the project is located to grow by more than 5%.	C2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action is inconsistent with local land use plans or zoning regulations.	C2, C2, C3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action is inconsistent with any County plans, or other regional land use plans.	C2, C2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supported by existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure.	C3, D1c, D1d, D1f, D1d, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action is located in an area characterized by low density development that will require new or expanded public infrastructure.	C4, D2c, D2d D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may induce secondary development impacts (e.g., residential or commercial development not included in the proposed action)	C2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. Consistency with Community Character

The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character.
(See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3)

☒ NO☐ YES

If “Yes”, answer questions a - g. If “No”, proceed to Part 3.

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community.	E3e, E3f, E3g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire)	C4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may displace affordable or low-income housing in an area where there is a shortage of such housing.	C2, C3, D1f D1g, E1a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may interfere with the use or enjoyment of officially recognized or designated public resources.	C2, E3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action is inconsistent with the predominant architectural scale and character.	C2, C3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Proposed action is inconsistent with the character of the existing natural landscape.	C2, C3 E1a, E1b E2g, E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Project : Date :

Full Environmental Assessment Form
Part 3 - Evaluation of the Magnitude and Importance of Project Impacts
and
Determination of Significance

Part 3 provides the reasons in support of the determination of significance. The lead agency must complete Part 3 for every question in Part 2 where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

Based on the analysis in Part 3, the lead agency must decide whether to require an environmental impact statement to further assess the proposed action or whether available information is sufficient for the lead agency to conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact. By completing the certification on the next page, the lead agency can complete its determination of significance.

Reasons Supporting This Determination:

To complete this section:

- Identify the impact based on the Part 2 responses and describe its magnitude. Magnitude considers factors such as severity, size or extent of an impact.
- Assess the importance of the impact. Importance relates to the geographic scope, duration, probability of the impact occurring, number of people affected by the impact and any additional environmental consequences if the impact were to occur.
- The assessment should take into consideration any design element or project changes.
- Repeat this process for each Part 2 question where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.
- Provide the reason(s) why the impact may, or will not, result in a significant adverse environmental impact
- For Conditional Negative Declarations identify the specific condition(s) imposed that will modify the proposed action so that no significant adverse environmental impacts will result.
- Attach additional sheets, as needed.

(1) Construction on steep slopes for such things as trail construction, trail widening and lift construction has the potential for significant impacts to land (erosional soil loss) and to water (sedimentation). The impact potential is exacerbated by the multi-year, multi-phase construction activities that would be proposed under the pending unit management plan amendment.

(2) Expansion of the snowmaking reservoir has the potential for significantly impacting downstream water quality during and after construction. Use of spoils from the reservoir excavation as fill elsewhere within the intensive use area could cause significant impacts similar to those described in (1) above.

(3) The project site is located over a principal aquifer. Adding additional underground petroleum storage has the potential for causing significant localized impacts to groundwater.

(4) Bicknell's thrush is a species of special concern in New York State and portions of the intensive use area are within a State-designated Bird Conservation Area. Construction activities in and around areas of Bicknell's thrush breeding and/or nesting could have a significant impact on this species.

Determination of Significance - Type 1 and Unlisted Actions

SEQR Status: ☒ Type 1 ☐ Unlisted

Identify portions of EAF completed for this Project: ☒ Part 1 ☒ Part 2 ☒ Part 3

Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF, as noted, plus this additional support information

and considering both the magnitude and importance of each identified potential impact, it is the conclusion of the
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority as lead agency that:

☐ A. This project will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environment, and, therefore, an environmental impact statement need not be prepared. Accordingly, this negative declaration is issued.

☐ B. Although this project could have a significant adverse impact on the environment, that impact will be avoided or substantially mitigated because of the following conditions which will be required by the lead agency:

There will, therefore, be no significant adverse impacts from the project as conditioned, and, therefore, this conditioned negative declaration is issued. A conditioned negative declaration may be used only for UNLISTED actions (see 6 NYCRR 617.d).

☒ C. This Project may result in one or more significant adverse impacts on the environment, and an environmental impact statement must be prepared to further assess the impact(s) and possible mitigation and to explore alternatives to avoid or reduce those impacts. Accordingly, this positive declaration is issued.

Name of Action: Gore Mountain Intensive Use Area 2017 Unit Management Plan (UMP) Amendment

Name of Lead Agency: NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority

Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency: Robert Hammond

Title of Responsible Officer: Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency:



Date:

11/15/17

Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

Date:

For Further Information:

Contact Person: Robert Hammond

Address: Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction

Telephone Number: (518) 302-5332

E-mail: bhammond@orda.org

For Type 1 Actions and Conditioned Negative Declarations, a copy of this Notice is sent to:

Chief Executive Officer of the political subdivision in which the action will be principally located (e.g., Town / City / Village of)

Other involved agencies (if any)

Applicant (if any)

Environmental Notice Bulletin: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/enb/enb.html>

PRINT FULL FORM

Appendix 2
ORDA/NYSDEC Consolidation Agreement

AGREEMENT CONSOLIDATING THE
MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS FOR THE GORE MOUNTAIN SKI CENTER, THE
WHITEFACE MOUNTAIN SKI CENTER AND MEMORIAL HIGHWAY, AND THE
MOUNT VAN HOEVENBERG RECREATION AREA

THIS CONSOLIDATION AGREEMENT is made by and between the NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION ("DEPARTMENT") and the OLYMPIC REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ("ORDA").

RECITALS:

A. The DEPARTMENT and ORDA, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2614 of the Public Authorities Law, entered into an agreement dated April 1, 1984, authorizing ORDA to use, operate, maintain and manage the Gore Mountain Ski Center Area, and entered into an agreement dated October 4, 1982, authorizing ORDA to use, operate, maintain and manage the Whiteface Mountain Ski Center and Memorial Highway, and the Mount Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area (hereinafter referred to collectively as "the Agreements");

B. The parties previously amended the Agreements several times, with the last amendment occurring on June 12, 2013;

C. The parties also entered into a Memorandum of Understanding effective December 15, 1984, that established methods and procedures to implement the foregoing Agreements (hereinafter "MOU"), and amended the MOU on March 11, 1991; and

D. The parties find it in their mutual interests to consolidate the Agreements and make other amendments necessary for their implementation.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereby agree as follows:

1. Except as otherwise specified in this Consolidation Agreement, all terms and conditions of the Agreements as amended are hereby ratified and affirmed, and shall remain in full force and effect. Copies of the Agreements are attached hereto as Attachment 1, and a copy of the MOU is attached hereto as Attachment 2. In the event of any conflict between the Agreements and this Consolidated Agreement, this Consolidated Agreement shall control.

2. Section 10 of the April 1, 1984 agreement relating to management of the Gore Mountain Ski Center Area, and Section 11 of the October 4, 1982 agreement relating to management of the Whiteface Mountain Ski Center and Memorial Highway, and the Mount Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area, which pertain to unit management planning are amended to read as follows:

“Unit Management Plans.

A. General Guidelines

- (1) In consultation with the DEPARTMENT, ORDA shall prepare and periodically amend Unit Management Plans (“UMP”) for the facilities at the Gore Mountain Ski Center Area, Whiteface Mountain Ski Center and Memorial Highway, and the Mount Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area (“Facilities”), which ORDA manages pursuant to this agreement, as outlined in Section I, Introduction, Unit Management Plan Development of the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan (“APSLMP”). The UMPs will contain an inventory of the natural resources, Facilities and public use of the Facilities; establish goals and objectives for the future use and management of the Facilities; evaluate alternative plans for the provision

and management of public use of the Facilities and an assessment of the environmental impacts of each alternative; establish preferred management options for the Facilities in fulfillment with ORDA's legislative mandate through a procedure involving the participation of interested citizens, user groups and adjacent local governments; describe the specific management goals and policies which are incorporated in the preferred management plan; describe any specific physical development or improvement projects required by the UMP, including a priority schedule for the completion of each project and estimated costs thereof; provide a priority schedule for the removal and/or termination of any non-conforming uses; and describe procedures for the continued monitoring of the UMP's implementation. A UMP cannot amend the APSLMP and as finally adopted shall be in conformance with the general guidelines and criteria of the APSLMP. Any issues with respect to conformance of a proposed UMP with the APSLMP will be resolved and any necessary amendments to the APSLMP acted on prior to ORDA providing the DEPARTMENT with a proposed Final UMP to pass on to Adirondack Park Agency ("Agency") for final review.

- (2) Annually, ORDA shall provide the DEPARTMENT with a schedule for the preparation and/or revision of any UMP or UMP amendment proposed to be undertaken by ORDA with respect to any of the Facilities and shall promptly advise the DEPARTMENT of any changes thereto.

- (3) To identify significant issues and constraints, scheduling, data needs, and public involvement, ORDA will consult with the DEPARTMENT prior to undertaking the preparation of a UMP or UMP amendment.

B. Staff Consultation

ORDA will consult with the DEPARTMENT in the preparation and/or revision of a UMP as follows:

- (1) ORDA will provide written notification to the DEPARTMENT before the development of a written draft of a UMP update and/or amendment is prepared and will not undertake the preparation and/or revision of any UMP without written notice to the DEPARTMENT of the intent to do so.
- (2) The Regional Director of the DEPARTMENT's Region 5 office in Ray Brook or the Director's designee shall be the DEPARTMENT's contact for formal communications between ORDA and the DEPARTMENT.
- (3) ORDA's President/CEO or the President/CEO's designee will be the contact for formal communications between ORDA and the DEPARTMENT.
- (4) ORDA shall request the official designation of a representative of the DEPARTMENT to assist ORDA with preparation and/or revision of UMPs. The DEPARTMENT will ask the Agency to designate a representative to assist ORDA with preparation and/or revision of UMPs.
- (5) To assist the planning team in the development of individual UMPs, ORDA shall send drafts to the DEPARTMENT and consult with the DEPARTMENT on conformance issues.

- (6) The DEPARTMENT will participate in planning team discussions, review preliminary UMP drafts, and comment on UMP text and proposed management actions.
- (7) ORDA staff will consult with the DEPARTMENT during the drafting of UMPs and UMP Amendments. DEPARTMENT staff will review preliminary draft UMPs and provide comment on SLMP conformance issues. This internal, informal, deliberative process is ordinarily exempt from the Freedom of Information Law (FOIL).
- (8) DEPARTMENT staff will participate in public information sessions and conduct field inspections with the planning teams.
- (9) In the preparation of UMPs, ORDA will normally serve as lead agency for State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR), and the DEPARTMENT and the Agency will participate in the SEQR process as involved agencies.

C. UMP Review

INITIAL DRAFT UMP:

- (1) ORDA will provide DEPARTMENT with fourteen review copies of an internal "Initial Draft" of the UMP or UMP amendment for the Facilities, including alternative management objectives, where appropriate, for review and comment, prior to the completion of a draft plan for public review (the "Public Draft"). The DEPARTMENT will provide seven of the drafts to the Agency for review. The DEPARTMENT will work with ORDA to best ensure that the fourteen review copies are distributed on a media such as CD's and Data Sticks, so that ORDA complies with the

intent and the spirit of Executive Order No. 4: Establishing a State Green Procurement and Agency Sustainability Program (2008).

- (2) The Initial Draft UMP will contain all the elements specified in the APSLMP, including all required inventories, statement of alternative management objectives, administrative actions, schedules for UMP implementation and all information, text, maps and appendices which are intended for inclusion in the Public Draft.
- (3) The DEPARTMENT shall be the primary contact with the Agency, with assistance from ORDA as requested by the DEPARTMENT, with respect to any UMPs for the Facilities, utilizing applicable provisions set forth in the UMP section of the March, 2010 Memorandum of Understanding between the Agency and the DEPARTMENT concerning implementation of the APSLMP or any such subsequent MOU.

PUBLIC DRAFT UMP:

- (1) The Public Draft which ORDA provides to the DEPARTMENT for release by the DEPARTMENT for public review and comment will contain appropriate SEQRA documents.
- (2) ORDA will provide copies of the Public Draft to the DEPARTMENT for release to Agency members, the Agency's Executive Director and the Agency's State Land staff. Upon release of the Public Draft, DEPARTMENT staff, with assistance from ORDA staff as requested, will

provide a presentation to the Agency on the proposed management actions contained in the Public Draft and provide a written submission to the Agency discussing the DEPARTMENT's position on key APSLMP conformance issues.

- (3) If the initially released Public Draft is revised, subsequent drafts will be entitled "Revised Public Draft" and dated appropriately.

FINAL UMP:

- (1) After completion of public review and comment on a UMP, ORDA shall prepare a response to public comments, necessary SEQR documentation and a proposed Final UMP, and provide them to the DEPARTMENT. After the Commissioner of the DEPARTMENT ("Commissioner") approves the proposed Final UMP, the DEPARTMENT will transmit the proposed Final UMP to the Agency.
- (2) The proposed Final UMP will be in a form proposed for approval by the Commissioner.
- (3) DEPARTMENT staff, with such assistance from ORDA staff as may be requested, will make a presentation on the proposed Final UMP to the Agency as a "first reading" and prior to formal approval by the Agency for APSLMP conformance.
- (4) Following the conformance determination by the Agency and subsequent approval of a UMP by the Commissioner, the DEPARTMENT shall

publish a notice of approval of the Final UMP in the Environmental Notice Bulletin.

- (5) The approved UMP shall contain a copy of the Agency resolution on APSLMP conformance and the Commissioner's approval memorandum. A copy of the Final UMP as approved by the Commissioner will be provided by the DEPARTMENT to ORDA and the Agency for their respective files.


D. UMP Amendments

Any modification involving new or expanded improvements to an adopted UMP prior to the periodic five-year update must be processed as an Amendment to the UMP following the procedure for original UMP preparation set forth above."

3. This Consolidation Agreement shall commence on the date it is signed by both parties and shall remain in effect for a term of twenty years.
4. The MOU as amended on March 11, 1991, shall remain in full force and effect and shall not be affected by this Consolidation Agreement, except that in the case of any inconsistency between this Consolidation Agreement and the MOU concerning unit management planning this Consolidation Agreement shall control.


IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused these present to be signed.


NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

BY: 
Joseph J. Martens
Commissioner

10/30/13
Date

OLYMPIC REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

BY: 
Ted Blazer
President and CEO

11-17-13
Date 

EDMS #471942 v. 7

FIRST AMENDMENT TO CONSOLIDATION AGREEMENT
(DEC No.CA00488)

THIS AGREEMENT is made by and between the NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION ("DEPARTMENT") and the OLYMPIC REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ("ORDA").

A. WHEREAS, the DEPARTMENT has administrative jurisdiction over the Gore Mountain Ski Center Area, the Whiteface Mountain Ski Center and Memorial Highway, and the Mount Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area;

B. WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of Public Authorities Law Section 2614, the DEPARTMENT entered into various cooperative agreements authorizing ORDA to use, operate, maintain and manage these facilities;

C. WHEREAS, by instrument dated November 11, 2013, the parties consolidated their various agreements concerning ORDA's use, operation, maintenance, and management of Gore Mountain Ski Center Area, Whiteface Mountain Ski Center and Memorial Highway, and the Mount Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area (hereinafter referred to as "Consolidation Agreement");

D. WHEREAS, the Parties may by mutual agreement amend the Consolidation Agreement pursuant to the underlying agreements;

E. WHEREAS, the Consolidation Agreement has a term of 20 years, and will expire November 11, 2033; and

F. WHEREAS, the parties have determined it is in their interest to amend the Consolidation Agreement by extending its term to 25 years.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereby agree as follows:

1. Section three of the Consolidation Agreement is amended to provide that it shall terminate on December 31, 2040, unless modified in writing by the parties.
2. All other terms all terms and conditions of the Consolidation Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused these present to be signed.

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

BY:




Joseph J. Martens
Commissioner

6/18/2015

Date

OLYMPIC REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

BY:



Ted Blazer
President and CEO

6-23-15

Date

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

BETWEEN

THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION


AND

THE OLYMPIC REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION ("DEC") and THE OLYMPIC REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ("ORDA") entered into the following agreements in connection with the transfer of the management of certain winter recreational facilities under DEC's care and custody, to ORDA:

1. Agreement dated October 4, 1982, amended November 10, 1982 and amended April 1, 1984, in relation to Whiteface Mountain Ski Center and Memorial Highway, and Mt. Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area, and
2. Agreement dated April 1, 1984, in relation to Gore Mountain Ski Center.

There are a number of provisions in the aforesaid agreements requiring that certain specific actions be taken from time-to-time by the parties, including compliance by ORDA with all applicable laws and implementing regulations, whether federal, state or local, in all its activities relating to the facilities subject to the aforesaid agreements. The purpose of this memorandum is to establish mutually agreeable methods and procedures by which certain managerial requirements contained in the aforesaid agreements



can be fulfilled in an orderly and efficient manner. It is the further purpose of this memorandum to establish the means for the implementation of the Unit Management Plans described in Section VII. hereof.

It shall be the responsibility of the signatories or their designees to generally administer the provisions of this Memorandum of Understanding. This memorandum amends and supersedes that certain existing Memorandum of Understanding between DEC and ORDA effective December 15, 1984, which established mutually agreeable methods and procedures for implementation of the aforesaid agreements between DEC and ORDA relating to Whiteface Mountain Ski Center and Memorial Highway, Mt. Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area and Gore Mountain Ski Center.

The aforesaid requirements contained in the aforesaid agreements are set forth below, together with the methods and procedures to be followed for their implementation. Compliance with this memorandum and the individual Unit Management Plans for the above facilities shall occur immediately.

I. Inspections:

ORDA agrees to conduct a joint inspection of all facilities at least annually with the DEC. The ORDA also agrees that the DEC may conduct unannounced inspections of the facilities at any time in a reasonable manner.

Implementation:

Annually, during the month of July, joint inspections will be held at each of the facilities covered by the aforesaid agreements. The purpose of inspections shall be to document, in writing, compliance with all aspects of the agreements and with the aforesaid unit management plans. While the agreements allow for unannounced inspections, the parties shall enter into this agreement in the spirit of cooperation. DEC shall contact the ORDA Environmental Monitor and the Facility Manager to accompany the DEC staff only in connection with any non-regulatory or non-enforcement inspections of the facilities other than the annual inspection. Such non-regulatory or non-enforcement inspections, however, shall not be delayed due to the unavailability of said ORDA individuals. In the event of an emergency situation involving a non-regulatory or non-enforcement matter, said ORDA personnel shall also be contacted to the extent practicable. In ORDA's case, the annual inspection and non-regulatory or non-enforcement inspections will be conducted by the Facility Manager and ORDA's Environmental Monitor. In DEC's case, all annual joint inspections will be coordinated by the Region 5 Supervisor of Natural Resources; all non-regulatory or non-enforcement inspections shall

be coordinated by the appropriate DEC program supervisor.

II. Maintenance:

ORDA agrees to maintain and keep the facilities, personal property and equipment in good repair. All mechanical equipment shall be maintained and operated in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations and applicable industrial code rules.

Implementation:

This will be discussed during the annual inspection trips. A paragraph in the inspection letter will reference compliance with this section. In the case of personal property and equipment, this provision means such personal property and equipment owned by DEC, and not such personal property and equipment independently acquired by ORDA.

III. Repairs:

ORDA also agrees to undertake any repairs or manner of repairs to the facilities, personal property and equipment which the DEC specifically requests, so long as the funds therefor are made available to ORDA.

Implementation:

Any requests from DEC to ORDA shall be in writing at the time of request. During the annual inspection trip, if there are projects that were requested during the previous year, their completion should be referenced in the inspection letter.

IV. Public Recreation:

ORDA agrees to continue providing the space, facilities and level of public recreation, including youth sports, training, promotion and programming, which were provided by DEC at each facility during calendar year 1981.

Implementation:

The Appendix/Exhibit listing the Recreation Program (See Appendix B of the aforesaid Whiteface Mountain Ski Center/Mt. Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area agreement, and Exhibit 3 of the aforesaid Gore Mountain Ski Center agreement.) will be reviewed during the annual inspection trip and a note of compliance will be placed in the inspection letter.

V. Existing Agreements:

ORDA agrees to comply with all agreements to which DEC is a party concerning the facilities which were in existence on the date on which this Agreement was executed.

Implementation:

Each agreement listed in the Appendix/Exhibit (See Appendix C of the aforesaid Whiteface Mountain Ski Center/Mt. Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area agreement, and Exhibit 4 of the aforesaid Gore Mountain Ski Center agreement.) will be reviewed during the annual inspection trip and will be referenced in the inspection letter.

VI. Capital Improvements:

The DEC agrees that ORDA may undertake capital improvements to the facilities. ORDA agrees to obtain the prior written approval of DEC before undertaking any such improvements, and further agrees, if federal funds are to be sought for such improvement, to obtain the prior written approval of DEC of any application for such funds.

Implementation:

The Commissioner or his designee shall give written approval to each year's capital projects affecting

DEC's facilities before Board approval is obtained. Such action constitutes approval, within budget, to commence the project development process, including planning and design, Unit Management Plan planning, State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR) review, obtaining applicable regulatory approvals, and public bidding, etc., as necessary. ORDA shall also request prior written approval from the Commissioner or his designee for any federal funds sought to undertake such capital improvements. During the annual inspection trip, each capital improvement completed shall be listed in the inspection letter.

VII. Unit Management Plans:

Unit Management Plans, together with Final Environmental Impact Statements, were prepared by ORDA and DEC, in consultation with the APA, and adopted by the Commissioner of Environmental Conservation for the Mount Van Hoevenberg Recreation Area on December 2, 1986; the Whiteface Mountain Ski Center on May 19, 1987; and the Gore Mountain Ski Center on November 18, 1987.

Implementation:

A. ORDA will provide DEC with specific notice prior to undertaking any management actions described in a

Unit Management Plan or in an amendment thereto for determination of consistency with the applicable Unit Management Plan. (See Appendix I for Unit Management Plan amendment process). Such notice shall be given at least 30 days prior to the actual undertaking of construction of the management action. Such notice will include a project plan, the appropriate environmental assessment as may be required under SEQR, an erosion control plan for any projects that may result in disturbance of soils, together with the declaration of significance. It is understood that DEC will be an "involved agency" concerning these actions throughout the SEQR process.

B. ORDA shall comply with all formal DEC policies or delegations affecting Unit Management Plan compliance by DEC.

C. The Unit Management Plans provide that the cutting of trees associated with the implementation of management actions will be in accordance with the established policies and procedures of the Commissioner of Environmental Conservation (See Appendix II - Organization and Delegation Memorandum #84-06, as amended). The DEC procedures will be initiated by the Regional Forestry Manager for DEC upon notice by the ORDA facility manager

that tree cutting is contemplated in conjunction with a management action. The Regional Forestry Manager will inform the ORDA facility manager within five working days, in writing, as to whether the cutting may proceed or that notice will be required in the Environmental Notice Bulletin ("ENB") and that the cutting will be reviewed pursuant to the DEC tree cutting policy. Should notice be required, ORDA will provide DEC with the appropriate ENB notice including the designated contact person. The DEC will then complete the notice requirements and inform ORDA as to the decision in writing upon completion of the review process. It is agreed that Environmental Notice Bulletin publication and DEC review will not be required in cases where the tree cutting was specifically described in the detail required by the DEC policy in the Unit Management Plan and noticed in the ENB in the process of adoption of the Unit Management Plan or an amendment thereto. Such notice must include a count of the number of trees to be removed which exceed three inches in diameter and the acreage of land involved. Nor will such notice and review be required where a tree cut could constitute a "Type II Action" under the DEC rules and regulations governing the

implementation of SEQR (6 NYCRR 618.2). Any trees cut in accordance with this section can be removed from the premises in any manner deemed feasible by ORDA so long as such method is consistent with the guidelines of the State Land Master Plan, the Unit Management Plan, Article 8 of the ECL, and Division Direction Memorandum LF-84-2 dated May 31, 1984 and LF-84-2 Supplement dated July 3, 1986. (See Appendix III).

D. A new structure or improvement not described in a Unit Management Plan, or in an amendment to a Unit Management Plan, cannot be undertaken or constructed. This provision, however, does not prevent ORDA from undertaking the construction of the following activities, provided that all conditions in Items A, B, and C above are fully complied with and implemented.

1. Ordinary maintenance, rehabilitation and minor relocation of conforming structures or improvements as defined and interpreted in the DEC-APA Memorandum of Understanding governing implementation of the State Land Master Plan (SLMP), as last amended on April 3, 1985.

2. A change in the use of a structure or improvement as described in a Unit Management Plan that is not inconsistent with the guidelines and criteria of the SLMP for intensive use areas,

3. Any facility or structure that is listed as a Type II Action in the DEC rules and regulations governing the implementation of SEQR (6 NYCRR 618.2) and, in particular, the construction and location of single, small, new or existing facilities or structures where the total area of the structure or expansion does not exceed 400 square feet and the surroundings are returned to their original condition after the construction/installation of the structure or facility.

4. Any project consisting solely of the cutting of not more than ten (10) trees more than 3 inches in diameter at breast height.

5. Any action deemed immediately necessary to insure public health or safety. In such cases DEC will be immediately notified of the situation and what the proposed or ongoing action consists of.

E. The Unit Management Plans will be administered on a day-to-day basis by the Environmental Monitor for ORDA and the Region 5 Supervisor of Natural Resources for DEC. Notification of project

implementation, concerns dealing with potential environmental problems, requests for change in preapproved action plans, need for Unit Management Plan amendment and other similar communication will all take place between the Environmental Monitor for ORDA and the Region 5 Supervisor of Natural Resources for DEC. Agreements made by these individuals will be binding on both agencies. If agreement cannot be reached on a specific issue, the issue will be elevated in the respective agencies for resolution.

VIII. Removal of Property and Equipment:

No part of any facility, nor personal property or equipment of DEC used in connection therewith, shall be sold or removed from the facility without the prior written approval of DEC.

Implementation:

DEC currently maintains a computer program for the inventory of property. All DEC equipment transferred to ORDA is part of that inventory. DEC shall supply appropriate forms to ORDA and ORDA will advise DEC via the forms when equipment is surplus, destroyed or when new DEC equipment is acquired. DEC shall maintain the inventory and shall annually certify with ORDA that the list is

correct. Lead role in DEC for the above items is vested in the Division of Operations Central Office..

This Memorandum of Understanding will become effective upon its execution by each of the parties hereto.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

BY: Thomas C. Jozling
Thomas C. Jozling, Commissioner

Date March 11, 1991

OLYMPIC REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

BY: Ned Harkness
Ned Harkness, President, C.E.O.

Date March 8, 1991

APPENDIX I

REVISION/AMENDMENT TO UNIT MANAGEMENT PLANS

1. Any material modification or amendment to the unit management plans is to conform to the guidelines and criteria of the SLMP, and will be made following the same procedure prescribed in the master plan for original unit management plan preparation.
2. A proposed amendment will be presented in its complete form and content, including indication of the specific sections of the existing management plan being amended, and be accompanied by:
 - (A) An evaluation of whether or not the proposed amendment will require a reexamination of the inventory and assessment section of the plan.
 - (B) If the amendment represents a departure from the goals and objectives stated in the plan, a discussion of impacts of the new objectives on facilities, public use and resources of the unit.
 - (C) An assessment of whether or not the proposed amendment is consistent with carrying capacity of the area.
 - (D) A schedule for the implementation of proposed management actions.

Any action to amend a unit management plan in connection with a proposed management action is to be initiated no later than the required site-specific environmental assessment pursuant to SEQR.

3. Consistent with the DEC-ORDA management agreements, ORDA and DEC will cooperate and provide such staff assistance as may be necessary in the preparation of amendments to the unit management plans. Both agencies will designate an appropriate representative to be the lead contact person in the matter. Division of Responsibility shall be as follows.

ORDA -

Develop and make appropriate revisions, in response to comments, to all documents. These will include the actual plan and accompanying SEQR.

Provide for public comment including hearings/meetings. Make a record of comments and responses.

Print and distribute all draft and final documents.

Present draft documents to designated DEC contact for DEC review, including the SEQR committee, posting in the Environmental Notice Bulletin, APA review and DEC Commission's final approval.

DEC -

Provide assistance to designated ORDA representative on format and procedure.

Coordinate APA review and comments.

Coordinate DEC review, comments and final approval.

Coordinate all notices in the ENB.

APPENDIX II

File Ref. 1620

MEMORANDUM FROM
HENRY G. WILLIAMS, Commissioner

New York State
Department of Environmental Conservation

RECEIVED

FEB 22 1984

February 16, 1984 Environmental Conservation
Regional Director - Region 5
EAT BROOK, NEW YORK

TO: Executive Staff, Division and Regional Directors
FROM: Hank Williams *Hank Williams*
RE: ORGANIZATION AND DELEGATION MEMORANDUM #84-06

Purpose:

To establish a policy regarding the prohibition of cutting, removal or destruction of trees and other vegetation on all Forest Preserve lands pursuant to Article XIV of the Constitution of New York State.

Background:

Article XIV of the Constitution specifically states that the timber on the Forest Preserve shall not "...be sold, removed or destroyed." Over the years it has been necessary to occasionally cut trees in the interest of public safety, overall protection of the Preserve and for the development of facilities. Such cutting has been sanctioned through Constitutional Amendment or by Opinion of the Attorney General, who has interpreted the Constitution as allowing such cutting.

Policy:

Section 9-0105 of the Environmental Conservation Law provides that the Division of Lands and Forests has responsibility for the "care, custody and control" of the Adirondack and the Catskill Forest Preserve. In accordance with this responsibility, all construction of new facilities, expansion or modification of existing facilities and maintenance of facilities, that will result in the cutting, removal or destruction of vegetation on any of the lands constituting the Forest Preserve shall require approval of the Director of the Division of Lands and Forests in accordance with the following Procedure. However, under no circumstances will approval be granted for the cutting of trees for firewood, timber or other forest products purposes.

Procedure:

A. Construction of New Facilities and the Expansion or Modification of Existing Facilities

All projects that involve the cutting, removal or destruction of trees or other vegetation in the Forest Preserve must have approval from the Director of the Division of Lands and Forests to be applied for in the following manner:

1. Regional Facilities

Requests for approval will be submitted by the Regional Director to the Director of the Division of Lands and Forests

2. Non-Regionalized Facilities

Requests for approval will be submitted by the Director of the Division responsible for the facility to the Director of the Division of Lands and Forests

Requests for approval to cut, remove or destroy trees for the purpose of new construction, expansion or modification projects must be submitted in writing and include the following information:

- The location of the project including a map delineating the project
- A description of the project and its purpose
- A count, by species, of all trees to be cut, removed or destroyed
- A delineation of areas where vegetation, in addition to trees three inches or more in diameter, is to be disturbed
- A listing of any protected species of vegetation located within three hundred feet of the area to be disturbed during the project
- A description of measures to be taken to mitigate the impact on and restoration of vegetation, if appropriate, to the area impacted

All decisions to approve any cutting, removal or destruction of trees will be subject to individual SEQR determinations.

B. Routine Maintenance

Responsibility for approval of all routine maintenance projects involving the cutting, removal or destruction of trees or other vegetation is delegated to the Regional Forester for the region in which the project is to occur.

Routine maintenance projects include the following activities:

- Maintenance of foot trails, cross-country ski trails, etc., including "the cutting of the few trees necessary...." (1934 A.G. 268 January 18, 1934.)
- Boundary line surveys and the maintenance of such boundary lines as "an aid to the conservation work of the State...where the number of small trees utilized or removed...appear immaterial (1934 A.G. 309 September 20, 1934.)
- Removal of "dead timber, either standing or fallen...for fuel at the public camp sites...." (1934 A.G. 315 October 30, 1934.)
- Maintenance of scenic vistas along trails when "tree removal may not be sufficient to pass the point of immateriality." (1935 A.G. 274 January 17, 1935.)
- Removal of dead and hazardous trees in developed areas such as campgrounds and ski centers "that endanger people." (1935 A.G. 306 June 26, 1935.)
- Salvage of windfall timber when "such blowdown timber constitutes a fire hazard." (1950 A.G. 154 December 28, 1950.)

1. Regional Facilities

Requests for approval of routine maintenance projects will be made to the Regional Supervisor for Natural Resources who will direct them to the Regional Forester.

2. Non-Regionalized Facilities

Requests for approval of routine maintenance projects will be made by the facility manager to the Regional Director of the Region in which the facility is located, who will direct them to the Regional Forester.


Requests for approval of routine maintenance projects should be submitted in writing as soon in advance of the date of beginning of the maintenance work as possible and include a description of the project and its location. If prior written or verbal approval cannot be obtained, hazardous trees involving imminent danger to human safety or damage to facilities may be removed without prior approval. However, such action must be reported within 24 hours following removal of the tree(s).

MEMORANDUM FROM
HENRY G. WILLIAMS, Director

Secretary of Environmental Conservation

July 29, 1986

TO: Executive Staff, Division and Regional Directors

FROM: Hank Williams 

SUBJECT: Organization and Delegation Memorandum #84-06: Addendum

Background:

The above memorandum was promulgated on February 16, 1984 "To establish a policy regarding the prohibition of cutting, removal or destruction of trees and other vegetation on all Forest Preserve lands pursuant to Article XIV of the Constitution of New York State."

Since that time it has come to our attention that the procedures established in the memorandum do not include provision for adequate notice to the public as to the number of trees proposed to be cut and the size of the land area involved on specific projects.

Amendment:

Therefore, Part A. under Procedure of Memorandum #84-06 is amended and expanded by the addition of the following paragraph at the end of such Part A. on page 2. of such Memorandum.

Any construction or reconstruction activity involving land under the jurisdiction of the Department of Environmental Conservation within the Adirondack or the Catskill Park-- regardless of the classification of such land--that is a Type I action or otherwise requires notice in the Environmental Notice Bulletin will include information in such notice as to the (1) acreage or extent of the land area proposed to be involved and (2) number of trees in excess of three inches stump diameter proposed to be cut, removed or destroyed. A copy of such notice as it appeared in such Bulletin (with the date of the Bulletin noted) will be included and made a part of the information constituting the "request for approval" just above described.

APPENDIX III

MEMORANDUM

July 3, 1986

TO: Chief, Bureau of Preserve Protection and Management
Regional Supervisors for Natural Resources

FROM: Norman J. VanValkenburgh

SUBJECT: DIVISION DIRECTION -- LF-84-2 Supplement
TOPIC: Cutting, Removal or Destruction
of Trees and Other Vegetation on
Forest Preserve Lands

As you will recall, Commissioner Williams promulgated Organization and Delegation Memorandum #84-06 on February 16, 1984 for the purpose of "...establish(ing) a policy regarding the prohibition of cutting, removal or destruction of trees and other vegetation on all Forest Preserve lands pursuant to Article XIV of the Constitution of New York State." In order to implement the provisions of #84-06, this Division issued procedures on May 31, 1984 under designation LF-84-2.

However, the question of whether or not live-standing trees could be cut and used for maintenance of trails including "the construction of structures such as foot bridges, dry tread and water bars" remained. Accordingly, an opinion on this question was formally requested of the Attorney General on November 8, 1985. A copy of such request is attached hereto for information and clarification purposes.

A reply from the Attorney General under date of June 24, 1986 has now been received. A copy of such Formal Opinion No. 86-F1, which allows for the "supervised selective cutting...of only those few scattered trees necessary for the maintenance of popular and steep trails to lessen soil compaction, erosion and the destruction of vegetation" within other specified constraints and parameters, is attached and made a part of this memorandum.

With Formal Opinion No. 86-F3 in hand, it is appropriate to now revise Division Direction-LF-84-2 to incorporate those added authorities. Accordingly, paragraph 1 (page 4) of Part II of LF-84-2 is hereby deleted and the following substituted therefor:

1. Maintenance of foot trails, snowmobile trails, cross-country ski trails, horse trails.

This includes projects that involve blowdown removal, hazard tree elimination (3" or more in diameter), problem tree removal (3" or more in diameter), mowing, etc.

Applications may be submitted by Area if appropriate (i.e., High Peaks Wilderness Area, St. Regis Canoe Area, Saranac Lake Wild Forest, Whiteface Mountain Intensive Use Area, etc.). Trails should be listed separately with the total length of the trail covered by a single Application, if appropriate, and in priority order of needed maintenance.

Live-standing trees may be cut or used for the construction of bridges, dry tread, waterbars or other minor trail structures only after considering the following alternatives and in accordance with the following conditions:


- A. Alternatives to any type of trail hardening or structural development must be considered, especially in wilderness areas where such structures diminish the character of the area. Such alternatives include the closing or limitation of use of a trail where the impact of such use is leading to degradation of the other resources and the character of the Forest Preserve. A second alternative is to relocate the trail in such a way that trail hardening would not be necessary.
- B. If, after considering the above alternatives, it is determined that structures are needed to protect the surface of the trail or the safety of the public, the following materials should be considered in order of priority:
 1. Native rock or stone from near the site.
 2. Native rock or stone from another location brought to the site.
 3. Peeled, but untreated timber or logs from another location brought to the site.

4. On-site trees in accordance with the conditions under C. following.

C. If on-site trees are to be used, such use must be in accordance with the following conditions:

1. The Regional Forester or his designated representative must approve all trees to be cut, after considering any other previous cutting that has been done in the area.
2. Cutting must be discreet with tops fully lopped and dispersed out of sight of the trails, and with stumps cut flush to the ground.
3. Live trees must be between three to twelve inches in diameter (DBH), and must be at least 100 feet apart.
4. Structures requiring the use of live on-site trees are not to be replaced more frequently than 7-10 years, which is the range of normal life expectancy.

Dead and downed material may be used for such purposes although consideration must be given to human safety and the longevity or life of such structures when such material is used.


Director of Lands and Forests

Attachments

cc: D. Grant
H. Doig
J. Corr
G. Colvin
G. Sovas
K. Wich
R. Bernhard
Regional Directors
Bureaus of Fish and Wildlife
Bureaus of Lands and Forests
Bureaus of Marine Resources
Bureaus of Mineral Resources

MEMORANDUM

May 31, 1984

TO: Chief, Bureau of Preserve Protection and Management
Regional Supervisors for Natural Resources

FROM: Norman J. Vanvalkenburgh

SUBJECT: DIVISION DIRECTION — LF-84-2.

TOPIC: Cutting, Removal or Destruction of Trees and Other
Vegetation on Forest Preserve Lands

PURPOSE: The purpose of this memorandum is to establish administrative procedures for the implementation of Commissioner Williams' Organization and Delegation Memorandum #84-06 relating to the construction of new facilities, the expansion or modification of existing facilities and routine maintenance projects on lands of the Forest Preserve.

FACTS AND ANALYSIS: Such Organization and Delegation Memorandum states, in part: "Section 9-0105 of the Environmental Conservation Law provides that the Division of Lands and Forests has responsibility for the 'care, custody and control' of the Adirondack and the Catskill Forest Preserve. In accordance with this responsibility, all construction of new facilities, expansion or modification of existing facilities and maintenance of facilities, that will result in the cutting, removal or destruction of vegetation on any of the lands constituting the Forest Preserve shall require approval of the Director of the Division of Lands and Forests..." In order to carry out this direction and policy, the succeeding procedures will be followed by regional and non-regionalized personnel in requesting approval for such projects on lands of the Forest Preserve that involve the cutting, removal and/or destruction of vegetation. In all cases, the provisions and constraints of the Organization and Delegation Memorandum will be recognized and complied with.

PART I — Construction of New Facilities and the Expansion or Modification of Existing Facilities

PROCESS AND CALENDAR

October-November

Regional Operations
Supervisor or Manager of
Non-Regionalized Facility

1. Following conceptual approval of the project by the Regional and/or appropriate Central Divisional Offices, prepares a

-2-

October-November (Cont'd)

Forest Preserve Project Work Plan in the form attached hereto as Appendix A for each proposed project.

Each such Plan shall include: (1) A description of the project and its purpose, (2) A sketch map delineating the project and showing its location, (3) A count by species and size class, of all trees to be cut, removed or destroyed, (4) Identification of any protected species of vegetation within 300' of the area to be disturbed, (5) A description of measures to be taken to mitigate the impact on vegetative cover, and (6) Proposed use of motorized equipment or motor vehicles, if any.

Regional Supervisor for
Natural Resources

2. Submits completed Work Plan to the Regional Supervisor for Natural Resources.
3. Reviews Work Plan for completeness and conformance to Delegation Memorandum #84-06 and forwards to the Regional Forester.

December

Regional Forester.

4. Enters receipt of Work Plan in Regional Log of Forest Preserve Projects (See Appendix B attached).
5. Reviews Forest Preserve Project Work Plan to determine if project is appropriate taking into consideration Forest Preserve land classification, Unit Management Plan goals and management objectives for the land area involved.
6. Makes on-site field inspections as necessary and appropriate.
7. Insures that SICR requirements for each project have been addressed.
8. Consults with Operations Supervisor or Facility Manager to effect any changes or modification to Work Plan.
9. Signs Work Plan signifying approval or indicates disapproval by stating reasons in Comments Section. If approved, forwards Work Plan through Regional Supervisor for Natural Resources to Regional Director or appropriate Division Director, in the case of non-regionalized facil-

December (cont'd)

ities. If disapproved, returns Work Plan to originator.

January

Regional Director or
Director of Division
responsible for Facility

10. Completes Regional Log.

11. Reviews Forest Preserve Project Work Plan.

12. Signs Work Plan signifying approval or indicates disapproval by stating reasons in Comments section.

13. If approved, forwards Work Plan to Director of Lands and Forests. If disapproved, returns Work Plan through Regional Supervisor for Natural Resources and Regional Forester to originator.

February

Director of Lands
and Forests

14. Effects review of Work Plan by appropriate Central Office staff to determine that Plan conforms to Division goals and is in keeping with responsibility for care, custody and control of lands of the Forest Preserve.

15. Signs Work Plan signifying approval or indicates disapproval by stating reasons in Comments section.

16. Returns Work Plan to Regional Director or appropriate Division Director.

March

Regional Director or
Director of Division
responsible for Facility

17. Distributes Work Plan through Regional Supervisor for Natural Resources and Regional Forester to originator.

Current Fiscal Year

Regional Operations
Supervisor or Manager of
Non-Regionalized Facility

18. Implements project in accordance with Work Plan approvals and conditions.

Regional Forester

19. Monitors implementation of Work Plan to insure conformance to approvals and conditions.

-4-

Current Fiscal Year (cont'd)

20. On completion of project, completes Inspection report (See Appendix C attached) and retains in Project file.

PART II - Routine Maintenance ProjectsPROCESS

Application for routine maintenance projects on lands of the Forest Preserve shall be submitted on the form attached hereto as Appendix D as soon as possible in advance of the starting date of the project. The Application should be directed to the Regional Supervisor for Natural Resources who will forward it to the Regional Forester. The Application will be reviewed as rapidly as possible by the Regional Forester and a determination made as to approval or disapproval.

When approvals have been granted, a copy of the Application will be forwarded to appropriate Regional Lands and Forests personnel to assure proper notification and provide for monitoring of the project.

Applicants should consider the following guidelines when submitting project requests:

1. Maintenance of foot trails, snowmobile trails, cross-country ski trails, horse trails, etc.

This includes projects that involve blowdown removal, hazard tree elimination (3" or more in diameter), problem tree removal (3" or more in diameter), mowing, etc.

Applications may be submitted by Area if appropriate (i.e., High Peaks Wilderness Area, St. Regis Canoe Area, Saranac Lake Wild Forest, Whiteface Mountain Intensive Use Area, etc.). Trails should be listed separately with the total length of the trail covered by a single Application, if appropriate and in priority order of needed maintenance. It is clearly understood that live standing trees are not to be cut or used for construction of bridges, dry tread, water bars or other structures. Dead and downed material may be used for such purposes although consideration must be given to human safety and the longevity or life of such structures when such material is used.

2. Maintenance of roads, phone lines, power lines, ski lifts, downhill ski trails, canoe carries, parking areas, openings around buildings, scenic vistas, etc.

This includes projects that involve the removal of hazardous, problem or ugly trees 3" or more in diameter.

Projects should be listed individually but, several may be submitted on a single Application if they are similar in nature (i.e., phone lines A, B, & C). Tree axioms are advisable where more than an occasional live tree

must be cut to avoid potential damage to the facility. Felled trees may not be utilized for any purpose and should be scattered near the site so as not to interfere with the facility and to be non-obstructive.

3. Removal of dead and hazardous trees in developed areas, such as campgrounds and ski centers that potentially endanger people.

This includes projects involving removal of dead and/or hazardous trees in, developed or intensive use areas.

Applications should be submitted separately for each facility. However, all projects for a specific facility can be included on a single Application. Tree counts should be included with the Application. Trees that are proposed to be removed should be flagged. Trees that are felled may be cut up and used for fuel at the facility, but for no other purpose.

4. Boundary line surveys and maintenance.


This includes all projects on lands of the Forest Service whether done by Department employees or by others under contract to the Department.

More than one survey project may be included on a single Application but, separate Applications should be submitted for survey projects geographically distant from each other.

5. Salvage of windfall timber when such blowdown timber constitutes a fire hazard.

This includes projects of fire hazard circumstances and should be submitted on Applications for each Area involved.

In any of the above situations, projects will be checked and monitored by the Regional Forester.


Director for Lands and Forests

Attachments

cc: D. Grant
H. Loig
G. Colvin
G. Sovas
K. Wich
R. Bernhardt
Regional Directors
Bureau of Fish and Wildlife
Bureau of Lands and Forests
Bureau of Marine Resources
Bureau of Mineral Resources

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
DIVISION OF LANDS AND FORESTS

Forest Preserve Project Work Plan
for

Construction of New Facilities and the Expansion or
Modification of Existing Facilities

FY 19__

Region/Facility	Project Title & Location	Land Classification	Project No.
-----------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	-------------

Description & Justification (Attach Sketch Map Showing Location and other
Required Supporting Documents):

Description of Use of Motorized Equipment or Motor Vehicles, if any:

Prepared By:

Date:

APPROVALS OR DISAPPROVALS

Comments:

Date:

Regional Forester

Date:

Regional Supervisor for
Natural Resources

Date:

Regional Director or
Division Director

Date:

Director of Lands and Forests

APPENDIX A

11/06/1990

15:51

TULAGEWICZ L.P. OFFICE

1 518 523

14712563

P.14

REGIONAL LOG
FOREST PRESERVE PRODUCTS

REGION _____
F.Y. _____

Plan ived	Originator	Project Description	Project:		Dates of Inspection	Date of Approval or Disapproval	Comments, including Approval or Disapproval Action
			Maintenance	Facility			

FOREST PRESERVE PROJECT

REGION: _____ INSPECTED BY: _____ DATE: _____

PROJECT NO.: _____

PROJECT LOCATION: _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

TREES CUT (NO. & SPECIES):

VEGETATION DISTURBED AND MITIGATING ACTIONS TAKEN:

COMMENTS:

APPLICATION FOR ROUTINE MAINTENANCE PROJECT

REGION: _____

PROJECT: # _____

APPLICANT NAME: _____ DATE OF APPLICATION: _____

ADDRESS: _____ OTHER CONTACT PERSON: _____

LOCATION OF PROJECT/S: _____

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT/S: (Attached additional sheets if necessary)

WHO IS TO DO WORK: _____

ESTIMATED STARTING DATE: _____ ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE: _____

APPLICANT SIGNATURE: _____

PROJECT ACTION:

APPROVED _____ DISAPPROVED _____

REGIONAL FORESTER

REMARKS: _____ DATE: _____

Appendix 3

Correspondence

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

Division of Fish and Wildlife, New York Natural Heritage Program
625 Broadway, Fifth Floor, Albany, NY 12233-4757
P: (518) 402-8935 | F: (518) 402-8925
www.dec.ny.gov

September 26, 2017

Robert Fraser
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Re: Gore Mountain Ski Center
County: Warren Town/City: Johnsburg

Dear Mr. Fraser:

In response to your recent request, we have reviewed the New York Natural Heritage Program database with respect to the above project.


Enclosed is a report of rare animals that our database indicates occur in the vicinity of the project site.

For most sites, comprehensive field surveys have not been conducted; the enclosed report only includes records from our database. We cannot provide a definitive statement as to the presence or absence of all rare or state-listed species or significant natural communities. Depending on the nature of the project and the conditions at the project site, further information from on-site surveys or other sources may be required to fully assess impacts on biological resources.

Our database is continually growing as records are added and updated. If this proposed project is still under development one year from now, we recommend that you contact us again so that we may update this response with the most current information.

The presence of the animals identified in the enclosed report may result in this project requiring additional review or permit conditions. For further guidance, and for information regarding other permits that may be required under state law for regulated areas or activities (e.g., regulated wetlands), please contact the NYS DEC Region 5 Office, Division of Environmental Permits, as listed at www.dec.ny.gov/about/39381.html.

Sincerely,



Colleen Lutz
Assistant Biologist
New York Natural Heritage Program



**The following rare animal has been documented at the project site.**

We recommend that potential onsite and offsite impacts of the proposed project on these species or communities be addressed as part of any environmental assessment or review conducted as part of the planning, permitting and approval process, such as reviews conducted under SEQR. Field surveys of the project site may be necessary to determine the status of a species at the site, particularly for sites that are currently undeveloped and may still contain suitable habitat. Final requirements of the project to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential impacts are determined by the lead permitting agency or the government body approving the project.

The following animal, while not listed by New York State as Endangered or Threatened, is of conservation concern to the state, and considered rare by the New York Natural Heritage Program.

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	NY STATE LISTING	HERITAGE CONSERVATION STATUS
Bicknell's Thrush <i>Breeding</i>	<i>Catharus bicknelli</i>	Special Concern	Imperiled in NYS
Gore Mountain, on the project site , 0.25 mile northeast of the State Fire Tower, 2005-su: The birds were encountered in spruce/fir forest with a canopy height of 5 to 7 meters.			

12171

This report only includes records from the NY Natural Heritage database. For most sites, comprehensive field surveys have not been conducted, and we cannot provide a definitive statement as to the presence or absence of all rare or state-listed species. Depending on the nature of the project and the conditions at the project site, further information from on-site surveys or other sources may be required to fully assess impacts on biological resources.

If any rare plants or animals are documented during site visits, we request that information on the observations be provided to the New York Natural Heritage Program so that we may update our database.

Information about many of the rare animals and plants in New York, including habitat, biology, identification, conservation, and management, are available online in Natural Heritage's Conservation Guides at www.guides.nynhp.org, from NatureServe Explorer at www.natureserve.org/explorer, and from USDA's Plants Database at <http://plants.usda.gov/index.html> (for plants).



Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation

ANDREW M. CUOMO
Governor

ROSE HARVEY
Commissioner

November 09, 2017

Mr. Robert Fraser
Environmental Scientist
The LA Group, P.C.
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Re: APA
Gore Mountain Ski Center
793 Peaceful Valley Rd, Johnsburg, Warren County, NY
17PR07541

Dear Mr. Fraser:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). We have reviewed the project in accordance with the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (Section 14.09 of the New York Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law). These comments are those of the OPRHP and relate only to Historic/Cultural resources. They do not include potential environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617).

Based upon this review, it is the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation's opinion that your project will have no impact on archaeological and/or historic resources listed in or eligible for the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places.

If further correspondence is required regarding this project, please be sure to refer to the OPRHP Project Review (PR) number noted above.

Sincerely,

Michael F. Lynch, P.E., AIA
Director, Division for Historic Preservation

Appendix 4
Adirondack Sub-alpine Forest Bird Conservation Area Description



**Department of
Environmental
Conservation**

Adirondack Sub-Alpine Forest Bird Conservation Area

General Site Information: This BCA includes Adirondack Mountain summits above 2,800 feet - more specifically, those with dense subalpine coniferous forests favored by Bicknell's thrush. Bicknell's thrush prefers dense thickets of stunted or young growth of balsam fir and red spruce. Found less frequently in other young or stunted conifers, and heavy second growth of fir, cherry and birch.

Adirondack Sub-Alpine Forest BCA Management Guidance Summary

Site Name: Adirondack Sub-Alpine Forest Bird Conservation Area

State Ownership and Managing Agency: Department of Environmental Conservation

Location: Adirondack Mountain summits above 2,800 feet in Clinton, Essex, Franklin, Hamilton, and Warren counties. Surveyed and confirmed nesting locations for Bicknell's thrush (Atwood and Rimmer, et al. 1996) include: Mount Marcy, Algonquin Peak, Blue Mountain, Cascade Mountain, Giant Mountain, Kilburn Mountain, Hurricane Mountain, Lower Wolfjaw Mountain, Lyon Mountain, Mount Haystack, Phelps Mountain, Porter Mountain, Rocky Ridge Peak, Santanoni Peak, Snowy Mountain, Vanderwhacker Mountain, Wakely Mountain, Whiteface Mountain, and Wright Peak.

Size of Area: Approximately 69,000 acres

DEC Region: 5

Vision Statement: Continue to maintain the wilderness quality of the area, while facilitating recreational opportunities in a manner consistent with conservation of the unique bird species present.

Key BCA Criteria: Diverse species concentration site; individual species concentration site; species at risk site (ECL §11-2001, 3.f, g, and h). Peaks over 2,800 feet with dense subalpine thickets provide habitat for a distinctive bird community, which includes Bicknell's thrush (special concern), blackpoll warbler and Swainson's thrush.

Critical Habitat Types: Dense subalpine coniferous thickets. To a lesser degree, young or stunted and heavy second growth of cherry or birch.

Operation and Management Considerations:

- *Identify habitat management activities needed to maintain site as a BCA.*

None identified for certain, although human access and acid rain could be impacting.

- *Identify seasonal sensitivities; adjust routine operations accordingly.*

The BCA is comprised of lands that are within the Adirondack High Peaks Wilderness Area, and other lands within the broader Adirondack Forest Preserve. The Adirondack High Peaks Wilderness Area portion is subject to relatively stringent regulations and use limitations. Portions of the BCA that are not within the High Peaks Wilderness Area may have less stringent use limitations.

Access to wilderness areas is completely limited to foot trails and non-motorized access, including horse trails. Access in wild forest and intensive use areas may include motorized forms of access. Examples include a road up Blue Mountain to transmitters, and a road up Whiteface. The road up Blue Mountain is used largely for administrative access to the transmitter towers. Whenever possible, routine maintenance on these towers or the access road should be scheduled outside the nesting season for Bicknell's thrush (May through July). The road up Whiteface sees considerable use by the public.

Trail and road maintenance activities have the potential to disturb nesting activities of high altitude birds (in particular, Bicknell's thrush). Whenever possible, routine maintenance should be planned so that it can be completed outside of the normal nesting season. Should maintenance be needed during the nesting season, the use of non-motorized equipment would help to minimize the impacts.

- *Identify state activities or operations which may pose a threat to the critical habitat types identified above; recommend alternatives to existing and future operations which may pose threats to those habitats.*

Ensure that bird conservation concerns are addressed in the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan, individual unit management plans, and other planning efforts. For those areas where plans have already been completed, incorporate concerns for subalpine bird communities at the earliest opportunity.

On May 18, 2000, Emergency Regulations were adopted for the High Peaks Wilderness Area, which comprises part of the BCA. These regulations prohibit camping above 4,000 feet; limit camping between 3,500 and 4,000 feet to designated areas; prohibit campfires above 4,000 feet, and require the leashing of pets above 4,000 feet.

- *Identify any existing or potential use impacts; recommend new management strategies to address those impacts.*

There has been little research on what effect normal use of hiking trails has on nesting birds. Recreational use in some areas of the BCA is relatively high. More research is needed on whether there is a significant impact to bird populations from the current level of human visitation. The Adirondack High Peaks Wilderness portions of the BCA are remote locations and access is largely limited to foot trails. Motorized vehicles are not normally allowed. Those areas of the BCA outside of the High Peaks Wilderness Area allow the use of motorized vehicles and have fewer restrictions on other uses. The Unit Management Planning process for these areas should assess the effects of current levels of recreational use, and the need for new trails (including placement, timing, and construction method) on subalpine bird species (in particular, Bicknell's thrush). Consideration should be given to prohibiting motorized vehicle access to subalpine forests above 2,800 feet.

Education, Outreach, and Research Considerations:

- *Assess current access; recommend enhanced access, if feasible.*

Recreational use in some areas of the BCA is relatively high. Further study or research would help to assess impacts of recreational activities on nesting high altitude species. The need for protective measures will be discussed and incorporated as part of the planning process for the Adirondack Forest Preserve and Wilderness Areas that form the BCA, or at the earliest opportunity.

- *Determine education and outreach needs; recommend strategies and materials.*

There is a need to identify to the public the distinctive bird community present in subalpine forests over 2,800 feet. The potential impacts of human intrusion need to be portrayed to the public, and a "please stay on the trails" approach may be beneficial. Continue partnerships with the National Audubon Society, High Peaks Audubon Society, Adirondack Mountain Club and other groups involved in education and conservation of birds of the Adirondack High Peaks.

- *Identify research needs; prioritize and recommend specific projects or studies.*

Acid rain deposition may be having an impact on nesting success of songbirds at high elevations by causing die-offs of high altitude conifer forests, and killing snails and other sources of calcium needed for egg production. More research is needed on this. The curtailment of sulphur dioxide emissions and the reduction of acid rain is currently

a significant New York State initiative.

A detailed inventory and standardized monitoring of special concern species is needed for the area. In particular, all peaks above 2,800 feet should be surveyed for Bicknell's thrush.

The impact of the current levels of human use on nesting success needs to be assessed.

Contacts:

DEC Region 5 Wildlife Manager, 518-897-1291

DEC Region 5 Forester, 518-897-1276

Sources:

Atwood, J. L., C. C. Rimmer, K. P. McFarland, S. H. Tsai, and L. R. Nagy. 1996. *Distribution of Bicknell's thrush in New England and New York*. Wilson Bulletin 108(4):650-661.

Bull, John L. 1998. *Bull's Birds of New York State*. Comstock Publishing Associates, Ithaca, NY.

NYSDEC Division of Lands and Forests. 1999. *High Peaks Wilderness Complex Unit Management Plan*. NYSDEC, Albany, NY.

Rimmer, C. C., Atwood, J., and L. R. Nagy. 1993. *Bicknell's Thrush - a Northeastern Songbird in Trouble?* Vermont Institute of Natural Science, Woodstock, VT.

State of New York Endangered Species Working Group. 1996. *Species Dossier for Bicknell's Thrush*. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

Wells, J. V. 1998. *Important Bird Areas in New York State*. National Audubon Society, Albany, NY.

Date BCA Designated: 11/16/01

Date MGS Prepared: 12/6/01

Appendix 5

Trail Inventory and Analysis

Trail Inventory and Analysis



November, 2017

Updated Feb 23, 2018

Updated April 10, 2018

Prepared for:



**Olympic Regional
Development Authority**

NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
2634 Main Street
Lake Placid, NY 12946

Prepared by:

The LA Group, Landscape Architecture and Engineering, P.C.
40 Long Alley, Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
(518) 587-8100
www.thelagroup.com

Introduction

The following Trail Inventory and Analysis was performed as part of ORDA's and Gore Mountain's ongoing efforts to update and maintain the calculated ski trail mileage that currently exists on the mountain. The inventory examines only existing and previously approved trails, and does not contemplate potential future trail improvements. Potential future trail improvements are evaluated in the 2018 UMP proper, using this inventory as a baseline.

The last update to the ongoing trail inventory was performed in 2005 and since that time improved technology and high definition aerial photography has been made readily available. This provides the opportunity for a more detailed refinement of the trail mileage calculations that were presented in previous Unit Management Plans (UMP's). A similar update is being performed for Whiteface Mountain and it is anticipated the same update will be performed for Belleayre Mountain when that UMP is next amended.

The analysis below calculates trail width in accordance with existing legislation and documents the methodology used. A brief summary of previous calculations found in existing Unit Management Plans and related amendments is provided, along with additional description of all ski area appurtenances considered as part of this effort. Findings are summarized at the end of the analysis.

1.0 Background: New York State Constitution, Article XIV (Conservation)

1.1 History of Legislation Pertaining to Gore Mountain

Article 14, Section 1 of the New York State Constitution is the "forever wild" clause protecting state Forest Preserve lands. On November 4, 1941, the clause was amended by a vote of the People of the State of New York authorizing the:

"constructing and maintaining [of] not more than twenty miles of ski trails thirty to eighty feet wide on the north, east and northwest slopes of Whiteface Mt. in Essex County."

In 1944 the New York State Legislature created the Whiteface Mountain Authority from the Whiteface Mountain Highway Commission (Chapter 691 of the Laws of 1944). The new Authority assumed the responsibility for the Whiteface Mountain Memorial Highway and was additionally given the authority to:

“Acquire, construct, reconstruct, equip, improve, extend, operate and maintain ski trail developments”

at Whiteface Mountain, Gore Mountain and Old Forge. As such, “ski trail development” was further defined to mean:

“ski trails, ski tows, open slopes made available for skiing, and all such appurtenances, facilities and related developments as in the judgment of the Authority may be necessary for the promotion, use and enjoyment of the ski trails.” (Laws of 1944 ch. 691, §1; Public Authorities Law §101 (repealed 1974)).

In 1960 the Whiteface Mountain Authority was renamed the Adirondack Mountain Authority. In 1968 the Adirondack Mountain Authority ceased to exist and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation was given the responsibility to continue development, maintenance and operation of the ski areas. Following the 1980 Winter Olympics in Lake Placid, the Olympic Regional Development Authority (ORDA) was created in 1982 and assumed the responsibility to continue development, maintenance and operation of Whiteface and the other remaining Olympic venues. A DEC/ORDA MOU in 1984 transferred Gore Mountain to ORDA’s Management. Although ORDA has day to day management authority over Gore and Whiteface, DEC retains ultimate jurisdiction over both facilities.

The original authorization to develop Gore Mountain allowed for constructing, maintaining and operating not more than 30 miles of ski trails thirty to eighty feet wide on Gore and Pete Gay Mountains. In 1987 the “forever wild” clause of the New York State Constitution was again amended authorizing Gore Mountain to construct, maintain and operate:

“Not more than forty miles of ski trails thirty to two hundred feet wide, together with appurtenances thereto, provided that no more than eight miles of such trails shall be in excess of one hundred twenty feet wide, on the slopes of Gore and Pete Gay Mountains . . .”

1.2 Collaboration and Consultation with State Agencies

In addition to the enabling legislation found in Article 14, Section 1 of the New York State Constitution and the several amendments to that document that were approved by the People of the State of New York, interpretations and actual application of legislation pertaining to the development, maintenance and operation of ski trails on “forever wild” lands have been made which are

pertinent to understanding what is allowed. The single most comprehensive interpretation of the legislation was made by New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) attorney Philip H. Gitlen in a February 17, 1977 memorandum pertaining to the proposed expansion and improvements to Whiteface Mountain in anticipation of hosting the 1980 Winter Olympics.

In this memorandum Mr. Gitlen opined extensively on the calculation procedure for allowed trail widths at Whiteface Mountain as allowed by the legislation and as historically developed at the ski area.

The first condition in this memorandum relates to trail width where two or more trails join together. In this instance Mr. Gitlen observed that “where two or more trails join together they were often developed so as to be a multiple of allowable 80 ft. width . . .” Several trails were found to be 200 to 300 feet wide. From this observation Mr. Gitlen concluded that “where two or more trails join together a multiple of the constitutionally imposed width limitation may be allowable.”

Secondly, Mr. Gitlen observed that “trails which have lifts associated with them are often considerably wider than the constitutionally stated maximum width of 80 feet.” From this observation Mr. Gitlen concluded that “where a chair lift bisects a trail, an allowance for the width of the chair lift may be allowed in addition to the constitutional requirements for trail widths.” He further justified this conclusion stating that “this has the beneficial effect of limiting the amount of new clearing required for chair lifts and enhancing the visual appearance of the ski center. (NYS DEC) staff has advised that clearing for a chair lift would be at least thirty to fifty feet”.

With respect to the constitutional limitation which limits the total mileage of trails, when discussing the construction of the new Giant Slalom trail at Whiteface Mr. Gitlen stated that “...the construction of this ski trail will not violate the express limitation on the allowable length of trails to be developed. This is so even if one considers areas where two trails join together as separate trails for the mileage computation”.

Lastly, Mr. Gitlen recognized the fact that snowmaking pipelines and grooming equipment are necessities of a modern ski area. As such, he opined that an allowance in trail width should be made. “. . . for access by modern snow grooming machinery without creating an unsafe condition for the recreational skier, and provision of adequate means of access for use and maintenance of the snow making systems to be installed without decreasing the safety afforded the recreational skier.”

In conclusion, Mr. Gitlen found that “several working rules may be derived from both the past history of Whiteface Mountain and the requirements attendant with the development of a modern ski center.” They are:

1. Where a lift bisects a trail, an allowance for the clearing required for the lift must be made. In such cases, a minimum of 30 additional feet of clearing is required for the lift line.
2. Where trails join together or at the junction of two trails a multiple of the 80 foot width is allowable; and
3. Sufficient clearing adjacent to ski trails can be allowed for the purposes of installing and maintaining snowmaking systems, an appurtenance to a modern ski center.

With the creation of the Adirondack Park Agency, (APA) the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan, (APSLMP) adopted in 1971, provided guidelines for the preservation, management and use of State-owned lands by State agencies in the Adirondack Park. The Gore Mountain Ski Center land is classified under the APSLMP as an “Intensive Use Area.” The APSLMP provides that the primary management guideline for Intensive Use Areas is to provide the public opportunities for a variety of outdoor recreational pursuits in a setting and on a scale in harmony with the relatively wild and undeveloped character of the Adirondack Park.

The Adirondack Park Agency Act (Section 816) directs the NYSDEC to develop, in consultation with the APA, individual Unit Management Plans (UMPs) for each unit of land under its jurisdiction that is classified in the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan. Unit Management Plans must conform to the guidelines and criteria set forth in the State Land Master Plan.

Gore Mountain Ski Center opened in 1964 and early management was under the direction of the NYSDEC. Management was delegated to the Olympic Regional Development Authority (ORDA) on April 1, 1984, through an agreement with NYSDEC which was authorized by Chapter 99 of the Laws of 1984 (Article 8, title 28, Section 2614, Public Authorities Law). This agreement transferred to ORDA the responsibility for the use, operation, maintenance and management of the ski area. Under the agreement, ORDA is to cooperate with NYSDEC to complete and periodically update the UMP for the ski area. A UMP for Gore was completed in 1987 and subsequently amended three times. A major re-write of the UMP was completed in 1994/1995 which included an extensive “Master Plan” for the expansion of Gore Mountain. It has subsequently been updated in

a UMP for years 2002-2007. The most recent amendment to the 2002-2007 UMP was in 2005.

Concurrent with the preparation of each UMP has been the preparation of a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS). Each UMP/GEIS has been publically noticed and made available for Agency and public comment. Public hearings were held on each UMP/GEIS.

All previous UMP/GEIS documents included proposed new ski trail development. Mileage calculations were included in each document and the increase in approved trail mileage was reviewed and approved by the DEC and APA for each UMP/GEIS.

2.0 Trail Width and Length Guidance Established for Gore Mountain

ORDA has maintained a calculation of trail widths and overall length of trails at Gore Mountain since it began managing the mountain in 1984. These trail widths and lengths have been reported in each UMP since the original 1987 version and have subsequently been approved, each time, by the DEC and APA.

As previously stated, Gore Mountain is authorized, at this time, to maintain and operate “not more than forty miles of ski trails thirty to two hundred feet wide, together with appurtenances thereto, provided that no more than eight miles of such trails shall be in excess of one hundred twenty feet wide . . .”

Based on an understanding of Article 14, Section 1 of the New York State Constitution, the “forever wild” clause, and Amendments as approved by the People of the State of New York and interpretations made by DEC, especially NYSDEC Attorney Mr. Philip Gitlen, Esq., and actual historic practice of implementing the legislation, Gore Mountain has applied the following guidance for the measurement of trail widths and length:

1. Where a lift bisects a trail, allowances for the clearing required for the lift can be made. These clearing allowances are not included in the trail width calculation. Based on today’s lift safety standards, Gore Mountain should apply a clearing allowance of forty feet for a double chair lift and surface lift and sixty feet for a triple chair lift, quad chair lift and gondola to accommodate chair/cab swing due to wind and avoid hazardous trees in case of a tree blow down. This is in accordance with Mr. Gitlen’s guidance that “. . . a minimum of 30 additional feet clearing is required for the lift line.”
2. For the purpose of calculating width, where two or more trails join together to create a wider, single open slope, the slope may be counted as a single trail, or

as a multiple of the constitutionally imposed width limitation. At the time of Mr. Gitlen's conclusion the constitutionally imposed width limitation was 80 feet. As a result of the 1987 Amendment to the NYS Constitution the current width limitation is both 120 feet and 200 feet. Therefore if an area where two or more trails join together exceeds 120 feet in width but is less than 200 feet, Gore Mountain may elect to count this as a single trail segment within the allowable 8 miles of trails over 120 feet in width, or as multiple trails, each with the 120 feet width limitation. In the case where it is counted as multiple trails, the mileage of each trail shall count toward the maximum allowable trail length. This is in accordance with Mr. Gitlen's conclusions.

3. Where snowmaking systems exist on a ski trail, a clearing allowance of 10 feet can be applied to allow for the installation and operation of snowmaking systems. This clearing allowance does not get included in the width calculation for trails with snowmaking systems. This is in accordance with Mr. Gitlen's guidance ..."sufficient clearing adjacent to ski trails can be allowed for the purposes of installing and maintaining snowmaking systems, an appurtenance to a modern ski center." Based on discussion presented by Mr. Gitlen, a 10' width allowance for snowmaking was proposed as a suitable width at that time. In previous UMP documents, a 15' clearing allowance for snowmaking was determined to be sufficient and applied where applicable. For the purpose of this analysis, the more conservative 10' allowance is applied. The same allowance could be applied to similar infrastructure adjacent to trails such as power lines, for the same reasons; to allow room for safe installation and maintenance of an appurtenance, with the realized benefit of consolidating clearing for both trails and utilities in a single location.
4. This Inventory takes no position on the issue of whether the length and width of glades should be applied against constitutionally authorized trail lengths and widths. The Gitlen memo does not discuss the issue of whether glades should be counted, and there have been no court cases on the issue. Even if glades are counted, however, the total mileage and width of ski trails at Gore Mountain are within the constitutional limits.
5. "Work Roads" are not included in trail length computations since they are not maintained for skiing, but are used for trail maintenance and grooming access. Similarly, areas adjacent to trails where snowmaking equipment is staged or temporarily stored shall not be included in calculated trail width.
6. "Queuing/Trail Access areas" are not included in the trail length computation since they are not defined ski trails. These areas are typically adjacent to lodges, ski patrol buildings and other appurtenant buildings and lift terminals. They are used by skiers to take their skis on or off, adjust their gear, or wait in line to load

lifts or unload from lifts. They are also used by mountain staff and maintenance crews for access and maintenance to appurtenant structures. These areas are considered 'appurtenant' areas.

7. Only ski trails on "intensive use area" lands are included in the trail length computations. Trails in the Historic North Creek Ski Bowl that are on Town of Johnsbury controlled lands are not subject to inclusion in the trail length calculations, since they are not located on State owned Forest Preserve Lands.

3.0 Ski Trail Inventory

3.1 Summary of Previous Trail Development/Approval by UMP

Gore Mountain has been in a continuous mode of upgrading its trail system since 1984 when ORDA began managing the ski area. This included simple safety and widening improvements that did not increase trail length, as well as the development of new trails.

A review of past UMP's indicates the following progress in trail development at Gore Mountain. The 1987 UMP reported a total of 41 existing trails with a total length of 16.5 miles on 172 acres of terrain. Between 1987 and 1995, 3.05 miles of new trails were developed bringing the total trail length to 19.55 miles and 46 trails on 187.7 acres of terrain.

The 1995 UMP approved the construction of up to 28.5 miles of trails, an increase of 8.95 miles. Between 1995 and the issuance of the 2002-2007 UMP a total of 5.55 miles of new trails were constructed. This brought the total constructed trail length to 25.1 miles, existing as 50 trails on 249.5 acres of terrain.

The 2002-2007 UMP approved an additional 5.4 miles of trails bringing the total approved trail length to 33.9 miles. The 2005 UMP Amendment approved a net increase of 1.5 additional miles, bringing the total length of trails approved for construction under Gore's UMP to 35.4 miles.

3.2 Trail Length Calculation Methodology

Technological advances including the utilization of high resolution aerial photography that is available today, along with the application of the guidance and criteria established in Section 2, allows for a more detailed refinement of the trail mileage calculations that were presented in previous Unit Management Plans.

Current trail mileage of developed ski trails was calculated for Gore Mountain using the most recently available aerial photography. This includes aials provided by the NY Statewide Digital Orthoimagry Program and NYS Office of Cyber Security, Spring 2013 natural color imagery (image pixel size of 2' and horizontal accuracy within 4' at the 95% confidence level), and High Definition (4K UHD) natural color imagery available from Google Earth, imagery date September 2015. The aerial imagery was imported into both GIS and AutoCAD software allowing spatial data such as length and width of each trail to be collected not only for historically built trails, but also for the most recent improvements. Active ski trails were identified and verified using current Gore Mountain trail map guides which promote and advertise the skiable terrain at Gore Mountain, information from the Gore Mountain General Manager and first-hand knowledge of the mountain gained through site visits. Ski lifts, work roads, snowmaking and other appurtenances were also identified and accounted for using the same sources noted above, along with background information and mapping included in previous UMPs and Amendments.

Building on the inventory above, trails were then measured and categorized as being less than 30 feet wide, 30 to 120 feet wide and 120 to 200 feet wide. The guidance noted in Section 2.0 above was used as the baseline criteria for this effort. While applying this guidance, the following assumptions and/or determinations were made in regard to the measurement and categorization of each trail.

1. While the presence of a ski lift and/or snowmaking apparatus on a trail would allow clearing widths in excess of the 120' and 200' limit, (a width allowance) to accommodate a "safety and maintenance zone", analysis indicated that applying a width allowance did not affect or change the width categorization of a trail.
2. In accordance with Guidance 7 in Section 2.0 above, only trails on Forest Preserve lands classified as Intensive Use were included in the final mileage calculation. Trails in the historic North Creek Ski Bowl on Town Park lands are excluded from the mileage total.
3. In accordance with Guidance 6 in Section 2.0 above, skier queuing areas were identified, mapped and excluded from the mileage calculation.
4. In accordance with Guidance 5 in Section 2.0 above, work roads and/or areas that remain open for grooming access, work or emergency access and not offered for skiing by the public were excluded from the mileage calculation. A good example of this is the abandoned ski trail Lower

Tannery, which remains in use as a work road and emergency egress route for the ski patrol but is not available for the public to ski.

5. Appurtenant cleared areas that are independent of ski trails such as electric line routes, other utility line routes and the abandoned gondola route were excluded from the mileage calculation since they are not maintained and offered for skiing. Appurtenant cleared areas that include the infrastructure above and are offered for skiing are included in the calculations.

4.0 Trail Length Summary

Drawing 1, “Gore Mountain, Ski Trail and Glade Inventory,” illustrates the existing ski trails and glades at Gore Mountain for the Winter 2016/2017 ski season. Drawings 2, 2a, 2b and 2c, “Existing and Approved Ski Trails and Glade Inventory”, provide additional detail illustrating trail width and locations where appurtenant width allowances were applied. These drawings also illustrate trails that were approved in previous UMP’s that have not yet been constructed.

Table 1, “Gore Mountain Trail and Glade Inventory,” presents the results of the inventory and mileage measurement for each trail as shown on the drawings. The Table lists each trail by name, indicates if a ski lift and/or snowmaking exists on a trail, and presents lengths of each trail by width (less than 30 feet wide, 30 feet to 120 feet wide and 120 feet to 200 feet wide. Table 1 also tabulates the glades at Gore Mountain, and the trails that were approved in previous UMP’s but are not yet constructed. Key totals are summarized below:

1. Total constructed trail length 0-200 feet in width at Gore Mountain, including the Ski Bowl trails on Town Lands is 29.9 miles.
2. Net constructed trail length for trails 0-200 feet wide on “Intensive Use” lands (excluding trails on town park lands in the North Creek Ski Bowl) is 27.43 miles.
3. Total trail length by width on “Intensive Use” lands is as follows:

a) Under 30 feet wide	1.31 miles
b) 30 feet to 120 feet wide	25.69 miles
c) 120 feet to 200 feet wide	0.42 miles
4. Total calculated length of previously approved, but not yet constructed trails on Intensive Use lands is 5.52 miles.

5. Total calculated length of Glades on Intensive Use lands at Gore Mountain is 4.85 miles.

G:\Proj-2015\201537_Gore_Mountain_2015\201537-04_UMP Work Gore and Ski Bowl\2015037-004Admin\05Reports\TrailAnalysis\Gore MtnTrail Analysis_2018-CleanFinal.docx

TABLE 1

Gore Mountain Trail and Glade Inventory
April, 2018



Trails

Trail Pod #	Trail Name	Gross Trail Length (LF)	Trail Length on "Intensive Use" Lands	Trail Length on Town Lands	Width Allowances	Trail Length on "Intensive Use" Lands (under 30' wide)	Trail Length on "Intensive Use" Lands (30'-120' wide)	Trail Length on "Intensive Use" Lands (120'-200' wide)
1H	1A	825	825	0	S	0	825	0
1E	2B	357	357	0	S,L1	0	357	0
3F	3B	1,952	1,952	0	S	0	1,952	0
12F	46ER	3,260	0	3,260	L1	0	0	0
9A Lower	Bear Cub Run	608	608	0	-	0	608	0
WORKRD	Cedar's Traverse	3,514	3,514	0	S	0	3,514	0
7A	Chatiemac	3,119	3,119	0	S	100	3,019	0
6B-UP, 2K	Cloud	3,486	3,486	0	S	0	3,486	0
N/A	Crystal	157	157	0	-	157	0	0
3C-UP	Cutoff	922	922	0	-	0	922	0
7E	Dell	344	344	0	-	0	344	0
7N-Q(b)	Double Barrel (Looker's Right)	780	780	0	-	0	780	0
11N	Eagle's Nest Crossover	4,082	4,082	0	S	0	4,082	0
11A, 1N-P	Echo	5,735	5,735	0	S	0	5,320	415
C4	Farview	965	965	0	S	0	846	119
10G-Upper, C6	Foxlair	1,870	1,870	0	S	0	1,747	123
7B	Hawkeye	1,939	1,939	0	S	0	1,939	0
7F	Headwaters	2,740	2,740	0	S	0	2,740	0
11B-UP, M8	Hedges	1,489	1,489	0	-	1,000	489	0
12G Lower	Hudson	2,403	0	2,403	S	0	0	0
6H	Hullablow	1,173	1,173	0	S	0	1,173	0
3G	Jamboree	1,619	1,619	0	S	0	1,619	0
N/A	Jibland	318	318	0	-	0	0	318
N/A	Jug Handle	434	434	0	-	175	259	0
7N-M	Lies	1,109	1,109	0	S	0	1,109	0
6K	Little Cloud	364	364	0	S	0	364	0
3C-LOW	Little Dipper	993	993	0	S	0	993	0
N/A	Little Gore Crossover	770	0	770	-	0	0	0
2K	Lower Cloud Traverse	655	655	0	S	0	655	0
6G	Lower Darby	1,019	1,019	0	S	0	1,019	0
1C (1D-1NR)	Lower Sleighride	1,817	1,817	0	S	0	1,817	0
6F	Lower Steilhang	1,246	1,246	0	S	0	1,246	0
3A	Lower Sunway	3,769	3,769	0	S	0	3,769	0
10C-LOW	Lower Uncus	794	794	0	S	0	794	0
2J-UP	Lower Wood In Traverse	1,115	1,115	0	-	450	665	0
M2	Mica	444	444	0	-	219	225	0
12D	Moxham	2,877	368	2,509	-	0	368	0
2D	North Star	1,803	1,803	0	S	0	1,803	0
6E, 7N-O	Open Pit	972	972	0	S	0	972	0
3I	Otter Slide	407	407	0	S	0	407	0
12C, 12A	Peaceful Valley	6,010	3,173	2,837	S	0	3,173	0
2E UP, LOW	Pete Gay	3,976	3,976	0	S	0	3,976	0
10A, 10B LOW	Pine Knot	2,455	2,455	0	S	0	2,455	0
N/A	Pipeline Traverse	5,419	5,419	0	-	0	5,419	0
1C (1NR-3F)	Pot Luck	723	723	0	S	0	723	0
2C	Powder Pass	3,580	3,580	0	S,L	0	3,580	0
1B	Quicksilver	2,036	2,036	0	-	0	2,036	0
C7	Ruby Run	2,563	2,563	0	S	0	2,563	0
11K	Sagamore	6,037	6,037	0	S,L1	0	6,037	0
6B-LOW (2K-6K)	Santanoni	180	133	47	S	0	133	0
1C (1A-1D), 1D	Showcase	5,950	5,928	22	S,L1	0	5,928	0
1K	Showoff	188	188	0	-	188	0	0
2B, 2I	Sleeping Bear	2,796	2,796	0	S	0	2,796	0
N/A	Starting Gate	359	359	0	-	0	0	359
1C (1C-1A), 1A	Sunway	5,047	5,047	0	S	0	4,142	905
2A	Tahawus	4,184	4,184	0	S	0	4,184	0
C1	Tannery	2,768	2,768	0	S	0	2,768	0
1C (FROM 1NR)	The Arena	991	991	0	S,L1	0	991	0
7H	The Glen	433	433	0	-	0	433	0
N/A	The Gully	730	730	0	S	0	730	0
2F (2J-2E)	The Loop	850	850	0	-	348	502	0
12B	The Oak Ridge Trail	1,984	1,984	0	S	0	1,984	0
N/A	The Peace Pipe	918	918	0	-	0	918	0
7N-L	The Rumor	1,260	1,260	0	S	0	1,260	0
10E	Topridge	3,900	3,900	0	S	0	3,900	0
1K	Tower 6	118	118	0	-	118	0	0
3E	Twin Fawns	1,094	1,094	0	S,L2	0	1,094	0
1F	Twister	6,603	6,603	0	S	0	6,603	0
N/A	Twister's Little Sister	121	121	0	-	121	0	0
10C-UP	Uncas	1,833	1,833	0	S	0	1,833	0
12c	Eagles Nest Bridge	620	620	0	-	620	0	0
6D	Upper Darby	808	808	0	-	281	527	0
1G	Upper Sleighride	1,727	1,727	0	-	0	1,727	0
6C	Upper Steilhang	1,739	1,739	0	S	0	1,739	0
2F (TO 2J)	Upper Wood In	973	973	0	S	210	763	0
13A	Village Slopes	1,260	0	1,260	L1	0	0	0
3B	Ward Hill	874	874	0	-	0	874	0
1N-Q-1NR, 1N-R	Wildair	4,980	4,980	0	S,G	0	4,980	0
6J	Wood Lot North	924	924	0	S,L1	0	924	0
6B-LOW(FROM 6K)	Wood Lot South	1,163	1,163	0	S	0	1,163	0
2J (FROM 6B)	Wood Out	2,340	2,340	0	-	1,769	571	0
M1	Woodchuck	1,163	1,163	0	-	1,163	0	0
Totals (LF)		157,922	144,814	13,108		6,919	135,656	2,239
Totals (MILEAGE)		29.91	27.43	2.48		1.31	25.69	0.42

Appurtenant Width Allowances:

1. S=Snowmaking (15', maintenance and safety)
2. L1=Chairlift (60', Quad, Triple, or Gondola)
3. L2=Chairlift (40', Double chair, Surface lift)

Limitations:

1. Up to 40 miles of trails 30'-200' wide
2. No more than 8 miles of trails 120'-200' wide
3. No trails over 200' wide - unless area is counted as two trails side by side

Glades

Pod #	Glade Name	Gross Length (LF)	Length on "Intensive Use" Lands	Length on Town Lands	Length within Previously Approved Trails ¹	Net Calculated Length on "Intensive Use" Lands (LF)
11E	Abenaki Glades	2,724	2,724	0		2,724
11G, 11M	Barkeater Glades	3,645	3,645	0	3,645	0
No #	Birch Bark Alley Glades	853	853	0		853
No #	Boreas Glades	3,135	3,135	0		3,135
No #	Cave Glades	1,017	1,017	0		1,017
No #	Chattiemac Glades	635	635	0		635
No #	Chatterbox Glades	3,388	3,388	0		3,388
11J	Cirque Glades	5,607	5,607	0	4,085	1,522
No #	Darby Woods Glades	325	325	0		325
No #	Darkside Glades	848	848	0		848
7N-Q(a)	Double Barrel Glades	495	495	0	495	0
No #	Forever Wild Glades	1,877	1,877	0		1,877
No #	Half 'N' Half Glades	585	305	280		305
10F-LOW	High Pines Glades	2,345	2,345	0	2,345	0
10B-UPPER	Kill Kare Glades	1,147	1,147	0		1,147
No #	MacIntyre Glades	485	485	0		485
No #	Mineshaft Glades	271	271	0		271
No #	Otter Slide Glades	947	947	0		947
No #	Pinebrook Glades	944	944	0		944
No #	Rabbit Run	840	840	0		840
12D UPPER	Ridge Runner Glades	740	540	200		540
No #	Sagamore Glades	2,029	2,029	0		2,029
No #	Ski Bowl Glades	4,000	0	4,000		0
7N-P	Straight Brook Glades	1,725	1,725	0	1,170	555
11B	Tahawus Glades	1,480	1,480	0	1,480	0
No #	The Narrows Glades	1,209	1,209	0		1,209
1N-O	Twister Glades	2,850	2,850	0	2,850	0
	Totals (LF)	46,146	41,666	4,480	16,070	25,596
	Totals (Mileage)	8.74	7.89	0.85	3.04	4.85

¹If including the glades in a comparison against total trail mileage, this column must be subtracted from the Total Length of glades on IU Lands, since the lengths in this column are already included under the "Approved, Not Yet Constructed" trail length category.


Approved Trails, Not Yet Constructed

1N-O	Approved, not yet constructed	2,850	2,850	0
2N-L	Approved, not yet constructed	600	600	0
6N-O	Approved, not yet constructed	362	362	0
7N-P	Approved, not yet constructed	1,170	1,170	0
9A Upper	Approved, not yet constructed	925	925	0
9B	Approved, not yet constructed	1,250	1,250	0
10F	Approved, not yet constructed	2,345	2,345	0
10H	Approved, not yet constructed	3,848	3,848	0
11B Lower	Approved, not yet constructed	1,480	1,480	0
11G	Approved, not yet constructed	1,720	1,720	0
11M	Approved, not yet constructed	1,925	1,925	0
11L	Approved, not yet constructed	4,095	4,095	0
11I	Approved, not yet constructed	2,495	2,495	0
11J	Approved, not yet constructed	4,085	4,085	0
12E	Approved, not yet constructed	1,605	0	1,605
12G Upper	Approved, not yet constructed	1,580	0	1,580
12H	Approved, not yet constructed	3,067	0	3,067
12I	Approved, not yet constructed	6,410	0	6,410
12J	Approved, not yet constructed	2,140	0	2,140
	Totals (LF)	43,952	29,150	14,802
	Totals (MILEAGE)	8.32	5.52	2.80

Trail Name	Trail Length on "Intensive Use" Lands
1A	825
2B	357
3B	1,952
46ER	0
Bear Cub Run	608
Cedar's Traverse	3,514
Chatiemac	3,119
Cloud	3,486
Crystal	157
Cutoff	922
Dell	344
Double Barrel (Looker's Right)	780
Eagle's Nest Crossover	4,082
Echo	5,735
Farview	965
Foxlair	1,870
Hawkeye	1,939
Headwaters	2,740
Hedges	1,489
Hudson	0
Hullabloo	1,173
Jamboree	1,619
Jibland	318
Jug Handle	434
Lies	1,109
Little Cloud	364
Little Dipper	993
Little Gore Crossover	0
Lower Cloud Traverse	655
Lower Darby	1,019
Lower Sleighride	1,817
Lower Steilhang	1,246
Lower Sunway	3,769
Lower Uncus	794
Lower Wood In Traverse	1,115
Mica	444
Moxham	368
North Star	1,803
Open Pit	972
Otter Slide	407
Peaceful Valley	3,173
Pete Gay	3,976
Pine Knot	2,455
Pipeline Traverse	5,419
Pot Luck	723
Powder Pass	3,580
Quicksilver	2,036
Ruby Run	2,563
Sagamore	6,037
Santanoni	133
Showcase	5,928
Showoff	188
Sleeping Bear	2,796
Starting Gate	359
Sunway	5,047
Tahawus	4,184
Tannery	2,768
The Arena	991
The Glen	433
The Gully	730
The Loop	850
The Oak Ridge Trail	1,984
The Peace Pipe	918
The Rumor	1,260
Topridge	3,900
Tower 6	118
Twin Fawns	1,094
Twister	6,603
Twister's Little Sister	121
Uncas	1,833
Eagles Nest Bridge	620
Upper Darby	808
Upper Sleighride	1,727
Upper Steilhang	1,739
Upper Wood In	973
Village Slopes	0
Ward Hill	874
Wildair	4,980
Wood Lot North	924
Wood Lot South	1,163
Wood Out	2,340
Woodchuck	1,163
Totals (LF)	144,814
Totals (MILEAGE)	27.43

Glade Name	Calculated Length on "Intensive Use" Lands
Abenaki Glades	2,724
Barkeater Glades	0
Birch Bark Alley Glades	853
Boreas Glades	3,135
Cave Glades	1,017
Chatiemac Glades	635
Chatterbox Glades	3,388
Cirque Glades	1,522
Darby Woods Glades	325
Darkside Glades	848
Double Barrel Glades	0
Forever Wild Glades	1,877
Half 'N' Half Glades	305
High Pines Glades	0
Kill Kare Glades	1,147
MacIntyre Glades	485
Mineshaft Glades	271
Otter Slide Glades	947
Pinebrook Glades	944
Rabbit Run	840
Ridge Runner Glades	540
Sagamore Glades	2,029
Ski Bowl Glades	0
Straight Brook Glades	555
Tahawus Glades	0
The Narrows Glades	1,209
Twister Glades	0
Totals (LF)	25,596
Totals (Mileage)	4.85





Gore Mountain Land Use Boundary

20' Contour Line

Lift Line

Alpine Trail, Under 30'

Alpine Trail, 30'-120'

Alpine Trail, 120'-200'

Glade

Queing Area/Trail Access

Work Road/Appurtenance

Trail with Snowmaking Allowance (15')

Trail with Chairlift Allowance (40'/60')

Approved/Not Yet Constructed

Lands of Barton Mines

NYS Wild Forest Lands

Lands of Front Street Mountain Dev Co

Privately Owned Land

NYS Wilderness Lands

Town of Johnsburg Lands

The LA GROUP

Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.

40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs
NY 12866

p: 518/587-8100
f: 518/587-0180
www.thelagroup.com

Unauthorized alteration or addition to this document is a violation of Section 7209 of the New York State Education Law.

© the LA group 2017

OLYMPIC REGIONAL
NEW YORK
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Olympic Regional
Development Authority

2634 Main Street
Lake Placid, New York 12946

GORE
MOUNTAIN

Project Title:

Gore Mountain: 2018 Unit Management Plan Amendment &
Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement

Drawing Title

Existing and Approved Ski
Trails and Glade Inventory


1 inch = 1,500 feet


07501,500


Feet

Date: 04/10/2018
Project No: 201537

Drawing No: 2









New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Olympic Files
FROM: Philip H. Gitlen
SUBJECT: Whiteface Mountain Ski Center - Expansion of Trails
DATE: February 17, 1977

Creation of the Whiteface Mt. Ski Center

On November 4, 1941 the People of the State of New York passed an Amendment to Article 14, Section 1 of the New York State Constitution, the "forever wild" clause authorizing the:

"constructing and maintaining [of] not more than twenty miles of ski trails thirty to eighty feet wide on the North, East and Northwest slopes of Whiteface Mt. in Essex County."

Chapter 691 of the Laws of 1944 created the Whiteface Mt. Authority from the Whiteface Mt. Highway Commission. The new Authority assumed the responsibility of the Memorial Highway and was further given the authority to "acquire, construct, reconstruct, equip, improve, extend, operate and maintain ski trail developments" at Whiteface Mt., Gore Mt. and Old Forge (Laws of 1944, ch. 691 §1). The term "ski trail development" was defined as meaning;

"ski trails, ski tows, open slopes made available for skiing, and all such appurtenances, facilities and related developments as in the judgment of the Authority may be necessary for the promotion, use and enjoyment of the ski trails." (Laws of 1944 ch. 691, §1; Public Authorities Law §101 [repealed 1974])

The use of the language underlined above, is of considerable interest because in 1947 an additional Amendment to the "forever wild" clause of the New York Constitution authorized the construction of ski trails at Belleayre and Gore Mountains together with "appurtenances thereto". The absence of the term "appurtenances" in the Amendment authorizing the development of the Whiteface Mt. Ski Center had caused some to argue that Whiteface Mt. was not to be developed as a commercial ski center, complete with lodges, lifts, parking facilities, etc. but was to solely consist of ski trails between thirty and eighty feet wide.

Apparently, however, the Legislature in 1944 was of a different view and authorized the Adirondack Mt. Authority not only to develop ski trails at Whiteface Mt. but to undertake "ski trail development" which was defined to include "ski tows, open slopes made available for skiing, and such appurtenances, facilities and related developments as in the judgment of the Authority may be necessary for the promotion, use and enjoyment of the ski trails."

The limitations, if any, to the development of the Whiteface Mt. Ski Center was further made the subject of an Attorney General's opinion in 1957. In that opinion, the current Attorney General opined that the Amendment to the Constitution authorizing the development of the Whiteface Mt. Ski Center "was intended and must be interpreted to authorize a ski trail development in the full extent as it is defined in Section 101, subd. 4, of the Public Authorities Law (see definition of "ski trail development" cited above).

Accordingly, not only has the Legislature authorized the development of Whiteface Mt. as a modern ski center including "open slopes", "ski tows" and related facilities, but the New York State Attorney General has agreed that the Legislature correctly interpreted the limitations contained in the New York State Constitution when it created the Whiteface Mt. Authority (see report of Attorney General 1957 pp.197 et seq.)

In 1960 the Whiteface Mt. Authority was renamed the "Adirondack Mt. Authority" (Laws of 1960; ch. 958). In 1974 the Adirondack Mt. Authority ceased to exist and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation assumed responsibility for the continued development, maintenance and operation of the Whiteface Mt. Ski Center.

Existing Conditions at Whiteface Mt. Ski Center

The only significant improvements which have occurred at the Whiteface Mt. Ski Center since the Department of Environmental Conservation assumed jurisdiction over the operation, maintenance and development of that Center, has been the addition of a small building at the Easy Acres area housing the Alpine Training Center and the construction this past Summer of a new "Quad" lift replacing the former chairlift No.1. All other aspects of the facility as it currently exists are as a result of it's development by the Adirondack Mt. Authority and its predecessor. Certain aspects of this development warrant further development here to provide a basis for the discussion of proposed improvements which follows.

Approximately twelve miles of ski trails were developed by the Adirondack Mt. Authority. These ski trails range in width from approximately thirty feet to a maximum where two trails join together of 400 ft. ("Deer" and "Lower Valley Run") and a maximum for a single trail or "slope" of 250 ft. ("Deer"). A review of other trails at the Whiteface Mt. Ski Center indicates that where two or more trails join together they were often developed so as to be a multiple of allowable 80 ft. width, e.g. where "Cloudspin" and "Downhill" join together they are of a combined width of approximately 200 ft., and where "McKenzie", "Wilderness" and "Approach" join together they are of a common width of approximately 300 feet.

There are two conclusions which can be drawn from this pattern of development. The first is that where two or more trails join together a multiple of the constitutionally imposed width limitation may be allowable. The second is that "slopes" may be provided pursuant to the legislation authorizing development of Whiteface Mt. and the Attorney General's opinion, both cited above. The latter conclusion, however, appears to be of doubtful constitutionality, particularly considering the fact that the 1944 legislation has since been repealed.

In addition, trails which have lifts associated with them are often considerably wider than the constitutionally stated maximum width of 80 feet. For example, "Appleknocker" is bisected by chairlift #5 and is as wide as 200 feet in certain places; Valley Run is bisected by chairlift #1 and is 125 feet wide in certain places. Cloudspin, which is bisected in places by chairlift #6, is 150 feet wide in certain places.

From this one can conclude that where a chairlift bisects a trail, an allowance for the width of the chairlift may be allowed in addition to the constitutional requirement for trail widths. This has the beneficial effect of limiting the amount of new clearing required for chairlifts and enhancing the visual appearance of the ski center. Staff have advised that the clearing for a chairlift would be at least thirty to fifty feet.

Whiteface Mt. Ski Center, of course, also contains the normal appurtenances to any modern ski center including a large base lodge, considerable parking facilities and snow-making facilities over a portion of the lower mountain. Each appurtenance has required clearing of forested areas.

Proposed Developments

In connection with the Department's implementation of its long range plan for further development of the Whiteface Mt. Ski Center for the recreational skier as well as to provide appropriate facilities for the Alpine events which are part of the 1980 Winter Olympic Games, the following improvements are planned:

1. Expansion of the existing base lodge;
2. The installation of a significant additional amount of snow-making;
3. Construction of a new warehouse and competitor's building;
4. The construction of a new giant slalom trail;
5. The relocation of former chairlift #1 to serve the giant slalom trails;
6. The replacement of a portion of existing chairlift #6 with a surface lift to provide better access to the summit of Whiteface Mt.; and
7. The limited widening of existing trails and the addition of certain safety "run-outs" on "Downhill" and "Cloudspin".

The expansion of the base lodge, installation of snow-making, relocation and modification to lifts, and construction of additional buildings all appear to be in conformance with the earlier legislative interpretation of the Amendment to the New York State Constitution authorizing the development of the ski center by the Whiteface Mt. Authority as further interpreted by the aforementioned opinion of the New York State Attorney General. The aspect of the Department's development plans which have received considerable attention here have revolved around the construction of the new giant slalom trail and the widening of existing trails due to the more explicit limitations contained in the aforementioned Constitutional Amendment with respect to the allowable mileage and width of ski trail.

With respect to the constitutional limitation which authorizes the development of "not more than twenty miles" of ski trails, the addition of the new giant slalom trail will result in a total of 16 miles of ski trails at the Whiteface Mt. Ski Center. Accordingly, the construction of this ski trail will not violate the express limitation on the allowable length of trails to be developed. This is so even if one considers areas where two trails join together as separate trails for the mileage computation.

The more difficult issue is the allowable width of trails at Whiteface Mt. Ski Center. As noted earlier, there already exist trails or perhaps more properly called "slopes" which greatly exceed the 80 ft. limitation contained in the New York State Constitution. In addition, existing "trails" are, in places, considerably wider than 80 feet. This may be a result of original construction of the trails or may be a result of the natural forces which are present whenever one clears an area on a mountain noted for it's high winds and excessive snow cover. More likely, the portions of the trails which are greater than the 80 ft. limitation are probably a combination of man-made and natural (e.g. windthrow) forces. Nevertheless, the New York State Constitution expressly limits the width of ski trails to a maximum of 80 feet.

With this background, this memorandum will examine the need and reasons for the proposed widening of existing ski trails as well as the parameters which ought be established for the construction of the new giant slalom trail.

There are several reasons for widening the existing ski trails at Whiteface Mt. These include: providing a measure of safety for the recreational skier on relatively steep and winding trails, compliance with the FIS rules which require a minimum trail width of thirty meters for FIS approval, adequate provision for access by modern snow grooming machinery without creating an unsafe condition for the recreational skier, and provision of adequate means of access for use and maintenance of the snow making systems to be installed without decreasing the safety afforded the recreational skier.

As is apparent from the prior development of Whiteface Mt., where lifts (an "appurtenance") bisect trails, an additional width allowance has been utilized to provide a safe skiing area. Additionally, where trails have joined together it has apparently been assumed that a multiple of the 80 ft. width limitation has been allowed.

Accordingly, several working rules may be derived from both the past history of Whiteface Mt. and the requirements attendant with the development of a modern ski center:

1. Where a lift bisects a trail, an allowance for the clearing required for the lift must be made. In such cases, a minimum of 30 additional feet of clearing is required for the lift line.

2. Where trails join together or at the junction of two trails a multiple of the 80 ft. width is allowable; and
3. Sufficient clearing adjacent to ski trails can be allowed for the purposes of installing and maintaining snow-making systems, an appurtenance to a modern ski center.

The Department staff has prepared a map of all the ski trails to be used during the 1980 Winter Olympics and has indicated thereon all of the areas which are currently less than 30 meters in width and the extent of clearing which would otherwise be required for FIS approval (areas which the FIS has requested be cleared to insure a safe finish area). The Department has considered these drawings in connection with it's proposed plans for expanding the lift and snow-making capacities at Whiteface Mt. and the legal justification for widening each area in order to meet FIS specifications, accommodate the new snow-making system, and provide a reasonably safe skiing environment considering the location of lifts, the topography and similar considerations. The following is a discussion keyed to the map prepared by the Department's staff of each proposed area of widening and/or clearing:

Cloudspin (Women's downhill)

Area 1. This 400 ft. section of trail is relatively steep and is currently as narrow as 50 ft. While the installation of snow-making piping can be accomplished within the trees on the edge of the trail, adequate room for maintenance and operation while maintaining a safe skiing area requires that certain widening of the trail occur. In addition, the use of grooming equipment on this area will require widening so that grooming can be conducted without obstructing the trail or creating a hazard for the recreational skier. Accordingly, it is proposed that the trail be widened to approximately 90 (plus or minus) feet taking into account the 80 ft. limitation contained in the Constitution and an allowance for 10 feet of clearing for the provision of a suitable area for the maintenance and operation of snow-making equipment as well as to provide adequate room for grooming of the trails without creating an unsafe condition for the skier. In this connection it should be noted that the grooming machinery to be used by the Department is approximately 15 feet wide and is capable of using implements for snow-grooming which may be as much as 20 feet wide. The area to be cleared contains birch, balsam and spruce averaging 3 inches in width.

Area 2. This 100 ft. section of trail is at the end of a steep curving run which is currently 70 feet in width. The Department proposes to widen this area to approximately 90 feet which is considerably less than the width of the trail just down hill from this area. This widening is necessitated by the installation of the snow-making equipment and the use of snow-grooming equipment as noted above. In addition, chairlift #6 bisects this trail in this area.

Area 3. This 200 ft. section of trail is between two sections which are considerably in excess of 80 feet wide. The trail here is currently approximately 50 feet wide and it is proposed to widen it to approximately 90 feet to accommodate the installation of the snow-making equipment, the maintenance and grooming vehicles as well as to accommodate the installation of a new overhead electric system. This trail section is also bisected by chairlift #6.

Area 4. This 100 ft. section is at the junction of a crossover from "Downhill" which is currently 70 feet wide. The Department proposes to widen this section of trail to approximately 90 feet, to allow for the installation of the snow-making piping and access thereto, and to accommodate maintenance vehicles. Chairlift #6 currently bisects this section of trail.

Areas 5, 6 and 7. These areas encompass approximately 2300 ft. of trail where the current width ranges from 50 to 70 feet. Although snow-making will be installed in these areas, the trail at these locations is relatively straight and not as steep as in the upper mountain area and accordingly, there is no compelling need to widen these sections beyond the 80 ft. limitation contained in the New York State Constitution.

Area 8. This is an extremely small area at the junction of three ski trails with a current width of approximately 180 feet. The proposed widening will not result in the three trails being wider than a combined total of 240 ft. and accordingly is apparently in conformance with the Constitution. In addition, although snow-making will be installed on this trail, the width provided by the three common trails does not necessitate any additional clearing.

Downhill (Men's downhill)

Area 9. This is a 300 ft. section of steep, twisting trail which is currently 50 feet wide in which the Department proposes to widen to approximately 90 feet. The need and justification for this widening is the same as with area #1 with the addition that a snow-making pumphouse (#4) is proposed for installation in this area.

Areas 10 and 11. These encompass approximately 800 feet of trail where the current width is approximately 70 feet. The Department proposes to widen these sections to approximately 90 feet for the same reasons as given with respect to area #1.

Area 12. This is a 400 ft. section of relatively steep, twisting trail which is currently approximately 40 feet wide. FIS has required that this particular section of trail be widened to provide safety for the competitive skier. In addition, for the reasons given with respect to area #1, widening is needed for safety for the recreational skier. This will require a certain amount of clearing as well as the construction of a minor structure to bridge a narrow gorge area to make a trail approximately 90 ft. wide.

Areas 13, 14 and 15. These areas comprise approximately 1,000 feet of trail which are currently 50 to 75 feet in width which are located in a relatively flat straight area. Accordingly, although the Department will be installing snow-making in these areas and will be utilizing snow grooming machinery in these areas, no widening in excess of the 80 ft. limitation contained in the Constitution is required.

Areas 16 and 16a. These are relatively small areas at the junction of "Cloudspin", "Downhill" and the giant slalom trail. The clearing required will not result in a maximum width in excess of the 240 feet, the allowable limit for three merged trails.

Wilderness (Slalom)

Area 18. This section of trail is currently approximately 60 feet wide and the Department proposes to widen it to 90 feet. This area will be the subject of the installation of underground snow-making pipes and accordingly, additional clearing is required to prevent tree roots from interfering with the snow-making pipes and to provide adequate room for maintenance and operation of the snow-making system.

Area 18a. This is actually not a ski trail, but a work road which is currently 20 to 30 feet wide and which will be widened to accommodate maintenance equipment.

Area 18b. This area is approximately 1,000 ft. long and is currently 60 feet wide. The Department proposes to widen this trail to 90 feet for the reasons given for area #18.

Giant Slalom

Area 18c. This area is at the junction of the existing giant slalom and the proposed giant slalom trails as well as the beginning of the slalom trail. In addition, chairlift #2 bisects the existing giant slalom trail. The Department proposes to widen this area to approximately 250 feet wide, taking into account the existence of the three trails and the lift.

Area 19. No cutting is apparently required in this area.

Area 20. This area will be widened from approximately 50 feet to approximately 90 feet to accommodate underground snow-making equipment.

Area 21. This area, over 1,000 feet in length is approximately 50 feet wide and will be widened to approximately 80 feet. Although underground snow-making will be installed in this section, it is relatively straight and not quite as steep as other areas and accordingly the installation of pipes and access for maintenance and operation can be accomplished within an 80 ft. trail width.

Finish Area

Area 17a. This is the confluence of four trails bisected by lift #1 and is currently 120 feet wide. The Department proposes to widen this area to 300 feet well within the allowable limitation for a multiple of four trails.

Area 17. This is below the finish area and can be considered an extension of the above mentioned four trails. Accordingly, the proposed widening to 250 feet from the current 150 feet is, again, well within the multiple allowed for four merged trails.

Area 17b. The Department staff does not see any particular reason for this clearing and accordingly it is not now being proposed.

PHG/jlb

Appendix 6
Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild Forest 2005 UMP Excerpts

APPENDIX J: Further Descriptions of Management Actions

Raymond Brook nordic ski trail (Town of Johnsburg)

In the middle of the twentieth century, a network of ski trails was operated on and around Gore Mountain and Pete Gay Mountain on state and private land. Some of these trails on private land were eventually closed, others became part of Little Gore (also known as the North Creek Ski Bowl), and still others on state land became a part of what is now Gore Mountain Ski Area. An unmarked ski trail that exists in the vicinity of Balm-of-Gilead Mountain in the Siamese Ponds Wilderness Area (SPWA) may also have been a part of this network. This trail connects the Old Farm Clearing trailhead in SPWA to Barton Mines Road and receives moderate winter use. The SPWA UMP proposes designation of this herdpath as a marked DEC trail.

A continuation of this trail, which runs through the Raymond Brook drainage, will be partially re-opened. The new complete trail will run from SPWA, across Barton Mines Road, and eventually connect with State Route 28N just north of the hamlet of North Creek. If an agreement can be reached with the neighboring private owner(s), a short trail will connect from Forest Preserve to existing ski trails on Little Gore (See map). The Town of Johnsburg has indicated that they have arranged for permission to cut and mark ski/hiking trails from the North Creek Ski Bowl across this private land to the state boundary. In this way, the new trail will connect the existing unmarked ski trail in Siamese Ponds Wilderness Area with the hamlet of North Creek. There will also be the opportunity to drive up Barton Mines Road and ski down.

The section from Barton Mines Road to the old trail in the vicinity of an old ski shed, will be comprised of new construction for a distance of approximately 1.5 miles. The middle section will follow the old trail and will require blowdown removal and installation of erosion control devices. The lower section will be a combination of new construction and upgrade of existing paths and skid roads on recently purchased property. A parking lot will be constructed adjacent to Barton Mines Road, and an existing clearing along Route 28N will be utilized for parking at the lower end of the trail.


Raymond Brook Area

Johnsburg



proposed ski trail

possible Little Gore connector



Appendix 7
Stormwater Management Report

Stormwater Management Report

for:

Gore Mountain UMP
at
793 Peaceful Valley Road
North Creek, NY 12853
Warren County

Owner/Operator(s):

Olympic Regional Development Authority
2634 Main Street
Lake Placid, NY 12946
Contact: Mike Pratt

SWM Report Contact(s):

The LA Group, PC
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
1-518-587-8100
Project No. 2016006

Preparation Date:

11/7/2017

Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	4
2.1	SITE LOCATION	4
2.2	PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	4
2.3	SOIL CONDITIONS/SOIL TESTING	4
2.4	CURVE NUMBERS AND RAINFALL DATA.....	4
3.0	EXISTING CONDITIONS	5
4.0	PROPOSED CONDITIONS	5
5.0	NYSDEC DESIGN CRITERIA.....	6
5.1	SITE PLANNING TO PRESERVE NATURAL FEATURES	6
5.2	WATER QUALITY VOLUME (WQV).....	8
5.3	RUNOFF REDUCTION VOLUME (RRV).....	8
5.4	CHANNEL PROTECTION VOLUME (CPV)	9
5.5	OVERBANK FLOOD (QP) AND EXTREME FLOOD (QF) ATTENUATION.....	9
6.0	PROPOSED STORMWATER FACILITIES.....	10
7.0	POST-CONSTRUCTION MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS.....	10
8.0	REFERENCES.....	10

Attachment

- A Soil Investigations**
 - Soil Survey**
 - Natural Resource Map**
- B Existing Conditions Watershed Map and HydroCAD Calculations**
- C Proposed Conditions Watershed Map and HydroCAD Calculations**
- D Storm Data**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The following is a Stormwater Management Report (SWM Report) developed for the Operator, Olympic Regional Development Authority (ORDA), for Gore Mountain UMP, herein referred to as the “Project.” It is prepared in accordance with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Stormwater Management Design Manual, dated January, 2015.

The Project has been designed in accordance with Chapter 4 of the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual (SWMDM), and NYSDEC’s General Permit GP-0-15-002 for construction activities. Stormwater calculations were performed utilizing widely accepted engineering methodologies, including TR-55, and the stormwater modeling computer program HydroCAD (version 10.00) produced by HydroCAD Software Solutions, LLC.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Site Location

The Project is located off Gore Mountain Road in the Town of North Creek, Warren County, NY 12853. Access to the site is off of Peaceful Valley Road.

2.2 Project Description

The Project includes the construction of a new groomer garage and dedicated shuttle loop. The remainder of the proposed site improvements includes site grading, landscaping and stormwater controls. The project is considered a new development project per Chapter 4 of the SWMDM. The Project Site represents the area that will be disturbed as a result of the Project.

2.3 Soil Conditions/Soil Testing

According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey, the area surrounding the Project Site is comprised of Marlow very boulder fine sandy loam. The hydrological soil group classification for this soil type is ‘C’.

2.4 Curve Numbers and Rainfall Data

The surface cover for the project area is meadow non-grazed, grass, woods and impervious buildings and parking lot. The curve numbers utilized in the modeling were assigned based on cover type and HSG soil classification.

The design storms used for the pre-development versus post-development comparison were the 1, 10, and 100-year, 24-hour duration, SCS Type II events. The rainfall amounts for these storms are 2.10, 3.50, and 5.50 inches, respectively.

3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The Project area existing condition, for which this stormwater management plan is based, consists of meadows, woods, roofs, and grass. Under the watershed's Existing Condition, the watershed is broken into five (5) subcatchments. Runoff from the site flows to two separate analysis points (Analysis Points 1 & 2). Analysis Points 1 is located to the north east the project area and represents runoff entering North Creek. Analysis Points 2 is located to the south east of the project area and represents runoff entering Straight Brook. Analysis Points 1 & 2 were utilized in comparing all pre- versus post-runoff conditions. Refer to drawing "W-1 Existing Conditions Watershed Map," located in Attachment B for more information.

Table 3-1 below provides a summary of the existing conditions peak discharge rates for the Project's watershed.

Table 3-1		
Existing Conditions Peak Discharge Rates		
Analysis Point	AP-1	AP-2
Design Storm	(cfs)	(cfs)
10-Year	190.47	40.46
100-Year	455.12	122.47

Refer to Attachment B for more information on the existing conditions watershed modeling.

4.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

Under the watershed's Proposed Condition, all stormwater from the Project will continue to discharge to the same point as in the Existing Condition (Analysis Points 1 & 2). The total watershed has generally remained unchanged, as is shown on the drawing "W-2 Proposed Conditions Watershed Map" contained in Attachment C. To meet NYSDEC requirements (see Section 5.0 NYSDEC Design Criteria of this report) a bioretention basin and wet swale have been incorporated into the stormwater management design to mitigate the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff discharged from the Project Site.

Table 4-1 below provides a summary of the existing conditions versus proposed conditions peak discharge rates for the Project's watershed.

Table 4-1 Existing Conditions Versus Proposed Conditions Peak Discharge Rates				
Analysis Point	AP-1		AP-2	
	Existing	Proposed	Existing	Proposed
Design Storm	(cfs)	(cfs)	(cfs)	(cfs)
10-Year	200.44	197.68	40.46	40.46
100-Year	468.63	468.61	122.47	122.47

Refer to Attachment C for more information on the proposed conditions watershed modeling.

5.0 NYSDEC DESIGN CRITERIA

The New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual, dated January 2015 (The Manual) has been utilized to develop the stormwater management plan. The Manual includes a five-step process that involves site planning and stormwater management practice selection. The five steps include;

- Site planning to preserve natural features and reduce impervious cover,
- Calculation of the Water Quality Volume (WQv) for the Site,
- Incorporation of green infrastructure techniques and standard SMPs with Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv) capacity,
- Use of standard SMPs where applicable, to treat the portion of WQv not addressed by green infrastructure techniques and standard SMPs with RRv capacity, and
- Design of volume and peak rate control (where required)

The approach of the stormwater management plan was to address the stormwater requirements separately. The five steps were reduced to Site Planning to Preserve Natural Features, Water Quality Volume, Runoff Reduction Volume, Channel Protection Volume, and Overbank Flood and Extreme Storm Attenuation, as discussed in the following sections.

Attachment D of this report contains detailed calculations for determining and summarizing the required and provided volumes for Water Quality and Runoff Reduction. In general, the required design criteria (WQv and RRv) were calculated for all areas where site disturbance or green infrastructure techniques are proposed.

5.1 Site Planning to Preserve Natural Features

Within Chapter 3 of The Manual, Table 3.1 Green Infrastructure Planning General Categories and Specific Practices includes a list of planning practices utilized in the planning and design of

a project. There are two categories, Preservation of Natural Resources and Reduction of Imperious Cover.

Preservation of Natural Resources includes:

- Preservation of Undisturbed Areas
- Preservation of Buffers
- Reduction of Clearing and Grading
- Locating Development in Less Sensitive Areas
- Open Space Design
- Soil Restoration

Reduction of Impervious Cover includes:

- Roadway Reduction
- Sidewalk Reduction
- Driveway Reduction
- Cul-de-sac Reduction
- Building Footprint Reduction
- Parking Reduction

A Natural Resource Map for Green Infrastructure Planning has been developed which indicates natural resource areas and critical environmental areas to be protected (where feasible). As required in Section 3.6 of The Manual, the map includes (where applicable):

- Jurisdictional Wetlands
 - There are wetlands located near the project site. These wetlands will not be impacted as part of this project.
- Waterways
 - No waterways are impacted by the Project.
- Wetland Adjacent Area
 - There are wetlands located near the project site. The development does not impact NYSDEC wetland buffer areas.
- Floodplains
 - The project is not within the flood plain.
- Forest, vegetative cover
 - Project is designed to maintain as much of the woods as feasible.
- Topography/Steep slopes
 - There are no steep slopes located throughout the project.
- Existing soils, including hydrologic soil groups and soil erodibility
 - See Section 2.3 of this Report.
- Drainage Patterns
 - See Section 3.0 of this Report.

- Bedrock/Significant geological features
 - See Section 2.3 of this Report.

The Natural Resource Plan indicates the areas to be avoided and depicts the area most suitable for development.

5.2 Water Quality Volume (WQv)

The Water Quality Volume (WQv) requirement is designed to improve water quality sizing to capture and treat 90% of the average annual stormwater runoff volumes. The WQv is directly related to the amount of impervious cover created at a site. The following equation is used to determine the water quality storage volume.

$$WQv = \frac{(P)(Rv)(A)}{12}$$

Where:

WQv = Water quality volume (acre/feet)
 P = 90% Rainfall Event (1.1" for North Creek)
 Rv = 0.05 + 0.009(I) where I is percent impervious cover
 A = Site area in acres

The required WQv will be provided by bioretention basins and a wet swale designed in accordance with the SWMDM. Refer to Table 5-1 for a summary of the required versus provided water quality volumes for the Project.

Table 5-1 Water Quality Volume (WQv) Summary			
SMP	Type	Required	Provided
		(ac-ft)	(ac-ft)
SMP1	Wet Swale		0.194
SMP2	Bioretention Basin		0.032
SMP3	Bioretention Basin		0.105
TOTAL		0.138	0.331

Refer to Attachment D for detailed WQv calculations.

5.3 Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv)

Section 4.3 of the Manual states, "Runoff reduction shall be achieved by infiltration, groundwater recharge, reuse, recycle, evaporation/evapotranspiration of 100 percent of the post-

development water quality volumes to replicate pre-development hydrology by maintaining pre-construction infiltration, peak runoff flow, discharge volume, as well as minimizing concentrated flow by using runoff control techniques to provide treatment in a distributed manner before runoff reaches the collection system.”

The project does not achieve 100% reduction of the on-site WQv; however, through the use of green infrastructure the minimum required RRv of 0.041 ac-ft is reduced.

Table 5-2 Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv) Summary	
SMP	Provided
	(unit)
5.3.1 Conservation of Natural Areas	-
5.3.2 Sheetflow to Riparian Buffers/Filter Strips	-
5.3.3 Wet Open Swales	-
5.3.4 Tree Planting/Tree Box	-
5.3.5 Disconnection of Rooftop Runoff	-
5.3.6 Stream Daylighting	-
5.3.7 Rain Garden	-
5.3.8 Green Roof	-
5.3.9 Stormwater Planters	-
5.3.10 Rain Tanks/Cisterns	-
5.3.11 Porous Pavement	-
Bioretention Basin (SMP2)	0.013
Bioretention Basin (SMP3)	0.048
TOTAL	0.061 (ac-ft)

Refer to Attachment D for detailed RRv calculations.

5.4 Channel Protection Volume (CPv)

Channel Protection Volume (Cpv) is achieved by a combination of volume reduction through green infrastructure practices.

5.5 Overbank Flood (Qp) and Extreme Flood (Qf) Attenuation

The primary purpose of the Overbank Flood (Qp) control sizing criterion is to prevent an increase in the frequency and magnitude of out-of-bank flooding generated by urban

development. It requires storage and attenuation of the 10-year, 24-hour storm to ensure post-development peak discharge rates do not exceed the pre-development condition.

The intent of the Extreme Flood (Qf) criteria is to (a) prevent the increased risk of flood damage from large storm events, (b) maintain the boundaries of the pre-development 100-year floodplain, and (c) protect the physical integrity of stormwater management practices. It requires storage and attenuation of the 100-year, 24-hour storm to ensure post-development peak discharge rates do not exceed the pre-development condition.

During the 10-year and 100-year 24-hour storm the post-development peak discharge rates do not exceed the pre-development rates. See Table 4-1 of this Report for detailed comparison of pre- and post-development peak rates.

6.0 PROPOSED STORMWATER FACILITIES

The Project is proposing the installation of two bioretention basins and a wet swale to address stormwater requirements for the project. The stormwater facilities have been indicated on the plans and HydroCAD reports as SMP1 through SMP3. SMP1 is a wet swale located to the east of the new dedicated shuttle loop will treat runoff from the proposed shuttle loop as well as the existing roadway SMP2 is a bioretention basin located adjacent to the proposed groomer garage and will treat the roof runoff from the building. SMP3 is a bioretention basin located adjacent to the entrance of Lot E and will treat runoff from nearby impervious areas. The Stormwater facilities have been designed to provide the necessary pretreatment, treatment, and peak rate attenuation for stormwater runoff, for the project, as required by NYSDEC.

7.0 POST-CONSTRUCTION MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

Gore Mountain will be responsible for the continuous upkeep and maintenance of all stormwater management facilities. Maintenance includes, but is not limited to, cleaning of sediment from drainage inlet sumps, removal of sediment from SMPs, cleaning conveyance piping and channels of obstructions, inspection and repair as required of any outlet control mechanisms, and repairing any other detriments in the design that is resulting in the facilities to not function as intended in the design.

8.0 REFERENCES

1. Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds. Published by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, Washington, D.C., June 1986.
2. HydroCAD 10.00 Computer Program, by HydroCAD Software Solutions, LLC.

3. NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual. Published by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Updated January 2015.

G:\Proj-2015\201537_Gore_Mountain_2015\201537-04_UMP Work Gore and Ski Bowl\2015037-004Enviro\02SWPPP\2015037_SWM Report.doc

Attachment A

**Soil Investigations
Soil Survey
Natural Resource Map**



United States
Department of
Agriculture

NRCS

Natural
Resources
Conservation
Service

A product of the National
Cooperative Soil Survey,
a joint effort of the United
States Department of
Agriculture and other
Federal agencies, State
agencies including the
Agricultural Experiment
Stations, and local
participants

Custom Soil Resource Report for **Warren County, New York**



October 18, 2017

Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/>) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (<https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs>) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/?cid=nrcs142p2_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require

alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Contents

Preface	2
How Soil Surveys Are Made	5
Soil Map	8
Soil Map.....	9
Legend.....	10
Map Unit Legend.....	11
Map Unit Descriptions.....	11
Warren County, New York.....	13
BdC—Bice very bouldery fine sandy loam, sloping.....	13
HeE—Hermon very bouldery fine sandy loam, steep.....	14
HmE—Hermon-Lyman-Rock outcrop complex, steep.....	15
HpC—Hinckley-Plainfield complex, sloping.....	17
HpE—Hinckley-Plainfield complex, steep.....	19
LmE—Lyman-Rock outcrop complex, steep.....	21
MrC—Marlow very bouldery fine sandy loam, sloping.....	23
MrE—Marlow very bouldery fine sandy loam, steep.....	24
PIC—Plainfield loamy sand, 8 to 15 percent slopes.....	26
References	28

How Soil Surveys Are Made

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.

Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.

The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.

Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil

scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map. The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape, and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded. These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color, depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.

Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other properties.

While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management. Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same kinds of soil.

Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example, soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.

After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and


Custom Soil Resource Report

identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.


Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.

Custom Soil Resource Report Soil Map



Map Scale: 1:14,900 if printed on A landscape (11" x 8.5") sheet.




Map projection: Web Mercator Corner coordinates: WGS84 Edge tics: UTM Zone 18N WGS84

Custom Soil Resource Report

MAP LEGEND

Area of Interest (AOI)

 Area of Interest (AOI)

Soils

 Soil Map Unit Polygons

 Soil Map Unit Lines

 Soil Map Unit Points

Special Point Features

 Blowout

 Borrow Pit

 Clay Spot


 Closed Depression

 Gravel Pit

 Gravelly Spot

 Landfill

 Lava Flow

 Marsh or swamp

 Mine or Quarry

 Miscellaneous Water

 Perennial Water

 Rock Outcrop

 Saline Spot

 Sandy Spot

 Severely Eroded Spot


 Sinkhole

 Slide or Slip

 Sodic Spot

 Spoil Area

 Stony Spot

 Very Stony Spot

 Wet Spot

 Other

 Special Line Features

Water Features

 Streams and Canals

Transportation

 Rails

 Interstate Highways

 US Routes

 Major Roads

 Local Roads

Background

 Aerial Photography

MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:15,800.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service

Web Soil Survey URL:

Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Warren County, New York

Survey Area Data: Version 16, Sep 24, 2016

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Jun 30, 2014—Mar 29, 2017

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.

Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
BdC	Bice very bouldery fine sandy loam, sloping	15.2	2.6%
HeE	Hermon very bouldery fine sandy loam, steep	48.4	8.1%
HmE	Hermon-Lyman-Rock outcrop complex, steep	47.0	7.9%
HpC	Hinckley-Plainfield complex, sloping	6.6	1.1%
HpE	Hinckley-Plainfield complex, steep	57.1	9.6%
LmE	Lyman-Rock outcrop complex, steep	31.5	5.3%
MrC	Marlow very bouldery fine sandy loam, sloping	184.0	31.0%
MrE	Marlow very bouldery fine sandy loam, steep	195.2	32.9%
PIC	Plainfield loamy sand, 8 to 15 percent slopes	9.2	1.6%
Totals for Area of Interest		594.2	100.0%

Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They

generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a *soil series*. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into *soil phases*. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A *complex* consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An *association* is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An *undifferentiated group* is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include *miscellaneous areas*. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.

Warren County, New York

BdC—Bice very bouldery fine sandy loam, sloping

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9xw2

Elevation: 800 to 1,800 feet

Mean annual precipitation: 40 to 50 inches

Mean annual air temperature: 41 to 45 degrees F

Frost-free period: 100 to 130 days

Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Bice and similar soils: 70 percent

Minor components: 30 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Bice

Setting

Landform: Ridges, hills, till plains

Landform position (two-dimensional): Shoulder

Landform position (three-dimensional): Crest

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Loamy till derived mainly from granite and gneiss with variable components of sandstone and shale

Typical profile

Oe - 0 to 2 inches: moderately decomposed plant material

H2 - 2 to 5 inches: fine sandy loam

H3 - 5 to 24 inches: fine sandy loam

H4 - 24 to 60 inches: fine sandy loam

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent

Percent of area covered with surface fragments: 1.6 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches

Natural drainage class: Well drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.20 to 1.98 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water storage in profile: Moderate (about 7.9 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6s

Hydrologic Soil Group: B

Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Schroon

Percent of map unit: 5 percent

Custom Soil Resource Report

Hydric soil rating: No

Lyme

Percent of map unit: 5 percent

Landform: Depressions

Hydric soil rating: Yes

Stowe

Percent of map unit: 4 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Woodstock

Percent of map unit: 4 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Plainfield

Percent of map unit: 4 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Hinckley

Percent of map unit: 4 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Unnamed soils

Percent of map unit: 4 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

HeE—Hermon very bouldery fine sandy loam, steep

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9xwq

Elevation: 10 to 2,800 feet

Mean annual precipitation: 40 to 50 inches

Mean annual air temperature: 41 to 45 degrees F

Frost-free period: 100 to 130 days

Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Hermon and similar soils: 70 percent

Minor components: 30 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Hermon

Setting

Landform: Valley sides, moraines

Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Sandy and gravelly till derived mainly from crystalline rock

Custom Soil Resource Report

Typical profile

H1 - 0 to 5 inches: gravelly fine sandy loam
H2 - 5 to 18 inches: gravelly fine sandy loam
H3 - 18 to 25 inches: very gravelly sandy loam
H4 - 25 to 65 inches: very gravelly loamy sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 25 to 35 percent
Percent of area covered with surface fragments: 1.6 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Somewhat excessively drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High to very high (1.98 to 19.98 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 3.9 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 7s
Hydrologic Soil Group: A
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Marlow

Percent of map unit: 9 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Peru

Percent of map unit: 9 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Bice

Percent of map unit: 9 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Unnamed soils

Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Hydric soil rating: Unranked

HmE—Hermon-Lyman-Rock outcrop complex, steep

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9xws
Elevation: 10 to 2,800 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 37 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 41 to 48 degrees F
Frost-free period: 100 to 160 days
Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Hermon and similar soils: 40 percent

Lyman and similar soils: 20 percent

Rock outcrop: 20 percent

Minor components: 20 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Hermon

Setting

Landform: Valley sides, moraines

Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Sandy and gravelly till derived mainly from crystalline rock

Typical profile

H1 - 0 to 5 inches: gravelly fine sandy loam

H2 - 5 to 18 inches: gravelly fine sandy loam

H3 - 18 to 25 inches: very gravelly sandy loam

H4 - 25 to 65 inches: very gravelly loamy sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 25 to 35 percent

Percent of area covered with surface fragments: 1.6 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches

Natural drainage class: Somewhat excessively drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High to very high (1.98 to 19.98 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water storage in profile: Low (about 3.9 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 7s

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Lyman

Setting

Landform: Hillsides or mountainsides

Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Loamy till derived mainly from crystalline rock

Typical profile

Oe - 0 to 2 inches: moderately decomposed plant material

H2 - 2 to 4 inches: fine sandy loam

H3 - 4 to 10 inches: fine sandy loam

H4 - 10 to 19 inches: fine sandy loam

Custom Soil Resource Report

H5 - 19 to 23 inches: bedrock

Properties and qualities

Slope: 25 to 35 percent

Percent of area covered with surface fragments: 1.6 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: 10 to 20 inches to lithic bedrock

Natural drainage class: Somewhat excessively drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low (0.00 to 0.00 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water storage in profile: Low (about 4.1 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 7s

Hydrologic Soil Group: D

Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Rock Outcrop

Typical profile

R - 0 to 10 inches: bedrock

Properties and qualities

Depth to restrictive feature: 0 inches to lithic bedrock

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low (0.00 to 0.00 in/hr)

Minor Components

Peru

Percent of map unit: 8 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Marlow

Percent of map unit: 8 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Unnamed soils

Percent of map unit: 4 percent

Hydric soil rating: Unranked

HpC—Hinckley-Plainfield complex, sloping

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9xwy

Elevation: 0 to 1,150 feet

Mean annual precipitation: 37 to 46 inches

Custom Soil Resource Report

Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 48 degrees F

Frost-free period: 110 to 160 days

Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Hinckley and similar soils: 45 percent

Plainfield and similar soils: 35 percent

Minor components: 20 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Hinckley

Setting

Landform: Deltas, outwash plains, terraces

Landform position (two-dimensional): Shoulder

Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Sandy and gravelly glaciofluvial deposits derived principally from granite, gneiss, and schist

Typical profile

Oi - 0 to 1 inches: slightly decomposed plant material

H2 - 1 to 5 inches: cobbly sandy loam

H3 - 5 to 28 inches: very gravelly loamy sand

H4 - 28 to 64 inches: stratified very gravelly sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches

Natural drainage class: Excessively drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.57 to 5.95 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water storage in profile: Low (about 3.7 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4s

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Plainfield

Setting

Landform: Deltas, outwash plains, terraces

Landform position (two-dimensional): Shoulder

Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Sandy glaciofluvial or deltaic deposits

Typical profile

Oi - 0 to 1 inches: slightly decomposed plant material

H1 - 1 to 11 inches: loamy sand

Custom Soil Resource Report

H2 - 11 to 26 inches: sand

H3 - 26 to 60 inches: sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches

Natural drainage class: Excessively drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.57 to 5.95 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water storage in profile: Low (about 4.0 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6s

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Castile

Percent of map unit: 5 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Pits, sand, gravel

Percent of map unit: 5 percent

Hydric soil rating: Unranked

Unnamed soils

Percent of map unit: 5 percent

Hydric soil rating: Yes

Wareham

Percent of map unit: 3 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Wareham

Percent of map unit: 2 percent

Landform: Depressions

Hydric soil rating: Yes

HpE—Hinckley-Plainfield complex, steep

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9xwz

Elevation: 0 to 1,150 feet

Mean annual precipitation: 37 to 46 inches

Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 48 degrees F

Frost-free period: 110 to 160 days

Custom Soil Resource Report

Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Hinckley and similar soils: 45 percent

Plainfield and similar soils: 35 percent

Minor components: 20 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Hinckley

Setting

Landform: Deltas, outwash plains, terraces

Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Riser

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Sandy and gravelly glaciofluvial deposits derived principally from granite, gneiss, and schist

Typical profile

Oi - 0 to 1 inches: slightly decomposed plant material

H2 - 1 to 5 inches: cobbly sandy loam

H3 - 5 to 28 inches: very gravelly loamy sand

H4 - 28 to 64 inches: stratified very gravelly sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 25 to 35 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches

Natural drainage class: Excessively drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.57 to 5.95 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water storage in profile: Low (about 3.7 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 7s

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Plainfield

Setting

Landform: Deltas, outwash plains, terraces

Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Riser

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Sandy glaciofluvial or deltaic deposits

Typical profile

Oi - 0 to 1 inches: slightly decomposed plant material

H1 - 1 to 11 inches: loamy sand

H2 - 11 to 26 inches: sand

H3 - 26 to 60 inches: sand

Custom Soil Resource Report

Properties and qualities

Slope: 25 to 35 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Excessively drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (0.57 to 5.95 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 4.0 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 7s
Hydrologic Soil Group: A
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Castile

Percent of map unit: 5 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Unnamed soils

Percent of map unit: 5 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Pits, sand, gravel

Percent of map unit: 5 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Wareham

Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Wareham

Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Landform: Depressions
Hydric soil rating: Yes

LmE—Lyman-Rock outcrop complex, steep

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9xx3
Mean annual precipitation: 37 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 41 to 48 degrees F
Frost-free period: 100 to 160 days
Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Lyman and similar soils: 55 percent

Rock outcrop: 30 percent

Minor components: 15 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Lyman

Setting

Landform: Hillsides or mountainsides

Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Loamy till derived mainly from crystalline rock

Typical profile

Oe - 0 to 2 inches: moderately decomposed plant material

H2 - 2 to 4 inches: fine sandy loam

H3 - 4 to 10 inches: fine sandy loam

H4 - 10 to 19 inches: fine sandy loam

H5 - 19 to 23 inches: bedrock

Properties and qualities

Slope: 25 to 35 percent

Percent of area covered with surface fragments: 1.6 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: 10 to 20 inches to lithic bedrock

Natural drainage class: Somewhat excessively drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low (0.00 to 0.00 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water storage in profile: Low (about 4.1 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 7s

Hydrologic Soil Group: D

Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Rock Outcrop

Typical profile

R - 0 to 10 inches: bedrock

Properties and qualities

Depth to restrictive feature: 0 inches to lithic bedrock

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low (0.00 to 0.00 in/hr)

Minor Components

Peru

Percent of map unit: 4 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Marlow

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Hermion

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Unnamed soils

Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

MrC—Marlow very bouldery fine sandy loam, sloping

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9xx7
Mean annual precipitation: 40 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 41 to 45 degrees F
Frost-free period: 100 to 130 days
Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Marlow and similar soils: 70 percent
Minor components: 30 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Marlow

Setting

Landform: Hillsides or mountainsides
Landform position (two-dimensional): Shoulder
Landform position (three-dimensional): Crest
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Convex
Parent material: Loamy dense till derived mainly from crystalline rock

Typical profile

Oa - 0 to 2 inches: highly decomposed plant material
H2 - 2 to 8 inches: fine sandy loam
H3 - 8 to 14 inches: gravelly fine sandy loam
H4 - 14 to 30 inches: gravelly fine sandy loam
H5 - 30 to 60 inches: gravelly sandy loam

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent
Percent of area covered with surface fragments: 1.6 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: 18 to 36 inches to densic material
Natural drainage class: Well drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately low to moderately high (0.06 to 0.57 in/hr)

Custom Soil Resource Report

Depth to water table: About 24 to 36 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 4.9 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6s
Hydrologic Soil Group: C
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Hermon

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Lyman

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Woodstock

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Bice

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Peru

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Lyme

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Landform: Depressions
Hydric soil rating: Yes

Stowe

Percent of map unit: 4 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Unnamed soils

Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

MrE—Marlow very bouldery fine sandy loam, steep

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9xx8
Mean annual precipitation: 40 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 41 to 45 degrees F
Frost-free period: 100 to 130 days

Custom Soil Resource Report

Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Marlow and similar soils: 75 percent

Minor components: 25 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Marlow

Setting

Landform: Hillsides or mountainsides

Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Loamy dense till derived mainly from crystalline rock

Typical profile

Oa - 0 to 2 inches: highly decomposed plant material

H2 - 2 to 8 inches: fine sandy loam

H3 - 8 to 14 inches: gravelly fine sandy loam

H4 - 14 to 30 inches: gravelly fine sandy loam

H5 - 30 to 60 inches: gravelly sandy loam

Properties and qualities

Slope: 25 to 35 percent

Percent of area covered with surface fragments: 1.6 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: 18 to 36 inches to densic material

Natural drainage class: Well drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately low to moderately high (0.06 to 0.57 in/hr)

Depth to water table: About 24 to 36 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water storage in profile: Low (about 4.9 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 7s

Hydrologic Soil Group: C

Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Unnamed soils

Percent of map unit: 4 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Peru

Percent of map unit: 3 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Hermon

Percent of map unit: 3 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Lyman

Percent of map unit: 3 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Woodstock

Percent of map unit: 3 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Lyme

Percent of map unit: 3 percent

Landform: Depressions

Hydric soil rating: Yes

Bice

Percent of map unit: 3 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Stowe

Percent of map unit: 3 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

PIC—Plainfield loamy sand, 8 to 15 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 9xxq

Elevation: 720 to 1,150 feet

Mean annual precipitation: 37 to 46 inches

Mean annual air temperature: 45 to 48 degrees F

Frost-free period: 110 to 160 days

Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Plainfield and similar soils: 90 percent

Minor components: 10 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Plainfield

Setting

Landform: Deltas, outwash plains, terraces

Landform position (two-dimensional): Shoulder

Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Sandy glaciofluvial or deltaic deposits

Typical profile

H1 - 0 to 10 inches: loamy sand

H2 - 10 to 25 inches: sand

H3 - 25 to 60 inches: sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches

Custom Soil Resource Report

Natural drainage class: Excessively drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High to very high (5.95 to 19.98 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water storage in profile: Low (about 3.6 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6s

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Elnora

Percent of map unit: 4 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Hinckley

Percent of map unit: 4 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

Unnamed soils, similar to plainfield, reddish

Percent of map unit: 2 percent

Hydric soil rating: No

References

- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2004. Standard specifications for transportation materials and methods of sampling and testing. 24th edition.
- American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). 2005. Standard classification of soils for engineering purposes. ASTM Standard D2487-00.
- Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deep-water habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-79/31.
- Federal Register. July 13, 1994. Changes in hydric soils of the United States.
- Federal Register. September 18, 2002. Hydric soils of the United States.
- Hurt, G.W., and L.M. Vasilas, editors. Version 6.0, 2006. Field indicators of hydric soils in the United States.
- National Research Council. 1995. Wetlands: Characteristics and boundaries.
- Soil Survey Division Staff. 1993. Soil survey manual. Soil Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 18. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_054262
- Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053577
- Soil Survey Staff. 2010. Keys to soil taxonomy. 11th edition. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053580
- Tiner, R.W., Jr. 1985. Wetlands of Delaware. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, Wetlands Section.
- United States Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual. Waterways Experiment Station Technical Report Y-87-1.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National forestry manual. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/home/?cid=nrcs142p2_053374
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National range and pasture handbook. <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/landuse/rangepasture/?cid=stelprdb1043084>

Custom Soil Resource Report

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/scientists/?cid=nrcs142p2_054242

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053624






United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. 1961. Land capability classification. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 210. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_052290.pdf



Attachment B

**Existing Conditions Watershed Map and
HydroCAD Calculations**



LEGEND

-  SUBCATCHMENT BOUNDARY
-  TIME OF CONCENTRATION
-  SUBCATCHMENT ID
-  STORMWATER FACILITY
-  ANALYSIS POINT



The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.

People. Purpose. Place.

40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs
NY 12866

P: 518-587-8100
F: 518-587-0180
www.thelagroup.com

Unauthorized alteration or addition to this document is a violation of Section 7209 of the New York State Education Law.

© the LA Group 2017

Prepared for:

Olympic Regional
Development Authority

2634 Main Street
Lake Placid, New York 12946

Project Title:

Gore Mountain:
2017 Unit
Management Plan
Draft Amendment
& Draft Generic
Environmental
Impact Statement

Project No.:	2015037
Design:	BCS
Drawn:	BCS Ch/k'd: DBH
Scale:	1" = 200'




Description:	Date:

Drawing Title

Existing Conditions
Watershed Map

Drawing No.

W-1



Gore Pre Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 2

Area Listing (all nodes)

Area (acres)	CN	Description (subcatchment-numbers)
0.942	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C (3)
25.010	98	Paved parking, HSG C (1, 3, 4)
224.805	70	Woods, Good, HSG C (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
250.757	73	TOTAL AREA

Gore Pre Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 3

Soil Listing (all nodes)

Area (acres)	Soil Group	Subcatchment Numbers
0.000	HSG A	
0.000	HSG B	
250.757	HSG C	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
0.000	HSG D	
0.000	Other	
250.757		TOTAL AREA

Gore Pre Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 4

Ground Covers (all nodes)

HSG-A (acres)	HSG-B (acres)	HSG-C (acres)	HSG-D (acres)	Other (acres)	Total (acres)	Ground Cover	Subcatchment Numbers
0.000	0.000	0.942	0.000	0.000	0.942	>75% Grass cover, Good	3
0.000	0.000	25.010	0.000	0.000	25.010	Paved parking	1, 3, 4
0.000	0.000	224.805	0.000	0.000	224.805	Woods, Good	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
0.000	0.000	250.757	0.000	0.000	250.757	TOTAL AREA	

Gore Pre Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 1-YR Rainfall=2.10"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 5

Time span=5.00-20.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 301 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Stor-Ind+Trans method - Pond routing by Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment 1: Subcat 1

Runoff Area=164.691 ac 8.95% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.31"
Flow Length=2,229' Tc=29.6 min CN=73 Runoff=38.44 cfs 4.316 af

Subcatchment 2: Subcat 2

Runoff Area=35.807 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.24"
Flow Length=1,112' Tc=25.5 min CN=70 Runoff=5.99 cfs 0.705 af

Subcatchment 3: Subcat 3

Runoff Area=28.794 ac 30.03% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.52"
Flow Length=3,110' Tc=24.7 min CN=79 Runoff=14.79 cfs 1.238 af

Subcatchment 4: Subcat 4

Runoff Area=17.152 ac 9.44% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.31"
Flow Length=1,452' Tc=27.4 min CN=73 Runoff=4.24 cfs 0.450 af

Subcatchment 5: Subcat 5

Runoff Area=4.312 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.24"
Tc=6.0 min CN=70 Runoff=1.63 cfs 0.086 af

Pond 7P: Porous Parking Lots

Peak Elev=1,425.00' Storage=28 cf Inflow=1.63 cfs 0.086 af
Outflow=1.62 cfs 0.086 af

Pond FB-1: Forebay 1

Peak Elev=1,428.19' Storage=4,471 cf Inflow=4.24 cfs 0.450 af
Outflow=3.99 cfs 0.355 af

Pond SMP1: Pocket Pond 1

Peak Elev=1,428.02' Storage=12,634 cf Inflow=3.99 cfs 0.355 af
Outflow=0.31 cfs 0.066 af

Link AP-1: AP-1

Inflow=52.02 cfs 5.554 af
Primary=52.02 cfs 5.554 af

Link AP-2: AP-2

Inflow=5.99 cfs 0.771 af
Primary=5.99 cfs 0.771 af

Total Runoff Area = 250.757 ac Runoff Volume = 6.795 af Average Runoff Depth = 0.33"
90.03% Pervious = 225.747 ac 9.97% Impervious = 25.010 ac

Gore Pre Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=3.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 6

Time span=5.00-20.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 301 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Stor-Ind+Trans method - Pond routing by Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment 1: Subcat 1

Runoff Area=164.691 ac 8.95% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.05"
Flow Length=2,229' Tc=29.6 min CN=73 Runoff=159.47 cfs 14.475 af

Subcatchment 2: Subcat 2

Runoff Area=35.807 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.90"
Flow Length=1,112' Tc=25.5 min CN=70 Runoff=31.53 cfs 2.672 af

Subcatchment 3: Subcat 3

Runoff Area=28.794 ac 30.03% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.42"
Flow Length=3,110' Tc=24.7 min CN=79 Runoff=43.50 cfs 3.416 af

Subcatchment 4: Subcat 4

Runoff Area=17.152 ac 9.44% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.06"
Flow Length=1,452' Tc=27.4 min CN=73 Runoff=17.49 cfs 1.509 af

Subcatchment 5: Subcat 5

Runoff Area=4.312 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.90"
Tc=6.0 min CN=70 Runoff=7.41 cfs 0.325 af

Pond 7P: Porous Parking Lots

Peak Elev=1,425.00' Storage=128 cf Inflow=7.41 cfs 0.325 af
Outflow=7.41 cfs 0.325 af

Pond FB-1: Forebay 1

Peak Elev=1,428.48' Storage=5,100 cf Inflow=17.49 cfs 1.509 af
Outflow=17.43 cfs 1.413 af

Pond SMP1: Pocket Pond 1

Peak Elev=1,428.36' Storage=14,548 cf Inflow=17.43 cfs 1.413 af
Outflow=16.44 cfs 1.121 af

Link AP-1: AP-1

Inflow=200.44 cfs 17.891 af
Primary=200.44 cfs 17.891 af

Link AP-2: AP-2

Inflow=40.46 cfs 3.793 af
Primary=40.46 cfs 3.793 af

Total Runoff Area = 250.757 ac Runoff Volume = 22.397 af Average Runoff Depth = 1.07"
90.03% Pervious = 225.747 ac 9.97% Impervious = 25.010 ac

Gore Pre Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 1

Time span=5.00-20.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 301 points
Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
Reach routing by Stor-Ind+Trans method - Pond routing by Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment 1: Subcat 1

Runoff Area=164.691 ac 8.95% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.44"
Flow Length=2,229' Tc=29.6 min CN=73 Runoff=382.14 cfs 33.502 af

Subcatchment 2: Subcat 2

Runoff Area=35.807 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.19"
Flow Length=1,112' Tc=25.5 min CN=70 Runoff=81.61 cfs 6.541 af

Subcatchment 3: Subcat 3

Runoff Area=28.794 ac 30.03% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.98"
Flow Length=3,110' Tc=24.7 min CN=79 Runoff=91.09 cfs 7.157 af

Subcatchment 4: Subcat 4

Runoff Area=17.152 ac 9.44% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.44"
Flow Length=1,452' Tc=27.4 min CN=73 Runoff=41.92 cfs 3.492 af

Subcatchment 5: Subcat 5

Runoff Area=4.312 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.21"
Tc=6.0 min CN=70 Runoff=18.13 cfs 0.794 af

Pond 7P: Porous Parking Lots

Peak Elev=1,425.00' Storage=313 cf Inflow=18.13 cfs 0.794 af
Outflow=18.14 cfs 0.794 af

Pond FB-1: Forebay 1

Peak Elev=1,428.85' Storage=5,953 cf Inflow=41.92 cfs 3.492 af
Outflow=41.80 cfs 3.395 af

Pond SMP1: Pocket Pond 1

Peak Elev=1,428.65' Storage=16,221 cf Inflow=41.80 cfs 3.395 af
Outflow=41.66 cfs 3.100 af

Link AP-1: AP-1

Inflow=468.63 cfs 40.659 af
Primary=468.63 cfs 40.659 af

Link AP-2: AP-2

Inflow=122.47 cfs 9.641 af
Primary=122.47 cfs 9.641 af

Total Runoff Area = 250.757 ac Runoff Volume = 51.486 af Average Runoff Depth = 2.46"
90.03% Pervious = 225.747 ac 9.97% Impervious = 25.010 ac

Gore Pre Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 2

Summary for Subcatchment 1: Subcat 1

Runoff = 382.14 cfs @ 12.24 hrs, Volume= 33.502 af, Depth> 2.44"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Area (ac)	CN	Description
14.745	98	Paved parking, HSG C
149.946	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
164.691	73	Weighted Average
149.946		91.05% Pervious Area
14.745		8.95% Impervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
12.8	100	0.1000	0.13		Sheet Flow, Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.50"
16.8	2,129	0.1790	2.12		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
29.6	2,229	Total			

Summary for Subcatchment 2: Subcat 2

Runoff = 81.61 cfs @ 12.20 hrs, Volume= 6.541 af, Depth> 2.19"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Area (ac)	CN	Description
35.807	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
35.807		100.00% Pervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
16.8	100	0.0500	0.10		Sheet Flow, Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.50"
8.7	1,012	0.1500	1.94		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
25.5	1,112	Total			

Summary for Subcatchment 3: Subcat 3

Runoff = 91.09 cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume= 7.157 af, Depth> 2.98"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Gore Pre Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 3

Area (ac)	CN	Description
0.942	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C
8.646	98	Paved parking, HSG C
19.207	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
28.794	79	Weighted Average
20.149		69.97% Pervious Area
8.646		30.03% Impervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
11.2	100	0.1400	0.15		Sheet Flow, Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.50"
2.3	315	0.2000	2.24		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
0.6	160	0.0500	4.54		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Paved Kv= 20.3 fps
10.6	2,535	0.0700	3.97		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Grassed Waterway Kv= 15.0 fps
24.7	3,110	Total			

Summary for Subcatchment 4: Subcat 4

Runoff = 41.92 cfs @ 12.22 hrs, Volume= 3.492 af, Depth> 2.44"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Area (ac)	CN	Description
1.619	98	Paved parking, HSG C
15.533	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
17.152	73	Weighted Average
15.533		90.56% Pervious Area
1.619		9.44% Impervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
14.7	100	0.0700	0.11		Sheet Flow, Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.50"
12.7	1,352	0.1257	1.77		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
27.4	1,452	Total			

Summary for Subcatchment 5: Subcat 5

Runoff = 18.13 cfs @ 11.98 hrs, Volume= 0.794 af, Depth> 2.21"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Gore Pre Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 4

Area (ac)	CN	Description
4.312	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
4.312		100.00% Pervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
6.0					Direct Entry,

Summary for Pond 7P: Porous Parking Lots

Inflow Area = 4.312 ac, 0.00% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.21" for 100-YR event
 Inflow = 18.13 cfs @ 11.98 hrs, Volume= 0.794 af
 Outflow = 18.14 cfs @ 11.98 hrs, Volume= 0.794 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.4 min
 Discarded = 18.14 cfs @ 11.98 hrs, Volume= 0.794 af

Routing by Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
 Peak Elev= 1,425.00' @ 11.98 hrs Surf.Area= 145,040 sf Storage= 313 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= 0.3 min calculated for 0.794 af (100% of inflow)
 Center-of-Mass det. time= 0.2 min (794.9 - 794.7)

Volume	Invert	Avail.Storage	Storage Description		
#1	1,425.00'	145,040 cf	Custom Stage Data (Irregular) Listed below (Recalc)		
Elevation (feet)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Perim. (feet)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	Wet.Area (sq-ft)
1,425.00	145,040	2,721.0	0	0	145,040
1,426.00	145,040	2,721.0	145,040	145,040	147,761

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Discarded	1,425.00'	25.000 in/hr Exfiltration over Surface area

Discarded OutFlow Max=83.94 cfs @ 11.98 hrs HW=1,425.00' (Free Discharge)
 ↑**1=Exfiltration** (Exfiltration Controls 83.94 cfs)

Summary for Pond FB-1: Forebay 1

Inflow Area = 17.152 ac, 9.44% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.44" for 100-YR event
 Inflow = 41.92 cfs @ 12.22 hrs, Volume= 3.492 af
 Outflow = 41.80 cfs @ 12.23 hrs, Volume= 3.395 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.6 min
 Primary = 41.80 cfs @ 12.23 hrs, Volume= 3.395 af

Routing by Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
 Starting Elev= 323.00' Surf.Area= 0 sf Storage= 0 cf
 Peak Elev= 1,428.85' @ 12.23 hrs Surf.Area= 2,432 sf Storage= 5,953 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= 15.5 min calculated for 3.384 af (97% of inflow)
 Center-of-Mass det. time= 5.4 min (811.2 - 805.8)

Prepared by The LÅ Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 5

Volume	Invert	Avail.Storage	Storage Description
#1	1,425.00'	9,130 cf	Custom Stage Data (Irregular) Listed below (Recalc)

Elevation (feet)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Perim. (feet)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	Wet.Area (sq-ft)
1,425.00	805	104.0	0	0	805
1,426.00	1,147	123.0	971	971	1,166
1,427.00	1,546	142.0	1,342	2,313	1,589
1,428.00	2,002	161.0	1,769	4,082	2,071
1,429.00	2,515	180.0	2,254	6,335	2,614
1,430.00	3,085	200.0	2,795	9,130	3,248

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Primary	1,428.00'	20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir Head (feet) 0.20 0.40 0.60 0.80 1.00 1.20 1.40 1.60 Coef. (English) 2.49 2.56 2.70 2.69 2.68 2.69 2.67 2.64

Primary OutFlow Max=41.47 cfs @ 12.23 hrs HW=1,428.84' (Free Discharge)

1=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 41.47 cfs @ 2.47 fps)

Summary for Pond SMP1: Pocket Pond 1

Inflow Area =	17.152 ac,	9.44% Impervious,	Inflow Depth > 2.38"	for 100-YR event
Inflow =	41.80 cfs @	12.23 hrs,	Volume=	3.395 af
Outflow =	41.66 cfs @	12.25 hrs,	Volume=	3.100 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 1.1 min
Primary =	41.66 cfs @	12.25 hrs,	Volume=	3.100 af

Routing by Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 1,428.65' @ 12.25 hrs Surf.Area= 5,994 sf Storage= 16,221 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= 39.8 min calculated for 3.100 af (91% of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time= 11.0 min (822.3 - 811.2)

Volume	Invert	Avail.Storage	Storage Description
#1	1,425.00'	25,197 cf	Custom Stage Data (Irregular) Listed below (Recalc)

Elevation (feet)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Perim. (feet)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	Wet.Area (sq-ft)
1,425.00	3,031	236.0	0	0	3,031
1,426.00	3,768	255.0	3,393	3,393	3,813
1,427.00	4,563	274.0	4,159	7,552	4,655
1,428.00	5,414	293.0	4,982	12,534	5,558
1,429.00	6,323	312.0	5,863	18,397	6,522
1,430.00	7,288	331.0	6,800	25,197	7,546

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Device 2	1,428.00'	24.0" x 24.0" Horiz. Orifice/Grate C= 0.600 Limited to weir flow at low heads
#2	Primary	1,425.00'	24.0" Round Culvert L= 100.0' Ke= 0.500 Inlet / Outlet Invert= 1,425.00' / 1,424.00' S= 0.0100 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior, Flow Area= 3.14 sf

Gore Pre Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 6

#3 Primary 1,428.00' **20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir**
Head (feet) 0.20 0.40 0.60 0.80 1.00 1.20 1.40 1.60
Coef. (English) 2.49 2.56 2.70 2.69 2.68 2.69 2.67 2.64

Primary OutFlow Max=41.56 cfs @ 12.25 hrs HW=1,428.65' (Free Discharge)

2=Culvert (Passes 13.57 cfs of 24.60 cfs potential flow)

1=Orifice/Grate (Weir Controls 13.57 cfs @ 2.63 fps)

3=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 27.99 cfs @ 2.17 fps)

Summary for Link AP-1: AP-1

Inflow Area = 193.486 ac, 12.09% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.52" for 100-YR event

Inflow = 468.63 cfs @ 12.23 hrs, Volume= 40.659 af

Primary = 468.63 cfs @ 12.23 hrs, Volume= 40.659 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

Summary for Link AP-2: AP-2

Inflow Area = 57.271 ac, 2.83% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.02" for 100-YR event

Inflow = 122.47 cfs @ 12.21 hrs, Volume= 9.641 af

Primary = 122.47 cfs @ 12.21 hrs, Volume= 9.641 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

Attachment C



Proposed Conditions Watershed Map and HydroCAD Calculations

Plotted By: BRETT STROM
File Name: C:\Proj\2015037\Gore_Mountain_2015037.dwg
Plot Name: C:\Proj\2015037\Gore_Mountain_2015037.dwg
Plot Date: 2/10/2017 10:13:57
Plot Path: C:\Proj\2015037\Gore_Mountain_2015037.dwg
Plot Size: 11x17
Plot Scale: 1"=200'



LEGEND

- SUBCATCHMENT BOUNDARY
- TIME OF CONCENTRATION
- SUBCATCHMENT ID
- STORMWATER FACILITY
- ANALYSIS POINT



The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
People. Purpose. Place.
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs
NY 12866
P: 518-587-8100
F: 518-587-0180
www.thelagroup.com

Unauthorized alteration or addition to this document is a violation of Section 7209 of the New York State Education Law.

© the LA Group 2017

Prepared for:

Olympic Regional
Development Authority

2634 Main Street
Lake Placid, New York 12946

Project Title:

Gore Mountain:
2017 Unit
Management Plan
Draft Amendment
& Draft Generic
Environmental
Impact Statement

Project No.:	2015037
Design:	BCS
Drawn:	BCS CH:k d: DBH
Scale:	1"=200'




Description:	Date:

Drawing Title

Proposed Conditions
Watershed map

Drawing No.

W-2



Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 2

Area Listing (all nodes)

Area (acres)	CN	Description (subcatchment-numbers)
2.479	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C (1, 3, 7, 8)
26.675	98	Paved parking, HSG C (1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8)
221.578	70	Woods, Good, HSG C (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
250.732	73	TOTAL AREA

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 3

Soil Listing (all nodes)

Area (acres)	Soil Group	Subcatchment Numbers
0.000	HSG A	
0.000	HSG B	
250.732	HSG C	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
0.000	HSG D	
0.000	Other	
250.732		TOTAL AREA

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 4

Ground Covers (all nodes)

HSG-A (acres)	HSG-B (acres)	HSG-C (acres)	HSG-D (acres)	Other (acres)	Total (acres)	Ground Cover	Subcatchment Numbers
0.000	0.000	2.479	0.000	0.000	2.479	>75% Grass cover, Good	1, 3, 7, 8
0.000	0.000	26.675	0.000	0.000	26.675	Paved parking	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8
0.000	0.000	221.578	0.000	0.000	221.578	Woods, Good	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
0.000	0.000	250.732	0.000	0.000	250.732	TOTAL AREA	

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 1-YR Rainfall=2.10"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 5

Time span=5.00-20.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 301 points
 Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
 Reach routing by Stor-Ind+Trans method - Pond routing by Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment 1: Subcat 1	Runoff Area=163.668 ac 9.12% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.31" Flow Length=2,229' Tc=29.6 min CN=73 Runoff=38.20 cfs 4.289 af
Subcatchment 2: Subcat 2	Runoff Area=35.807 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.24" Flow Length=1,112' Tc=25.5 min CN=70 Runoff=5.99 cfs 0.705 af
Subcatchment 3: Subcat 3	Runoff Area=19.014 ac 35.43% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.56" Flow Length=3,110' Tc=24.7 min CN=80 Runoff=10.68 cfs 0.881 af
Subcatchment 4: Subcat 4	Runoff Area=17.152 ac 9.44% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.31" Flow Length=1,452' Tc=27.4 min CN=73 Runoff=4.24 cfs 0.450 af
Subcatchment 5: Subcat 5	Runoff Area=1.075 ac 28.40% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.48" Flow Length=324' Tc=18.5 min CN=78 Runoff=0.60 cfs 0.043 af
Subcatchment 6: Subcat 6	Runoff Area=4.312 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.24" Tc=6.0 min CN=70 Runoff=1.63 cfs 0.086 af
Subcatchment 7: Subcat 7	Runoff Area=214,383 sf 42.27% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.65" Flow Length=1,411' Tc=12.2 min CN=82 Runoff=4.85 cfs 0.265 af
Subcatchment 8: Subcat 8	Runoff Area=4.782 ac 21.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.41" Flow Length=1,380' Tc=20.9 min CN=76 Runoff=2.04 cfs 0.163 af
Reach SMP-1: Vegetated Swale	Avg. Flow Depth=0.33' Max Vel=1.01 fps Inflow=4.85 cfs 0.265 af n=0.150 L=1,317.0' S=0.0580 '/' Capacity=77.31 cfs Outflow=2.40 cfs 0.252 af
Pond 7P: Porous Parking Lots	Peak Elev=1,425.00' Storage=28 cf Inflow=1.63 cfs 0.086 af Outflow=1.62 cfs 0.086 af
Pond FB-1: Forebay 1	Peak Elev=1,428.19' Storage=4,471 cf Inflow=4.24 cfs 0.450 af Outflow=3.99 cfs 0.355 af
Pond PP-1: Pocket Pond 1	Peak Elev=1,428.02' Storage=12,634 cf Inflow=3.99 cfs 0.355 af Outflow=0.31 cfs 0.066 af
Pond SMP2: Bioretention Basin	Peak Elev=1,570.19' Storage=550 cf Inflow=0.60 cfs 0.043 af Outflow=0.14 cfs 0.043 af
Pond SMP3: Bioretention Basin	Peak Elev=1,464.64' Storage=1,548 cf Inflow=2.04 cfs 0.163 af Outflow=1.46 cfs 0.143 af
Link AP-1: AP-1	Inflow=49.66 cfs 5.607 af Primary=49.66 cfs 5.607 af
Link AP-2: AP-2	Inflow=5.99 cfs 0.771 af Primary=5.99 cfs 0.771 af

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 1-YR Rainfall=2.10"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 6

Total Runoff Area = 250.732 ac Runoff Volume = 6.882 af Average Runoff Depth = 0.33"
89.36% Pervious = 224.057 ac 10.64% Impervious = 26.675 ac

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=3.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 7

Time span=5.00-20.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 301 points
 Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
 Reach routing by Stor-Ind+Trans method - Pond routing by Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment 1: Subcat 1	Runoff Area=163.668 ac 9.12% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.05" Flow Length=2,229' Tc=29.6 min CN=73 Runoff=158.48 cfs 14.385 af
Subcatchment 2: Subcat 2	Runoff Area=35.807 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.90" Flow Length=1,112' Tc=25.5 min CN=70 Runoff=31.53 cfs 2.672 af
Subcatchment 3: Subcat 3	Runoff Area=19.014 ac 35.43% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.49" Flow Length=3,110' Tc=24.7 min CN=80 Runoff=30.14 cfs 2.363 af
Subcatchment 4: Subcat 4	Runoff Area=17.152 ac 9.44% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.06" Flow Length=1,452' Tc=27.4 min CN=73 Runoff=17.49 cfs 1.509 af
Subcatchment 5: Subcat 5	Runoff Area=1.075 ac 28.40% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.36" Flow Length=324' Tc=18.5 min CN=78 Runoff=1.84 cfs 0.122 af
Subcatchment 6: Subcat 6	Runoff Area=4.312 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>0.90" Tc=6.0 min CN=70 Runoff=7.41 cfs 0.325 af
Subcatchment 7: Subcat 7	Runoff Area=214,383 sf 42.27% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.64" Flow Length=1,411' Tc=12.2 min CN=82 Runoff=12.38 cfs 0.672 af
Subcatchment 8: Subcat 8	Runoff Area=4.782 ac 21.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>1.23" Flow Length=1,380' Tc=20.9 min CN=76 Runoff=6.88 cfs 0.492 af
Reach SMP-1: Vegetated Swale	Avg. Flow Depth=0.63' Max Vel=1.46 fps Inflow=12.38 cfs 0.672 af n=0.150 L=1,317.0' S=0.0580 '/' Capacity=77.31 cfs Outflow=7.88 cfs 0.653 af
Pond 7P: Porous Parking Lots	Peak Elev=1,425.00' Storage=128 cf Inflow=7.41 cfs 0.325 af Outflow=7.41 cfs 0.325 af
Pond FB-1: Forebay 1	Peak Elev=1,428.48' Storage=5,100 cf Inflow=17.49 cfs 1.509 af Outflow=17.43 cfs 1.413 af
Pond PP-1: Pocket Pond 1	Peak Elev=1,428.36' Storage=14,548 cf Inflow=17.43 cfs 1.413 af Outflow=16.44 cfs 1.121 af
Pond SMP2: Bioretention Basin	Peak Elev=1,570.58' Storage=1,858 cf Inflow=1.84 cfs 0.122 af Outflow=0.77 cfs 0.122 af
Pond SMP3: Bioretention Basin	Peak Elev=1,464.90' Storage=2,260 cf Inflow=6.88 cfs 0.492 af Outflow=6.66 cfs 0.464 af
Link AP-1: AP-1	Inflow=197.68 cfs 17.986 af Primary=197.68 cfs 17.986 af
Link AP-2: AP-2	Inflow=40.46 cfs 3.793 af Primary=40.46 cfs 3.793 af

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 10-YR Rainfall=3.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 8

Total Runoff Area = 250.732 ac Runoff Volume = 22.539 af Average Runoff Depth = 1.08"
89.36% Pervious = 224.057 ac 10.64% Impervious = 26.675 ac

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 1

Time span=5.00-20.00 hrs, dt=0.05 hrs, 301 points
 Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN
 Reach routing by Stor-Ind+Trans method - Pond routing by Stor-Ind method

Subcatchment 1: Subcat 1	Runoff Area=163.668 ac 9.12% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.44" Flow Length=2,229' Tc=29.6 min CN=73 Runoff=379.77 cfs 33.294 af
Subcatchment 2: Subcat 2	Runoff Area=35.807 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.19" Flow Length=1,112' Tc=25.5 min CN=70 Runoff=81.61 cfs 6.541 af
Subcatchment 3: Subcat 3	Runoff Area=19.014 ac 35.43% Impervious Runoff Depth>3.08" Flow Length=3,110' Tc=24.7 min CN=80 Runoff=61.92 cfs 4.875 af
Subcatchment 4: Subcat 4	Runoff Area=17.152 ac 9.44% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.44" Flow Length=1,452' Tc=27.4 min CN=73 Runoff=41.92 cfs 3.492 af
Subcatchment 5: Subcat 5	Runoff Area=1.075 ac 28.40% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.90" Flow Length=324' Tc=18.5 min CN=78 Runoff=3.90 cfs 0.260 af
Subcatchment 6: Subcat 6	Runoff Area=4.312 ac 0.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.21" Tc=6.0 min CN=70 Runoff=18.13 cfs 0.794 af
Subcatchment 7: Subcat 7	Runoff Area=214,383 sf 42.27% Impervious Runoff Depth>3.28" Flow Length=1,411' Tc=12.2 min CN=82 Runoff=24.19 cfs 1.345 af
Subcatchment 8: Subcat 8	Runoff Area=4.782 ac 21.00% Impervious Runoff Depth>2.71" Flow Length=1,380' Tc=20.9 min CN=76 Runoff=15.24 cfs 1.081 af
Reach SMP-1: Vegetated Swale	Avg. Flow Depth=0.95' Max Vel=1.83 fps Inflow=24.19 cfs 1.345 af n=0.150 L=1,317.0' S=0.0580 '/ Capacity=77.31 cfs Outflow=17.10 cfs 1.318 af
Pond 7P: Porous Parking Lots	Peak Elev=1,425.00' Storage=313 cf Inflow=18.13 cfs 0.794 af Outflow=18.14 cfs 0.794 af
Pond FB-1: Forebay 1	Peak Elev=1,428.85' Storage=5,953 cf Inflow=41.92 cfs 3.492 af Outflow=41.80 cfs 3.395 af
Pond PP-1: Pocket Pond 1	Peak Elev=1,428.65' Storage=16,221 cf Inflow=41.80 cfs 3.395 af Outflow=41.66 cfs 3.100 af
Pond SMP2: Bioretention Basin	Peak Elev=1,570.75' Storage=2,505 cf Inflow=3.90 cfs 0.260 af Outflow=3.34 cfs 0.245 af
Pond SMP3: Bioretention Basin	Peak Elev=1,465.21' Storage=2,543 cf Inflow=15.24 cfs 1.081 af Outflow=16.10 cfs 1.073 af
Link AP-1: AP-1	Inflow=468.61 cfs 40.805 af Primary=468.61 cfs 40.805 af
Link AP-2: AP-2	Inflow=122.47 cfs 9.641 af Primary=122.47 cfs 9.641 af

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 2

Total Runoff Area = 250.732 ac Runoff Volume = 51.682 af Average Runoff Depth = 2.47"
89.36% Pervious = 224.057 ac 10.64% Impervious = 26.675 ac

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 3

Summary for Subcatchment 1: Subcat 1

Runoff = 379.77 cfs @ 12.24 hrs, Volume= 33.294 af, Depth> 2.44"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Area (ac)	CN	Description
0.109	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C
14.928	98	Paved parking, HSG C
148.631	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
163.668	73	Weighted Average
148.740		90.88% Pervious Area
14.928		9.12% Impervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
12.8	100	0.1000	0.13		Sheet Flow, Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.50"
16.8	2,129	0.1790	2.12		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
29.6	2,229	Total			

Summary for Subcatchment 2: Subcat 2

Runoff = 81.61 cfs @ 12.20 hrs, Volume= 6.541 af, Depth> 2.19"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Area (ac)	CN	Description
35.807	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
35.807		100.00% Pervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
16.8	100	0.0500	0.10		Sheet Flow, Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.50"
8.7	1,012	0.1500	1.94		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
25.5	1,112	Total			

Summary for Subcatchment 3: Subcat 3

Runoff = 61.92 cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume= 4.875 af, Depth> 3.08"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 4

Area (ac)	CN	Description
1.256	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C
6.737	98	Paved parking, HSG C
11.022	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
19.014	80	Weighted Average
12.277		64.57% Pervious Area
6.737		35.43% Impervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
11.2	100	0.1400	0.15		Sheet Flow, Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.50"
2.3	315	0.2000	2.24		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
0.6	160	0.0500	4.54		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Paved Kv= 20.3 fps
10.6	2,535	0.0700	3.97		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Grassed Waterway Kv= 15.0 fps
24.7	3,110	Total			

Summary for Subcatchment 4: Subcat 4

Runoff = 41.92 cfs @ 12.22 hrs, Volume= 3.492 af, Depth> 2.44"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Area (ac)	CN	Description
1.619	98	Paved parking, HSG C
15.533	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
17.152	73	Weighted Average
15.533		90.56% Pervious Area
1.619		9.44% Impervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
14.7	100	0.0700	0.11		Sheet Flow, Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.50"
12.7	1,352	0.1257	1.77		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
27.4	1,452	Total			

Summary for Subcatchment 5: Subcat 5

Runoff = 3.90 cfs @ 12.11 hrs, Volume= 0.260 af, Depth> 2.90"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 5

Area (ac)	CN	Description
0.305	98	Paved parking, HSG C
0.770	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
1.075	78	Weighted Average
0.770		71.60% Pervious Area
0.305		28.40% Impervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
16.8	100	0.0500	0.10		Sheet Flow, Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.50"
1.7	224	0.1000	2.21		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Short Grass Pasture Kv= 7.0 fps
18.5	324	Total			

Summary for Subcatchment 6: Subcat 6

Runoff = 18.13 cfs @ 11.98 hrs, Volume= 0.794 af, Depth> 2.21"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Area (ac)	CN	Description
4.312	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
4.312		100.00% Pervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
6.0					Direct Entry,

Summary for Subcatchment 7: Subcat 7

Runoff = 24.19 cfs @ 12.04 hrs, Volume= 1.345 af, Depth> 3.28"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Area (sf)	CN	Description
30,438	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C
90,629	98	Paved parking, HSG C
93,317	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
214,383	82	Weighted Average
123,755		57.73% Pervious Area
90,629		42.27% Impervious Area

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 6

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
6.4	100	0.0800	0.26		Sheet Flow, Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.50"
2.1	404	0.0470	3.25		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Grassed Waterway Kv= 15.0 fps
0.7	190	0.0470	4.40		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Paved Kv= 20.3 fps
3.0	717	0.0700	3.97		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Grassed Waterway Kv= 15.0 fps
12.2	1,411	Total			

Summary for Subcatchment 8: Subcat 8

Runoff = 15.24 cfs @ 12.14 hrs, Volume= 1.081 af, Depth> 2.71"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Weighted-CN, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Area (ac)	CN	Description
0.416	74	>75% Grass cover, Good, HSG C
1.004	98	Paved parking, HSG C
3.362	70	Woods, Good, HSG C
4.782	76	Weighted Average
3.778		79.00% Pervious Area
1.004		21.00% Impervious Area

Tc (min)	Length (feet)	Slope (ft/ft)	Velocity (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description
12.3	100	0.1100	0.14		Sheet Flow, Woods: Light underbrush n= 0.400 P2= 2.50"
7.0	749	0.1290	1.80		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Woodland Kv= 5.0 fps
1.6	531	0.0790	5.71		Shallow Concentrated Flow, Paved Kv= 20.3 fps
20.9	1,380	Total			

Summary for Reach SMP-1: Vegetated Swale

Inflow Area = 4.922 ac, 42.27% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 3.28" for 100-YR event
Inflow = 24.19 cfs @ 12.04 hrs, Volume= 1.345 af
Outflow = 17.10 cfs @ 12.33 hrs, Volume= 1.318 af, Atten= 29%, Lag= 17.6 min

Routing by Stor-Ind+Trans method, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Max. Velocity= 1.83 fps, Min. Travel Time= 12.0 min
Avg. Velocity = 0.61 fps, Avg. Travel Time= 36.2 min

Peak Storage= 12,285 cf @ 12.13 hrs
Average Depth at Peak Storage= 0.95'
Bank-Full Depth= 2.00' Flow Area= 28.0 sf, Capacity= 77.31 cfs

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 7

6.00' x 2.00' deep channel, n= 0.150
Side Slope Z-value= 4.0 '/' Top Width= 22.00'
Length= 1,317.0' Slope= 0.0580 '/'
Inlet Invert= 1,465.00', Outlet Invert= 1,388.61'



Summary for Pond 7P: Porous Parking Lots

Inflow Area = 4.312 ac, 0.00% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.21" for 100-YR event
Inflow = 18.13 cfs @ 11.98 hrs, Volume= 0.794 af
Outflow = 18.14 cfs @ 11.98 hrs, Volume= 0.794 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.4 min
Discarded = 18.14 cfs @ 11.98 hrs, Volume= 0.794 af

Routing by Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Peak Elev= 1,425.00' @ 11.98 hrs Surf.Area= 145,040 sf Storage= 313 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= 0.3 min calculated for 0.794 af (100% of inflow)
Center-of-Mass det. time= 0.2 min (794.9 - 794.7)

Volume	Invert	Avail.Storage	Storage Description
#1	1,425.00'	145,040 cf	Custom Stage Data (Irregular) Listed below (Recalc)

Elevation (feet)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Perim. (feet)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	Wet.Area (sq-ft)
1,425.00	145,040	2,721.0	0	0	145,040
1,426.00	145,040	2,721.0	145,040	145,040	147,761

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Discarded	1,425.00'	25.000 in/hr Exfiltration over Surface area

Discarded OutFlow Max=83.94 cfs @ 11.98 hrs HW=1,425.00' (Free Discharge)
↑**1=Exfiltration** (Exfiltration Controls 83.94 cfs)

Summary for Pond FB-1: Forebay 1

Inflow Area = 17.152 ac, 9.44% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.44" for 100-YR event
Inflow = 41.92 cfs @ 12.22 hrs, Volume= 3.492 af
Outflow = 41.80 cfs @ 12.23 hrs, Volume= 3.395 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.6 min
Primary = 41.80 cfs @ 12.23 hrs, Volume= 3.395 af

Routing by Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
Starting Elev= 323.00' Surf.Area= 0 sf Storage= 0 cf
Peak Elev= 1,428.85' @ 12.23 hrs Surf.Area= 2,432 sf Storage= 5,953 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= 15.5 min calculated for 3.384 af (97% of inflow)

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 8

Center-of-Mass det. time= 5.4 min (811.2 - 805.8)

Volume	Invert	Avail.Storage	Storage Description
#1	1,425.00'	9,130 cf	Custom Stage Data (Irregular) Listed below (Recalc)

Elevation (feet)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Perim. (feet)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	Wet.Area (sq-ft)
1,425.00	805	104.0	0	0	805
1,426.00	1,147	123.0	971	971	1,166
1,427.00	1,546	142.0	1,342	2,313	1,589
1,428.00	2,002	161.0	1,769	4,082	2,071
1,429.00	2,515	180.0	2,254	6,335	2,614
1,430.00	3,085	200.0	2,795	9,130	3,248

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Primary	1,428.00'	20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir Head (feet) 0.20 0.40 0.60 0.80 1.00 1.20 1.40 1.60 Coef. (English) 2.49 2.56 2.70 2.69 2.68 2.69 2.67 2.64

Primary OutFlow Max=41.47 cfs @ 12.23 hrs HW=1,428.84' (Free Discharge)↑**1=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir** (Weir Controls 41.47 cfs @ 2.47 fps)**Summary for Pond PP-1: Pocket Pond 1**

Inflow Area = 17.152 ac, 9.44% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.38" for 100-YR event
 Inflow = 41.80 cfs @ 12.23 hrs, Volume= 3.395 af
 Outflow = 41.66 cfs @ 12.25 hrs, Volume= 3.100 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 1.1 min
 Primary = 41.66 cfs @ 12.25 hrs, Volume= 3.100 af

Routing by Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs
 Peak Elev= 1,428.65' @ 12.25 hrs Surf.Area= 5,994 sf Storage= 16,221 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= 39.8 min calculated for 3.100 af (91% of inflow)
 Center-of-Mass det. time= 11.0 min (822.3 - 811.2)

Volume	Invert	Avail.Storage	Storage Description
#1	1,425.00'	25,197 cf	Custom Stage Data (Irregular) Listed below (Recalc)

Elevation (feet)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Perim. (feet)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	Wet.Area (sq-ft)
1,425.00	3,031	236.0	0	0	3,031
1,426.00	3,768	255.0	3,393	3,393	3,813
1,427.00	4,563	274.0	4,159	7,552	4,655
1,428.00	5,414	293.0	4,982	12,534	5,558
1,429.00	6,323	312.0	5,863	18,397	6,522
1,430.00	7,288	331.0	6,800	25,197	7,546

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Device 2	1,428.00'	24.0" x 24.0" Horiz. Orifice/Grate C= 0.600 Limited to weir flow at low heads
#2	Primary	1,425.00'	24.0" Round Culvert L= 100.0' Ke= 0.500

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 9

Inlet / Outlet Invert= 1,425.00' / 1,424.00' S= 0.0100 '/' Cc= 0.900
 n= 0.013 Corrugated PE, smooth interior, Flow Area= 3.14 sf
 #3 Primary 1,428.00' **20.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir**
 Head (feet) 0.20 0.40 0.60 0.80 1.00 1.20 1.40 1.60
 Coef. (English) 2.49 2.56 2.70 2.69 2.68 2.69 2.67 2.64

Primary OutFlow Max=41.56 cfs @ 12.25 hrs HW=1,428.65' (Free Discharge)

2=Culvert (Passes 13.57 cfs of 24.60 cfs potential flow)

1=Orifice/Grate (Weir Controls 13.57 cfs @ 2.63 fps)

3=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 27.99 cfs @ 2.17 fps)

Summary for Pond SMP2: Bioretention Basin

Inflow Area = 1.075 ac, 28.40% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.90" for 100-YR event
 Inflow = 3.90 cfs @ 12.11 hrs, Volume= 0.260 af
 Outflow = 3.34 cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= 0.245 af, Atten= 15%, Lag= 5.1 min
 Primary = 3.34 cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= 0.245 af

Routing by Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs / 2
 Peak Elev= 1,570.75' @ 12.19 hrs Surf.Area= 4,026 sf Storage= 2,505 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= 60.5 min calculated for 0.245 af (94% of inflow)
 Center-of-Mass det. time= 39.9 min (829.6 - 789.7)

Volume	Invert	Avail.Storage	Storage Description
#1	1,570.00'	4,518 cf	Custom Stage Data (Irregular) Listed below (Recalc)

Elevation (feet)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Perim. (feet)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	Wet.Area (sq-ft)
1,570.00	2,691	275.0	0	0	2,691
1,571.20	4,953	308.0	4,518	4,518	4,261

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Device 3	1,570.00'	2.000 in/hr Exfiltration over Surface area
#2	Primary	1,570.50'	10.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir Head (feet) 0.20 0.40 0.60 0.80 1.00 1.20 1.40 1.60 Coef. (English) 2.49 2.56 2.70 2.69 2.68 2.69 2.67 2.64
#3	Primary	1,566.75'	6.0" Round Culvert L= 30.0' Ke= 0.500 Inlet / Outlet Invert= 1,566.75' / 1,565.00' S= 0.0583 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.012, Flow Area= 0.20 sf

Primary OutFlow Max=3.31 cfs @ 12.19 hrs HW=1,570.75' (Free Discharge)

2=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 3.13 cfs @ 1.25 fps)

3=Culvert (Passes 0.19 cfs of 1.83 cfs potential flow)

1=Exfiltration (Exfiltration Controls 0.19 cfs)

Gore Post Development

Prepared by The LA Group

HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 00439 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Type II 24-hr 100-YR Rainfall=5.50"

Printed 11/7/2017

Page 10

Summary for Pond SMP3: Bioretention Basin

Inflow Area = 4.782 ac, 21.00% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.71" for 100-YR event
 Inflow = 15.24 cfs @ 12.14 hrs, Volume= 1.081 af
 Outflow = 16.10 cfs @ 12.14 hrs, Volume= 1.073 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min
 Primary = 16.10 cfs @ 12.14 hrs, Volume= 1.073 af

Routing by Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs / 2
 Peak Elev= 1,465.21' @ 12.14 hrs Surf.Area= 2,928 sf Storage= 2,543 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= 7.6 min calculated for 1.070 af (99% of inflow)
 Center-of-Mass det. time= 4.7 min (800.1 - 795.4)

Volume	Invert	Avail.Storage	Storage Description		
#1	1,464.00'	2,543 cf	Custom Stage Data (Irregular) Listed below (Recalc)		
Elevation (feet)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Perim. (feet)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	Wet.Area (sq-ft)
1,464.00	2,177	175.0	0	0	2,177
1,465.00	2,928	200.0	2,543	2,543	2,946

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Device 3	1,464.00'	2.000 in/hr Exfiltration over Surface area
#2	Primary	1,464.50'	10.0' long x 10.0' breadth Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir Head (feet) 0.20 0.40 0.60 0.80 1.00 1.20 1.40 1.60 Coef. (English) 2.49 2.56 2.70 2.69 2.68 2.69 2.67 2.64
#3	Primary	1,460.75'	6.0" Round Culvert L= 35.0' Ke= 0.500 Inlet / Outlet Invert= 1,460.75' / 1,460.00' S= 0.0214 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.012, Flow Area= 0.20 sf

Primary OutFlow Max=15.97 cfs @ 12.14 hrs HW=1,465.20' (Free Discharge)
 2=Broad-Crested Rectangular Weir (Weir Controls 15.84 cfs @ 2.26 fps)
 3=Culvert (Passes 0.14 cfs of 1.74 cfs potential flow)
 1=Exfiltration (Exfiltration Controls 0.14 cfs)

Summary for Link AP-1: AP-1

Inflow Area = 193.461 ac, 12.95% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.53" for 100-YR event
 Inflow = 468.61 cfs @ 12.24 hrs, Volume= 40.805 af
 Primary = 468.61 cfs @ 12.24 hrs, Volume= 40.805 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

Summary for Link AP-2: AP-2

Inflow Area = 57.271 ac, 2.83% Impervious, Inflow Depth > 2.02" for 100-YR event
 Inflow = 122.47 cfs @ 12.21 hrs, Volume= 9.641 af
 Primary = 122.47 cfs @ 12.21 hrs, Volume= 9.641 af, Atten= 0%, Lag= 0.0 min

Primary outflow = Inflow, Time Span= 5.00-20.00 hrs, dt= 0.05 hrs

Attachment D

Storm Data

Job Name and # Gore Mountain

Minimum Runoff Reduction Volume

11/7/2017

$$RR_v = [(P)(R_v^*)(A_i)]/12$$

Where:

$$A_i = (S)(A_{ic})$$

$R_v = 0.05 + 0.009(I)$ where I is 100% impervious

A_i = impervious cover targeted for runoff reduction

A_{ic} = Total area of new impervious cover

P = 90% rainfall (see Figure 4.1 in NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual)

S = Hydrologic Soil Group (HSG) Specific Reduction Factor (S)

A=0.55, B=0.40, C=0.30, D=0.20

S (HSG C)	0.30
A_{ic}	1.58 acres
R_v	0.95
90% Rainfall	1.10
A_i	0.474

$$RR_v = 0.041 \text{ acre feet} = 1,799 \text{ ft}^3$$

Stormwater Practice Sizing

Job Name and #

Gore Mountain

Water Quality Volume Calculation

11/7/2017

$$WQv = [(P)(Rv)(A)]/12$$

Where:

$$Rv = 0.05 + 0.009(I)$$

I = impervious cover in percent

P = 90% rainfall (see Figure 4.1 in NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual)

A = Area in acres

New Impervious

% Impervious 100.00%

Rv 0.95

90% Rainfall 1.10

Area in Square Feet 68868

$$WQv \text{ Required} = 5997 \text{ ft}^3 \quad 0.138 \text{ ac-ft}$$

SMP-1: Wet Swale

% Impervious 42.27%

Rv 0.43

90% Rainfall 1.10

Area in Square Feet 214402

$$WQv \text{ Required} = 8459 \text{ ft}^3 \quad 0.194 \text{ ac-ft}$$

SMP-2: Bioretention Basin

% Impervious 21.48%

Rv 0.24

90% Rainfall 1.10

Area in Square Feet 62204

$$WQv \text{ Required} = 1387 \text{ ft}^3 \quad 0.032 \text{ ac-ft}$$

SMP-3: Bioretention Basin

% Impervious 21.00%

Rv 0.24

90% Rainfall 1.10

Area in Square Feet 208304

$$WQv \text{ Required} = 4564 \text{ ft}^3 \quad 0.105 \text{ ac-ft}$$

BIORETENTION WORKSHEET

(See Section 6.4.4 of the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual 2015)

1. **Underlying soil permeability** = 0.50 in/hr
(if no underdrains proposed, must infiltrate within 48 hours,
HSG A and B Soils)

2. **Calculate WQv:**
DA (maximum 5 acres) = 62,210 ft²
Percent Impervious Area, I = 21.48 %
Rv = .05 + .009 (I) (Minimum 0.2) = 0.243
P (90% Rainfall) = 1.10 in.
WQv = P Rv A/12 = 1,388 ft³
75% of WQv = 1,040.7

3. **Bioretention Details:**
Material = Planting Soil Mix
Filter bed depth (d_f) (2.5 - 4.0 ft) = 2.50 ft
Coefficient of permeability of filter media (k) = 1.00 ft/day
Avg. height of water above filter media (h_f) (max. 0.5 ft) = 0.50 ft
Design filter bed drain time (t_f) = 2 days

4. **Calculate required bioretention surface area (A_r):**

$$\text{Surface area (A}_r\text{)} = \frac{\text{WQv} \times d_f}{k (h_f + d_f) (t_f)}$$

Required Surface Area (A_r)	=	578 ft²
--	----------	---------------------------

5. **Bioretention surface area provided** = 600 ft² (design)

6. **Water Quality Volume provided** = 1440 ft³ (design)

7. **Is Bioretention Basin Lined or in HSG C/D Soils** Yes

8. **Runoff Reduction Volume provided** = 576 ft³ (design)

BIORETENTION WORKSHEET- SMP-3

(See Section 6.4.4 of the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual 2015)

1. **Underlying soil permeability** = 0.50 in/hr
(if no underdrains proposed, must infiltrate within 48 hours,
HSG A and B Soils)

2. **Calculate WQv:**
DA (maximum 5 acres) = 208,303 ft²
Percent Impervious Area, I = 21.00 %
Rv = .05 + .009 (I) (Minimum 0.2) = 0.239
P (90% Rainfall) = 1.10 in.
WQv = P Rv A/12 = 4,564 ft³
75% of WQv = 3,422.7

3. **Bioretention Details:**
Material Planting Soil Mix
Filter bed depth (d_f) (2.5 - 4.0 ft) = 2.50 ft
Coefficient of permeability of filter media (k) = 1.00 ft/day
Avg. height of water above filter media (h_f) (max. 0.5 ft) = 0.50 ft
Design filter bed drain time (t_f) = 2 days

4. **Calculate required bioretention surface area (A_r):**

$$\text{Surface area (A}_r\text{)} = \frac{\text{WQv} \times d_f}{k (h_f + d_f) (t_f)}$$

Required Surface Area (A_r)	=	1,901 ft²
--	----------	-----------------------------

5. **Bioretention surface area provided** = 2177 ft² (design)

6. **Water Quality Volume provided** = 5225 ft³ (design)

7. **Is Bioretention Basin Lined or in HSG C/D Soils** Yes

8. **Runoff Reduction Volume provided** = 2090 ft³ (design)

Appendix 8

Tree Counts

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Table ____ 2017 Management Actions Tree Cutting by Community Type and Location								
GORE IUA								
	Community	B		Trail 11-O		Trail 11-O		
		Mixed HW		4.2 acres		4.2 acres		
		3-4" dbh	>4" dbh	3-4" dbh	>4" dbh	Total		
Sugar Maple		81	125.1	340.2	525.42	865.62		
Beech		8.2	20.2	34.44	84.84	119.28		
Yellow birch			4.9	0	20.58	20.58		
White birch			24.4	0	102.48	102.48		
White ash				0	0	0		
Black cherry			6.5	0	27.3	27.3		
Ironwood				0	0	0		
Red Spruce			10.4	0	43.68	43.68		
Red Maple		14.6	27.7	61.32	116.34	177.66		
Basswood				0	0	0		
Red Oak		30.9	11.8	129.78	49.56	179.34		
Hemlock				0	0	0		
Balsam Fir			6.8	0	28.56	28.56		
Striped Maple				0	0	0		
Aspen				0	0	0		
Mountain Ash				0	0	0		
				565.74	998.76			
				SUBTOTAL		1564.5		

GORE IUA							
	Community	E		Trails 110,11A, 1N-P	Trails 110,11A, 1N-P	Trails 110,11A, 1N-P	
		Mixed HW		6.9 acres	6.9 acres	6.9 Acres	
		3-4" dbh	>4" dbh	3-4" dbh	>4" dbh	Total	
Sugar Maple		76.5	63	527.85	434.7	962.55	
Beech		189.2	197.2	1305.48	1360.68	2666.16	
Yellow birch		10.5	11	72.45	75.9	148.35	
White birch			33.5	0	231.15	231.15	
White ash				0	0	0	
Black cherry				0	0	0	
Ironwood				0	0	0	
Red Spruce				0	0	0	
Red Maple			28.4	0	195.96	195.96	
Basswood				0	0	0	
Red Oak		10.5	14.7	72.45	101.43	173.88	
Hemlock				0	0	0	
Balsam Fir				0	0	0	
Striped Maple			6.6	0	45.54	45.54	
Aspen			3.4	0	23.46	23.46	
Mountain Ash				0	0	0	
				1978.23	2468.82		
				SUBTOTAL	4447.05		

GORE IUA							
	Community	Q		Twister Widen	Twister Widen	Twister Widen	
		Pioneer HW		1.1 acres	1.1 acres	1.1 acres	
		3-4" dbh	>4" dbh	3-4" dbh	>4" dbh	Total	
Sugar Maple				0	0	0	
Beech				0	0	0	
Yellow birch		14.4	31.3	15.84	34.43	50.27	
White birch		28.8	108.4	31.68	119.24	150.92	
White ash				0	0	0	
Black cherry				0	0	0	
Ironwood				0	0	0	
Red Spruce			32.9	0	36.19	36.19	
Red Maple			24.1	0	26.51	26.51	
Basswood				0	0	0	
Red Oak				0	0	0	
Hemlock				0	0	0	
Balsam Fir		43.1	38.9	47.41	42.79	90.2	
Striped Maple		28.8	17.4	31.68	19.14	50.82	
Aspen				0	0	0	
Mountain Ash			9.2	0	10.12	10.12	
				126.61	288.42		
				SUBTOTAL		415.03	

[illegible]

Land Swap Addition							
	Community	E		Lift and Trails 12	Lift and Trails 12	Lift and Trails 12	
		Mixed HW		10.2 acres	10.2 acres	10.2 acres	
		3-4" dbh	>4" dbh	3-4" dbh	>4" dbh	Total	
Sugar Maple		76.5	63	780.3	642.6	1422.9	
Beech		189.2	197.2	1929.84	2011.44	3941.28	
Yellow birch		10.5	11	107.1	112.2	219.3	
White birch			33.5	0	341.7	341.7	
White ash				0	0	0	
Black cherry				0	0	0	
Ironwood				0	0	0	
Red Spruce				0	0	0	
Red Maple			28.4	0	289.68	289.68	
Basswood				0	0	0	
Red Oak		10.5	14.7	107.1	149.94	257.04	
Hemlock				0	0	0	
Balsam Fir				0	0	0	
Striped Maple			6.6	0	67.32	67.32	
Aspen			3.4	0	34.68	34.68	
Mountain Ash				0	0	0	
				2924.34	3649.56		
				SUBTOTAL		6573.9	

Appendix 9
Gore Mountain Sustainability Analysis



Sustainability Analysis

Environmental Report
June 2016





Overview

This report is a summation of various aspects of Gore Mountain's environmental performance. The information will be regularly updated and utilized as we develop annual reports and master plans for the facility.

Gore Mountain recognizes the impact that climate change has on our environment, and potentially on the ski experience we provide. We are an industry leader in environmental stewardship; our consistent commitment to sustainability can be noted not only throughout our responsible development practices, but also through the industry's recognition of Gore with several prestigious awards in this area. We voluntarily reviewed our entire operation in this report to demonstrate how we have improved, and where we can continue to improve.

As the largest ski area in New York State, we can play an active role in helping to change the culture toward a more sustainable future. We have improved our efficiencies and transferred our electric loads from traditional supply to solar power. We will continue modernizing our snowmaking system and greening our on-road and grooming fleets. We are working towards a hydroelectric generation system, composting our food waste, and expanding our educational programs.

Gore Mountain works closely with the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) to maintain the health of the environment at our facilities. The DEC has issued environmental permits to Gore Mountain for Bulk Petroleum Fuel Storage, Wastewater Treatment Facility Operations, Water Withdrawal, Dam Safety, Stormwater Management, and Air Emissions. We have expanded our educational programs and are developing plans for both a hydroelectric generation system and food waste composting.



03 | ELECTRICITY & FUEL

- Diesel, Gas, & Propane
- Electricity
- Emissions
- Solar
- Hydroelectric



09 | WATER

- Potable Water
- North Creek Reservoir
- Hudson River
- Wastewater
- Stormwater
- Water Conservation



12 | WASTE MANAGEMENT & RECYCLING

- Waste Repurposing
- Single-Stream Recycling
- Precious Metal Recycling
- Hazardous Waste
- Food Waste



15 | HERITAGE & EDUCATION

- Visual Resource Management
- Environmental Awareness
- Timeline of Progress



18 | AWARDS



Gore Mountain uses large amounts of energy and fuel in maintaining the highest quality ski experience for our customers. Throughout the years we have undergone several successful initiatives to offset our usage. These efficiencies have reduced our annual electrical load, in spite of us expanding the length of our season and the number of lifts we operate.



ELECTRICITY & FUEL

Diesel

Diesel is a major energy source for our operation. We use diesel for powering maintenance equipment, snowmaking compressors, and grooming equipment. Diesel operates the ski lifts during power outages and also fuels trucks and buses.

Over the past eight fiscal years, our usage of off-road diesel has decreased significantly and a future trend forecasts that this shift will continue (See Figure 1.1).

Our on-road diesel usage has had a slight average increase over the past eight fiscal years (See Figure 1.2). We correlate this to the amount of vehicles and equipment in our control, including the shuttle bus fleet. This increase was necessary to accommodate our growing number of guests, trails, and other expansion projects. We are actively investigating modernization of existing fleets with new technologies such as electric grooming machines and hybrid buses. Revised shuttle routes will help to conserve energy during busy days, and we are researching alternative fuels for the vehicles we presently own.




Figure 1.1: Off-road diesel usage over the past 8 fiscal years




Figure 1.2: On-road diesel usage over the past 8 fiscal years




Figure 1.3: Gasoline usage over the past 9 fiscal years




Figure 1.4: Propane usage over the past 8 fiscal years

Gasoline

Gore Mountain uses gasoline to operate snowmobiles for ski patrol and snowmaking operations. Gasoline is also used to attend trade shows, meetings, and conferences in our vehicles. Our use has been fluctuating over time, but overall there is a slight downward trend. (See Figure 1.3).

Propane

Our propane usage had a dramatic increase after the 2007/2008 fiscal year due to the addition of the Northwoods Lodge, conversion of the Base Lodge's heat from fuel oil, and the addition of two more commercial kitchens. Propane is used to heat almost all of Gore Mountain's buildings, with the exception of the Saddle Lodge which uses a wood stove and electric heat. The usage trend for propane is relatively flat and primarily dependent on the weather. (See Figure 1.4) A green heat initiative is targeted for future improvement in propane use reduction.



Electricity

While electricity powers the lifts, the largest use of it is for snowmaking compressors and pumps. We have substantially reduced the amount of kilowatt hours (kWh) used during the last four fiscal years and we plan to maintain this trend by continuing to replace traditional snowmaking with modernized, high-efficiency guns. We are also modernizing our compressors with improved, more efficient drives and changing most lighting to motion sensing and high-efficiency bulbs or LEDs. (See Figure 1.5)




Figure 1.5: Kilowatt Hours used over the past 4 fiscal years

Emissions

Every year we measure the carbon and nitrate emissions directly expelled from Gore Mountain's use of electricity. The lifts, lodges, snowmaking operations, and larger buildings are measured. There is an upward trend over the past six fiscal years for both of the emissions sources (See Figures 1.6 and 1.7). We are actively lessening this impact through a conversion to solar power.





Figure 1.6: Carbon and Nitrous emissions from all measured sources over the past 6 fiscal years





Solar

Gore Mountain signed two 25-year solar power purchase agreements in June 2015. 14,589 panels have since been installed spanning 20 acres, with their energy production scheduled to go online in summer 2016. The electricity generated, a combined 5.325MWdc, will credit Gore's meter at a rate higher than power that is traditionally sourced, and will offset approximately 85% of the mountain's energy use. The agreements are projected to save Gore approximately \$10M over the life of the contract, while providing a cleaner, more sustainable source of energy to Gore Mountain's electric distribution zone.



Hydroelectric


Gore Mountain has conceptually designed and is seeking capital funds for a hydroelectric plant on site *using the existing Hudson River snowmaking water transmission system*. It is estimated that the plant will generate 1,380,000 million kWh annually by passively utilizing natural water resources.

Gore Mountain has an advanced, sophisticated system of water storage, transportation, and control that is currently used only 3 months of the year. Capitalizing upon this infrastructure throughout the year could provide economic opportunities and bolster the mountain's sustainability.

Installation of a hydroelectric turbine and generator could almost completely offset the cost and emissions of electricity required to run the Hudson River pumps, all from naturally collected rainwater that otherwise pours over a dam and is not presently generating energy.

This system would provide yearly benefits up to \$118,700 for the foreseeable future, and would pay for itself within 8 years. Additional tax credits of \$15,200 could also be available.

If non-renewable energy costs continue to rise, this system will return even higher percentages of the initial investment.





WATER



Potable Water

Gore Mountain's treated water is provided by its own non-transient, non-community potable water system. There are two developed wells, one in the Base Area that produces 70 gallons per minute, and another at the Saddle Area that produces 5 gallons per minute. Both systems utilize holding tanks with chlorination pumps that are activated by flow. The chlorine residuals are monitored and recorded daily. Analytical reports are filed monthly with the NYS Department of Health. The Ski Bowl Lodge's potable water is serviced by the North Creek Water District.

North Creek Reservoir

The North Creek reservoir is a 25-million gallon upper elevation water source used for snowmaking since 1975. The reservoir was originally built as a Work Progress Administration project for the North Creek Water District. The reservoir is above Roaring Brook, an intermittent brook that flows into North Creek and then the Hudson River.

Hudson River

Gore Mountain withdraws water for snowmaking from the Hudson River. The pump house is located at the North Creek Train Depot. The established limit of 5,000 gallons per minute (GPM) is 1% of the record low flow at this location. The intake structure is designed to appear as a box culvert with a stream flowing into the river and has baffles and chambers designed to mitigate carryover effects from pumping and draining. Each year, almost 300 million gallons of water are used in snowmaking.



Wastewater

The mountain's annual wastewater treatment permit is a State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, which is designed to "eliminate the pollution of New York waters and to maintain the highest quality of water possible consistent with; public health, public enjoyment of the resource, protection and propagation of fish and wildlife and the industrial development within the state," according to the DEC's website.

Gore Mountain's operators monitor the wastewater produced. The normal testing parameters are volume, temperature, turbidity, dissolved oxygen, pH, biochemical oxygen demand, ammonia, suspended solids, settled solids and alkalinity. These tests are done on a daily basis and recorded for monthly submission to DEC. The waste sludge is trucked out periodically to a commercial wastewater facility. The plant has the capacity to process 70,000 gallons of wastewater per day but even at its peak, the mountain does not operate at 50% of design capacity.

Stormwater

Gore Mountain actively practices stormwater management techniques through proper implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans developed individually for each construction project. During heavy construction, the project site and the water downstream are closely monitored to protect water quality. Gore Mountain also incorporates proper stormwater management devices into any new construction project to control runoff after construction projects are completed.

Water Conservation

Gore Mountain uses low flow water fixtures in the lodges. These fixtures use a high-pressure technique that produces an equal flow to that of older, less efficient models, but they use less water.

With tactical earthwork of smoothing and filling irregularities on terrain, Gore has had great success decreasing the amount of manmade snow required to open several trails. Earthen features built into runs such as our boardercross have also allowed some mountain areas to open more quickly, with less energy needed to do so.



Gore Mountain generates substantial recyclable and non-recyclable waste from the guests, construction projects, and daily activities. Through the implementation of new systems, we are working to improve various areas of our facility's waste management practices.



WASTE MANAGEMENT & RECYCLING



WASTE MANAGEMENT & RECYCLING

Waste Repurposing

Gore Mountain has repurposed many items to keep material out of the waste cycle. The most high profile examples of repurposed, relocated items are the Topridge Triple, the Hudson Chair, the Village Chair, and the Bear Cub surface lift. Many of our buildings have been modernized and some have even been moved to continue utilizing these resources. Large repurposing projects include the Northwoods Lodge, which was converted from the loading barn of the historic 1967 gondola. Relocated buildings include the Mountain Adventure Buildings, both Ski Bowl yurts, and the operator buildings for the base of the gondola and Topridge lifts. Repurposed material has been used to construct the framework for the Fairview observation deck, safety bollards, corral posts, parking lot directional equipment, the Corduroy Café, and other specialty items.

Single-Stream Recycling

For the last four years, Gore Mountain has utilized a facility-wide single-stream recycling system. Single-stream recycling is a process in which materials are all mingled together with no sorting required by individuals.



Precious Metal Recycling

Our recycling has remained fairly constant. In fiscal year 2014/2015, we recycled an inordinately large amount of material due to a lift replacement that generated several tons of scrap metal.

Hazardous Waste

Gore Mountain generates some hazardous waste that must be disposed of properly and separately from the regular waste. Most of this waste is mercury from expired light bulbs. These light bulbs are temporarily stored in a sealed container by Gore Maintenance, then properly disposed of at a certified off-site facility.

Food Waste

Gore Mountain staff is researching compost systems in order to generate fertile soil from food waste. One option is an on-site composting pile or a composting tumbler. The compost would be initially generated from the kitchens' food waste, then secondarily from customer waste. The fertile soil produced would be used in gardens around the mountain and could also be spread on trails.

Gore Mountain and the Olympic Regional Development Authority have a corporate partnership with Centerplate to be their concession operator. Centerplate has transferred all of its cups and paper products used at the mountain to compostable and recyclable products. The amount of locally sourced foods and healthier options within Centerplate's offerings to Gore's guests is on the rise.




Figure 1.10: Amount of material recycled over the past 4 fiscal years



HERITAGE & EDUCATION



HERITAGE & EDUCATION

Visual Resource Management

A “gore” is a surveyor’s term for an area of unsurveyed land. Gore Mountain was left off the area’s earliest maps, likely due to the mysterious way the summit blends into the peaks surrounding it upon approach, as well as the natural ruggedness of the landscape. We have held true to this natural blend we have with our surroundings in our development of the ski resort as well. Examples of our award-winning performance in mitigating visual impact include:

- The layout and appearance of the Northwoods Gondola, designed with low towers, a low-profile lift line that follows the natural contour of the land, and color scheme carefully selected to blend into its surroundings.
- The appearance of the Hudson River Pump House and transformer at the Upper Hudson River Railroad station, painted Johnsbury Brown and designed to merge flawlessly into the depot facade.



- The appearance of the Hudson River Intake Structure, designed on the water’s edge to appear as a box culvert from which a tributary would flow.

- Gore’s new lift and trail network at the North Creek Ski Bowl, designed using a layout virtually identical to its historic layout.

- Constructing new buildings only in color schemes and architectural styles that match the natural environment, while renovating existing shells when possible to preserve open space and reuse materials.

- The “Topridge Area,” a pod of skiing that cannot be seen from any developed location.

- Gore Mountain’s new Nordic trail network, using existing terrain profiles and infrastructure to integrate new recreational opportunities with resources already available.

Environmental Awareness

Gore Mountain transforms every gondola ride into an educational opportunity with its unique Northwoods Knowledge program. Each cabin features a unique story about the area’s ecology or heritage. Topics that guests can read about on their gondola rides include wildlife adaptations, the Great Camps of the Adirondacks, how mountains are formed, and the science of snow. Interpretive signage is also placed around the mountain and lodges for people to identify area peaks, learn about the environment, and discover the history of Gore.

Gore has hosted environmental field trips for area schools and is developing environmental activities to incorporate into summer programming.





Timeline of Progress

- 1934** The first snow train, carrying 378 winter enthusiasts, arrives in North Creek at 10:30am from Schenectady on March 4. Round trip \$1.50. The Ski Patrol was organized, led by Lois Perret. It was one of the first of its kind and served as a model for patrols all over the world.
- 1946** A 3000' t-bar is installed at the North Creek Ski Bowl, servicing 830 vertical feet.
- 1964** The primary Gore Mountain facility is opened by New York State on January 25. It features a j-bar, a t-bar, and for the more advanced, a double chair, the longest lift in the East.
- 1967** The first gondola in New York State is installed at Gore Mountain. It remains New York's only gondola until 1999.
- 1976** Gore Mountain installs its first snowmaking system on four trails: Sleeping Bear, Sunway, Showcase, and Cloud.
- 1984** Gore Mountain installs the "Adirondack Express." This high-speed triple is the only lift of its kind in the Eastern US.
- 1995** "The Rumor" opens on February 9. This trail has 70% pitch and is one of the steepest trails in the East, designed for experts only.
- 1996** Gore Mountain taps the mighty Hudson River for a snowmaking water source and quadruples snowmaking capabilities.
- 1999** The Northwoods Gondola replaces the 1967 "Old Red Gondola." The high-speed eight-passenger lift is named SKI Magazine's "Best New Lift" and transports guests to the newly developed summit of Bear Mountain.
- 2002** The Topridge Area is introduced with a lift and four new trails. Conveniently linking guests from the Straight Brook Valley to Bear Mountain's summit, Topridge transforms the Gore Mountain experience.
- 2003** Gore Mountain begins winter management of the town-owned North Creek Ski Bowl.
- 2006** "Ruby Run," a new easier-rated trail off the Northwoods Gondola is added, offering beginners 1700' vertical feet and 2.2 miles of continuous skiing and riding.
- 2007** Gore Mountain opens the new Northwoods Lodge. "Village Chair," the first-ever aerial chairlift at the North Creek Ski Bowl, is installed for day/night skiing and snowboarding.
- 2008** New terrain serviced by a high-speed quad opens on Burnt Ridge Mountain, increasing Gore's vertical to 2300'.
- 2011** Gore Mountain opens the "Hudson Chair," completing its interconnect with the Historic North Creek Ski Bowl on Little Gore Mountain, and further developing its fourth peak of terrain.
- 2014** The 1984 Adirondack Express is replaced with an all-new luxurious and high-speed detachable quad, AEII.
- 2016** Gore Mountain's 14,589 solar panels go live on the grid and offset 85% of the mountain's energy use.



AWARDS

Awards and Recognitions


In May 2016, Gore Mountain received the ski industry's most esteemed recognition for sustainable performance—the Golden Eagle for Overall Environmental Excellence, presented by SKI Magazine and the National Ski Areas Association (NSAA). Gore was chosen for consistent leadership on environmental stewardship and enhancing the guest experience in creative ways that help both the planet and its business, with an emphasis upon initiatives accomplished during the last twelve months. Gore Mountain serves as an industry model for development, demonstrating that a growing resort (its acreage and uphill capacity have increased 131 percent and 142 percent respectively over the last 20 years) can at the same time be sustainable. Gore's commitment to solar energy, its steady investment in snowmaking efficiencies, strategic trail work to offset energy use, newly introduced service of locally sourced foods, replacement of traditional lighting with LED, and its environmental education initiatives all contributed to this esteemed award.

NSAA has also chosen Gore for past awards in the specific topics of Visual Resource Management, Environmental Education, and Environmental Group Relations. In addition, the mountain was a finalist for an award in Waste Reduction & Recycling.


Other honors include National Grid's 2014 nomination of Gore Mountain for a national energy conservation award, based on its efficiency upgrades. Demonstrating long-standing leadership in stewardship, Gore was one

of thirty presenters to the Environmental Concerns Task Force at the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism in 1995, and was one of twenty-four parties invited to participate the EPA's Sustainable Industry Mountain Resort Development Stakeholder Meeting in 1999.





GORE
MOUNTAIN



Appendix 10
DGEIS Public Hearing Transcript

*** Proof of Publication ***

WARREN COUNTY AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NEW YORK:

County of Warren, ss:

Donna Morehouse _____ being duly sworn,

says that (s)he is an authorized designee for Lee Enterprises, publishers of THE POST-STAR, a daily newspaper published in Glens Falls, Warren County, State of New York, and that the printed notice attached hereto was cut from the said POST-STAR, and that the said notice was published therein, namely

NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
January 8, 2018

THE LA GROUP LEGALS
40 LONG ALLEY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866

ORDER NUMBER 38724

Signed this 8 day of JANUARY, 2018
Donna Morehouse

Sworn to before me this 8 day of Jan, 2018
[Signature]

PUBLISHED ON: 01/08/2018

TOTAL AD COST: 57.98

FILED ON: 1/3/2018

Notice of SEQRA Public Hearing

The NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority will hold a public hearing on Wednesday January 24, 2018 at 7:00 PM in the Gore Mountain Base Lodge to receive public comment on the 2017 Amendment to the 2002 Gore Mountain Unit Management Plan /Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (UMP/DGEIS). Copies of the UMP/DGEIS are available for review at Gore Mountain, NYSDEC offices in Warrensburg and in Albany (Lands and Forests), at ORDA's Lake Placid office and at Johnsbury Town Hall in North Creek. The UMP/DGEIS is also available online at <http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/41866.html>. New actions proposed at Gore Mountain in the 2017 UMP Amendment include the following: construct a new ski trail connecting Burnt Ridge and the Base Lodge, widen Echo and Twister trails, Widen Sunway and other green trails served by Lift 3, add a new triple or quad chair from Northwoods Lodge to Lower Sunway, construct dedicated shuttle lanes, expand the NYSEF building, reconfigure maintenance to place a groomer garage and fueling station adjacent to the Sunway Trail, enlarge the snowmaking reservoir, construct a single-track bike trail loop for the Town trail at the top of Little Gore, and develop a hiking center based out of the Northwoods Lodge.

The purpose and need for the UMP Amendment is the on-going improvement and modernization of facilities at Gore Mountain that will add to the public accessibility, increase user safety and enhance recreational pursuits while simultaneously complying with the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan and Article XIV of the NYS Constitution.

Oral and written public comments will be accepted at the January 24, 2018 public hearing. Written public comments may also be submitted before or after the public hearing until the public comment period closes on February 9, 2018. Written public comments can be submitted via mail to: Olympic Regional Development Authority, 2634 Main Street, Lake Placid, NY, 12946, attn: Department of Environment, Planning & Construction or electronically to: Gore_2017_UMP_comments@orda.org

BRIAN J. CORCORAN
Notary Public - State of New York
No. 01C06133976
Qualified in Saratoga County
My Commission Expires September 19, 2021

SEQRA PUBLIC HEARING

NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority

January 24, 2018
7:00 p.m.

Gore Mountain Base Lodge
North Creek, New York

Contact: Kevin Franke
The LA Group
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
518-587-8100
kfranke@thelagroup.com

1
2 P R O C E E D I N G S :

3 MR. PRATT: Thanks for attending
4 tonight's presentation. I'm Mike
5 Pratt. I'm the president of the
6 Olympic Regional Development Authority
7 and former manager of Gore.

8 This is a powerful presentation
9 tonight. Our plans here for updating
10 our Unit Management Plan are not
11 traditional. They also include plans
12 to develop lands of the Town of
13 Johnsburg at the North Creek Ski
14 Bowl. So, simultaneously, we're
15 going through the SEQRA process,
16 trying to make amendments to our Unit
17 Management Plan, as well as complete
18 our Section 814 Adirondack Park
19 Agency application so that we gain
20 permits for both projects
21 simultaneously.

22 So we've been working very hard
23 on these projects. Everybody at Gore

1 has been contributing. People at the
2 Olympic Authority have been
3 contributing, and we've been
4 supported by our friends at the
5 LA Group. So right now I certainly
6 would like to thank all the staff
7 people that have been helping us out,
8 and I'll recognize Kevin Franke from
9 the LA Group who will kind of explain
10 the reasons for this public hearing
11 tonight and the SEQRA process.

12 What we're going to have is,
13 after Kevin speaks, Gore's general
14 manager, Bone Bayse, will give a
15 presentation of the plans and we'll
16 certainly give everyone an
17 opportunity to make comments.

18 As part of the SEQRA process,
19 this public hearing is designed for
20 us to accept your comments, not
21 necessarily designed to be a question
22 and answer session, but if there's
23 simple answers we can provide, we're

1 happy to do that. And certainly
2 after the presentation, we'll be
3 around for a little bit if anyone
4 wants one-on-one questions.

5 All right. Kevin Franke.

6 MR. FRANKE: Thanks, Mike. Just
7 a few procedural issues to get out of
8 the way before Bone gives the
9 presentation on the content of the
10 UMP.

11 Tonight's public hearing is
12 being held in accordance with the
13 State Environmental Quality Review
14 Act and Article 8 of the Conservation
15 Law. The document that's been issued
16 today is a Draft Unit Management
17 Plan, Draft Environmental Impact
18 Statement. Comments that we receive
19 tonight and comments that we'll
20 receive throughout the comment period
21 will all be addressed in the Final
22 UMP, Final Environmental Impact
23 Statement.

1 Most of you saw on the way in,
2 there is a sign-up sheet for those
3 who wish to speak. Emily has that.
4 We'll be calling up speakers from
5 that list. We do have a stenographer
6 here tonight to get an accurate
7 record of the hearing, so we'd ask
8 that when you first start your
9 comments that you restate your name
10 so Kelly, our stenographer, can get
11 that down for the record.

12 In addition to the comments that
13 we receive tonight, the public
14 comment period will remain open until
15 February 9th. Written comments can
16 be submitted by e-mail or by regular
17 mail. There are addresses, both
18 written and e-mail, where those
19 comments can be submitted on sheets
20 here on the front table. I believe
21 Emily also has a copy, as well, and
22 that information will also be up on
23 the screen at the end of Bone's

1 presentation.

2 Copies of UMP. Where can I get
3 a copy? There are hard copies in a
4 number of locations. Bone has a copy
5 here at Gore Mountain. There's one
6 down in Town Hall. There's one at
7 the DEC offices, both in Warrensburg
8 and in Albany. And for those who are
9 closer to Lake Placid, there's one at
10 the ORDA offices in Lake Placid.

11 The notice of this public
12 hearing was published in the
13 Environmental Notice Bulletin on
14 January 10th, 2018. There was a
15 legal notice announcing this public
16 hearing that was published in the
17 Post-Star on January 8th, 2018.

18 As part of this procedural
19 matter, I'd just like to read into
20 the record the public notice, and
21 then we'll turn it over to Bone for
22 his presentation.

23 Notice of SEQRA Public Hearing.

1 New York State Olympic Regional
2 Development Authority will hold a
3 public hearing on Wednesday, January
4 24, 2018 at 7:00 PM in the Gore
5 Mountain Base Lodge to receive public
6 comment on the 2017 Amendment to the
7 2002 Gore Mountain Unit Management
8 Plan/Draft Generic Environmental
9 Impact Statement (UMP/DGEIS). Copies
10 of the UMP/DGEIS are available for
11 review at Gore Mountain, NYSDEC
12 offices in Warrensburg and in Albany
13 (Lands and Forests), at ORDA's Lake
14 Placid office and at Johnsburg Town
15 Hall in North Creek. The UMP/DGEIS
16 is also available online at
17 [http://www/dec/ny/](http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/41866.html)
18 [gov/lands/41866.html](http://www/dec/ny.gov/lands/41866.html).

19 New actions proposed at Gore
20 Mountain in the 2017 UMP Amendment
21 include the following: Construct a
22 new ski trail connecting Burnt Ridge
23 and the Base Lodge, widen Echo and

1 Twister trails, Widen Sunway and the
2 other green trails served by Lift 3,
3 add a new triple or quad chair from
4 Northwoods Lodge to Lower Sunway,
5 construct dedicated shuttle lanes,
6 expand the NYSEF building,
7 reconfigure maintenance to place a
8 groomer garage and fueling station
9 adjacent to the Sunway Trail, enlarge
10 the snowmaking reservoir, construct a
11 single-track bike trail loop for the
12 Town trail at the top of Little Gore,
13 and develop a hiking center based out
14 of the Northwoods Lodge.

15 The purpose and need for the UMP
16 Amendment is the on-going improvement
17 and modernization of facilities at
18 Gore Mountain that will add to the
19 public accessibility, increase user
20 safety and enhance recreational
21 pursuits while simultaneously
22 complying with the Adirondack Park
23 State Land Master Plan and Article

1 XIV of the NYS Constitution.

2 Oral and written public comments
3 will be accepted at the January 24,
4 2018 public hearing. Written public
5 comments may also be submitted before
6 or after the public hearing until the
7 public comment period closes on
8 February 9, 2018. Written public
9 comments can be submitted via mail
10 to: Olympic Regional Development
11 Authority, 2634 Main Street, Lake
12 Placid, NY, 12946, Attn: Department
13 of Environmental Planning and
14 Construction, or electronically to
15 Gore.2017_UMP_comments@orda.org.

16 Again, thanks for coming out
17 tonight. We appreciate your interest
18 and your comments. Bone.

19 MR. BAYSE: Thank you, Kevin.
20 Thank you, Mike.

21 Hello everybody and thanks for
22 coming out this evening for tonight's
23 presentation. I'm going to walk you

1 through these slides, and, as both
2 Mike and Kevin had mentioned, at the
3 end, you'll have plenty of
4 opportunity to make comments.

5 So the Master Plan goals for
6 Gore are listed here and what we're
7 trying to do is make our venues more
8 desirable for recreational guests,
9 athlete training and hosting premiere
10 events, modernize the aging
11 facilities and infrastructure,
12 continue energy efficiency
13 improvements, improve operational
14 efficiency, increase competitiveness
15 in our marketplace, explore potential
16 for and increase development of
17 year-round and summer attractions,
18 improve quality and diversity of
19 recreational facilities and attract
20 more visitors, including the younger
21 and the next generation. And so,
22 working off of that master plan is
23 what brings us into those 2017

1 amendments to our 2002 plan.

2 The proposed action overview --
3 this is an overview and we'll keep
4 getting into more details as we go
5 here -- include new trail
6 construction, trail widening, lift
7 improvements, enlarge our snowmaking
8 reservoir, construct an independent
9 shuttle lane -- and that's a
10 modification of an already approved
11 1995 UMP, and build a new grooming
12 garage and fueling station, which is
13 also a modification of an approved
14 1995 UMP, an expansion on the NYSEF
15 building -- that's our race facility
16 here at the mountain.

17 This also includes a request for
18 a land reclassification that involves
19 the Gore Mountain intensive use area,
20 the Vanderwhacker Mountain Wild
21 Forest, and the Siamese Ponds
22 Wilderness. We're also looking to
23 expand summer recreation operations

1 at the North Creek Ski Bowl and that
2 would include a zip coaster, ropes
3 courses, mini golf, hiking and
4 mountain biking at that location.

5 This map right here shows you an
6 overview of the entire facility, just
7 to give you an idea of where we're
8 looking to make these improvements,
9 and then we'll get into some closer
10 slides. But down here you see where
11 our new proposed shuttle lane is, and
12 that's along the access road, and
13 then in through our parking lots into
14 the base area.

15 Lift and trail improvements at
16 our beginner area, which is the
17 Sunway Lift area and the Poma Lift
18 area if you're familiar with skiing
19 here. An intermediate trail -- a new
20 intermediate trail on the Burnt Ridge
21 area of the mountain, an expansion of
22 our snowmaking reservoir, a potential
23 land reclassification -- and I

1 mentioned that a couple moments ago.
2 And that would be, this piece of land
3 here would become wilderness. This
4 here would become part of the
5 intensive use of the ski area. And
6 then this area here, which are the
7 lands of the Town of Johnsbury, the
8 Ski Bowl.

9 Okay. First closeup slide.
10 This is the beginner area where we're
11 looking to do some improvements.
12 Again, if you're familiar with the
13 ski area now Lift 3 or our Sunway
14 Lift terminates right here. We're
15 looking to replace and extend that
16 Sunway Lift to go across the Sunway
17 Trail into that area. We believe
18 this will give us a better experience
19 for our customers, a better unloading
20 area. It gives them an
21 opportunity -- I don't know if you're
22 familiar with beginner skiers, but
23 they can sometimes have a tough time

1 getting their act together. When
2 they get off the lift, they're kind
3 of wobbly. This will allow them to
4 have a better staging area.

5 The green shaded areas are where
6 we're proposing to widen the trails
7 in this area, again, to make a better
8 experience for our beginner skiers.

9 Down here is the Poma Lift, and
10 there's where it currently ends.
11 We're proposing to put a new lift
12 there that would go all the way to
13 the bottom of that lower Sunway area,
14 and that would give a really nice
15 experience, again, for our beginner
16 and advanced beginner skiers.

17 Over onto the Burnt Ridge area.
18 This is the top of the Burnt Ridge
19 Lift for reference. And these shaded
20 areas are previously approved trails,
21 just so you can see what's out there.
22 But what we are proposing is to add a
23 new trail right here. This will give

1 another much needed access to the
2 base area. And when it goes
3 towards -- especially when you're
4 talking about the inner connect from
5 Gore over to the main base area here,
6 the middle part of this proposed
7 trail has already been approved --
8 previously approved where that's
9 shaded. And just this top section
10 and the bottom section are new
11 actions that we're looking to take to
12 get that trail.

13 This slide brings us over to the
14 base area and that's kind of where
15 we -- well, it's definitely where we
16 are right now. And this shows us the
17 proposed shuttle bus lane. And what
18 that shuttle bus lane would do, that
19 would be separate from the general
20 traffic flow. We found that our busy
21 days here continue to get busier and
22 a problem we have is that our shuttle
23 busses get caught in that traffic,

1 people coming up the road and going
2 through the parking lot. So with a
3 dedicated shuttle lane, we feel that
4 we can keep the traffic flow going
5 much smoother and make a much more
6 positive experience for our
7 customers.

8 Also, over here you can see
9 where our new grooming garage is
10 identified, where we would like to
11 put that. In the previous UMP
12 approval, it was to replace the
13 existing grooming garage, so the only
14 change is moving to a different
15 location. And what this will do for
16 us is put the grooming tractors
17 closer to snow. And that will help
18 quite a bit on maintenance, when
19 those machines don't have to come
20 down a gravel dirt road to get into
21 the garage. They'll be able to come
22 right off of the snow into the garage
23 and back out onto the snow.

1 And then the NYSEF building
2 expansion. This is where the NYSEF
3 building is and that's where that
4 would be expanded.

5 This slide shows the request for
6 land reclassification from the Gore
7 Mountain Intensive Use Area to
8 Siamese Ponds Wilderness Area. And
9 we're requesting that this area here
10 be reclassified. And this is
11 currently part of the Vanderwhacker
12 Mountain Wild Forest and we would
13 like to have that reclassified as
14 intensive use area, which is the ski
15 area classification.

16 This slide here shows us our Ski
17 Bowl improvements that we would like
18 to make. This top area, we're just
19 looking at that piece of land that we
20 would like to be reclassified. If we
21 were granted that reclassification,
22 we're proposing to realign the Hudson
23 Chair and have it terminate up here.

1 Currently it terminates down here.
2 That lift would come up here and we
3 would replace that lift with a
4 detachable chair. The shaded areas
5 show previously approved ski trails.
6 The lighter green areas show proposed
7 ski trails that would tie into those
8 previously approved.

9 Up here is our reservoir and the
10 light blue areas show where we are
11 proposing to enlarge the reservoir.

12 Summer and winter operation
13 improvements at the Ski Bowl include
14 a zip coaster, and that's on the next
15 slide. This gives you the overview.
16 Let's just jump to that. There.
17 It's a little bit closer for everyone
18 to see. This zip coaster is in
19 purple. We're proposing to put that
20 in there, along with a high ropes
21 course.

22 We're proposing to extend the
23 Village Chair. Currently the Village

1 Chair ends right there. We're
2 looking to extend that up into this
3 area, which puts it up high on the
4 Moxham Trail. We're looking to
5 extend the lights up there. This
6 will give a much better nighttime
7 skiing experience and it will also
8 give people ski lift access to the
9 ropes courses.

10 Down here we're looking to put
11 summer and winter tubing and a
12 permanent mini golf course. I
13 mentioned in the previous slide about
14 realigning the Hudson Chair. That
15 shows that there again. If that land
16 reclassification was not granted to
17 us, then we would keep the existing
18 alignment of that lift, but still
19 planning on changing the lift from a
20 fixed grip to a detachable chair.
21 The detachable chairs are easier for
22 summer traffic for people to load and
23 offload, as well as mountain bikes.

1 They're easier to load and offload on
2 those. And that would make it a much
3 nicer customer experience in the
4 summer. And if you haven't been to
5 the top of this area, the views of
6 downtown North Creek are spectacular.

7 We're also planning to continue
8 actions approved in previous UMPs.

9 We're going to continue trail
10 development and trail widening, lift
11 improvements, lodge improvements and
12 expansions, parking improvements,
13 snowmaking modernization and energy
14 efficiency improvements,
15 infrastructure modernization and
16 energy efficiency improvements.

17 We're going to continue to
18 improve and develop compatible
19 recreation amenities and public
20 access, and we'll also continue to
21 develop and improve a strong
22 connection between Gore, the Ski Bowl
23 and the Village of North Creek.

1 So that is the presentation in a
2 nutshell. I've shown you all the
3 slides and told you what we're
4 planning on doing. This slide here
5 gives you some more information.
6 Kevin had mentioned where you can get
7 copies of the UMP. It's also
8 available online. This gives you
9 some addresses here if you want to
10 send in written public comment.

11 And so at this time -- we're did
12 Kevin go? There he is. At this
13 time, we would start with the public
14 comment.

15 MR. FRANKE: And I would just
16 remind people, if you are going to
17 speak, please state your name for the
18 record so the stenographer can get
19 that down.

20 FROM THE FLOOR: Can we ask
21 questions first?

22 MR. BAYSE: Let's go through the
23 public comment.

1 FROM THE FLOOR: Hi everyone.
2 I'm Rick Morris. I know most of you.
3 I've skied at Gore for about 40 years.
4 I love Gore. It's my home mountain.
5 I love some of the work that's been
6 done here in the past. Great job for
7 Mike and great job for Bone for
8 keeping it up, and everyone else here.

9 And I also like the existing
10 hiking trails and backcountry ski
11 trails and snowshoe trails in the
12 area, and I've worked hard to help
13 build some of these trails. I've
14 worked hard to help maintain them, as
15 have a lot of other people here. And
16 I would like for Gore to be able to
17 expand as it feels necessary, as well
18 as to protect the existing trail
19 system, which we have for the public
20 to use.

21 The Rabbit Pond Ski Trail gets a
22 lot of use spring, summer, fall and
23 winter. It's an existing trail for

1 quite a while now. And I just think
2 there should be some way to both
3 expand Gore and to protect the
4 existing trail and to protect Rabbit
5 Pond. And that's what I would like
6 to see.

7 And what I have, I have a map
8 here of the proposed expansion of
9 Gore into the Rabbit Pond area and I
10 have a map of the existing trails in
11 the Rabbit Pond area, which I was
12 able to get from North Creek for
13 visitors to North Creek to use. But
14 what I haven't seen, and maybe this
15 is my fault, in the UMP, I haven't
16 seen a map showing both right on the
17 same map and showing how the proposed
18 new development would impact the
19 existing trails. And it seems like,
20 if you're going to put new trails in
21 and have them coexist with existing
22 trails, it would be important to be
23 able to see where they both lie.

1 So that's my comments. Great
2 job to people at Gore. You've done a
3 fantastic job in the past. And I
4 would like to see new development
5 here at Gore, but just to also
6 protect what we already have. Thank
7 you.

8 FROM THE FLOOR: Hi. I'm Dick
9 Carlson. Most people know me. I
10 worked here at Gore for seven years, I
11 would like to say back in the day, on
12 the ski patrol. I worked at Garnet
13 Hill for 25 years and am associated
14 lately with the same group that Rick
15 works with, which is the Siamese Ponds
16 Trail Improvement Society, Upper
17 Hudson Trails Alliance. I work with
18 Adirondack Trecks and so forth.

19 We're concerned with
20 trails-based recreation in the North
21 Creek area. And, you know, I would
22 like to preface my comments by
23 saying, if this is the least of our

1 problems, compared to some of the
2 federal climate change, EPA, National
3 Park Service and a host of other
4 ones, I think we're indeed fortunate.
5 This is not a huge deal in that
6 respect.

7 That said, the Village of North
8 Creek has very few hiking
9 opportunities. And I have to
10 discount hiking on ski trails and
11 hiking on wide areas. There's really
12 three main trails. The Schaeffer
13 Trail, the Rabbit Pond Trail and the
14 Raymond Brook Trail. And to, you
15 know, utilize one little bit of added
16 vertical for those trails that come
17 down from the Rabbit Pond area, I
18 think is misguided, especially if it
19 will eliminate the Rabbit Pond Trail
20 from hiking, snowshoeing and skiing
21 in season. It's really a delightful
22 trail. And it's an intimate hiking
23 trail, like a regular trail you would

1 see in the woods where the trees are
2 quite close to you on both sides. So
3 it's an important consideration, as
4 well.

5 And the Hamlets to Hut
6 Initiative is using the Raymond Brook
7 Trail, which is right adjacent to the
8 Rabbit Pond Trail, for their premiere
9 trip, which is supposed to begin this
10 spring.

11 And, also, the North Country
12 National Scenic Trail is also -- I
13 think the signs are up already. The
14 Raymond Brook Trail is part of that.
15 And, again, the Rabbit Pond Trail
16 teases into all this and to have that
17 not be available anymore would be,
18 again, I think misguided.

19 The question I had, and I know
20 that Crikelair property is some of
21 the Alpine Trails that are proposed
22 that are already approved. And I'm
23 wondering, is this development on

1 Crikelair's property? Is it Town of
2 Johnsburg? Is it going to be ORDA
3 property? How is that all going to
4 work?

5 And I guess that's about all I
6 have, other than the questions.
7 Thanks.

8 FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you,
9 everyone. I'm Jill Broderick. I'm
10 one of twelve members of the ORDA
11 board of directors and I would like to
12 thank everybody for their help putting
13 this plan together. I know -- I've
14 been told it takes a lot of time and
15 it looked like there's 300-some pages
16 that I perused today.

17 So I don't have many notes, but
18 I am very happy with probably
19 80 percent of the plan. And like
20 Rick just said, and Dick just said, I
21 do have my reservations about the
22 Rabbit Pond reclassification of that
23 land, only because it's sensitive. A

1 lot of people enjoy it just the way
2 it is and I don't think it's -- I'm
3 not sure if it's feasible, so -- I
4 haven't seen the numbers and I don't
5 really understand the realignment of
6 the lift. Let me see. I have notes.

7 If I may suggest adding to the
8 master plan goals, I would include to
9 improve and enhance the economy for
10 the host benefit community of the
11 Town of Johnsbury, and to improve the
12 health and wellness for the residents
13 by making recreational activities
14 affordable and accessible.

15 That's all I have. Again, thank
16 you very much.

17 FROM THE FLOOR: I'm Scott
18 Robertson. I've lived here for 35
19 years, taught, skied -- same with
20 everybody else here, probably. And --
21 sorry. Okay.

22 All the comments before, I echo
23 one hundred percent. I really hope

1 you guys can move the trail either
2 back to where you originally had it
3 or put in a trail -- I don't really
4 like this idea too much, but if we
5 have to compromise, maybe put in
6 another trail to move around so we
7 don't lose Rabbit Pond.

8 I've been going to the Huts and
9 Hamlets meetings and doing a lot of
10 these things and there's really
11 exciting stuff going on in the
12 backcountry. And, to be honest with
13 you, that's what I live for and I
14 have a lot of friends and that's what
15 they live for, too.

16 I'd hate to lose this trail. I
17 think it would be a big mistake.
18 What I did, I spent a lot of time
19 using typographical maps and tried to
20 overlay your maps on there to see
21 exactly where the trails went, and it
22 looked to me like we're going to be
23 losing part of the trail. Maybe I'm

1 wrong about that, but if we do the
2 proposal, that's what it looks like
3 to me. And I think that would be a
4 huge mistake, so -- that's it.

5 MR. FRANKE: Anyone else?

6 FROM THE FLOOR: This is quick.
7 I'm Julie West. I live in North
8 River. I've been here for a long
9 time. Skied all over.

10 I have an idea. The summer
11 recreation idea at Little Gore I
12 think is really exciting. And right
13 at Little Gore we have these awesome
14 hiking trails and biking trails, so
15 if you take the portions -- the
16 Rabbit Pond area that the everyone is
17 concerned about and make it a winter
18 area, it kind of takes the glimmer
19 out of the summer recreational
20 opportunities that maybe some of the
21 family could be doing while the
22 others are on the zip lines. Just a
23 thought.

1 My other concern is skier
2 numbers here at Little Gore. Do we
3 need more terrain at Little Gore? I
4 just haven't seen the mountain even
5 open that much because of climate
6 change or whatever. We just don't
7 have the terrain or snow for it.

8 So that's what I wanted to say.
9 Thanks.

10 FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. I'm Kelly
11 Nessle. I really -- this is the first
12 time I've paid any attention to this,
13 so my question -- and it's really more
14 of a question than a statement. We
15 have -- the Town of Johnsburg has
16 received money from the State of New
17 York for a design of trails that
18 leaves from Ski Bowl Park and goes up
19 through to North River and then goes
20 to other parts of the town. And that
21 work is probably going to be starting
22 sometime this year. And what I worry
23 about is a collision between the

1 interests of Gore Mountain and their
2 summer activities and the interests of
3 the Town of Johnsbury with their
4 hiking trails and their biking trails.
5 And I don't want the public that's
6 been coming already from Schenectady
7 and Vermont and everything else coming
8 up here to bike, all of the sudden
9 they can't go on trails that we're
10 making because they are going to be
11 charged. And I don't know if that's
12 in the plans or not, but that would be
13 my concern.

14 MR. FRANKE: Does anyone else
15 have a comment?

16 FROM THE FLOOR: Brandon Himmoff.
17 First of all, I think it's a great
18 plan, and there's a tremendous asset
19 here of, you know, a great mountain
20 and there's a lot of revenue that, you
21 know, that the state and the community
22 will get out of it if the mountain
23 grows.

1 I think that there are a couple
2 issues that I think the mountain is
3 beginning to realize. I thought some
4 of the commentary on like the pump
5 capacity and stuff that I saw on the
6 news was really very interesting.
7 But it seems to me that, like one of
8 the key issues of the mountain is the
9 connectivity of this side of the
10 mountain here and getting to Burnt
11 Ridge, and then using Burnt Ridge
12 maybe as the key to getting down the
13 mountain to the Ski Bowl.

14 The new route really helps a
15 lot, I think, to connect Burnt Ridge
16 back to the main part of the
17 mountain -- or historically the
18 larger part of the mountain. And I
19 wonder if maybe we can address
20 solutions to get to the other side,
21 because I don't think you really
22 increase the skier numbers if the
23 mountain is sort of disjointed. And

1 I think that there's a sort of design
2 issue.

3 I mean, the mountain sort of is
4 as it is. We just need to make
5 trails to connect A to B. And it
6 seems that, unless you kind of create
7 some kind of tunnel going under the
8 races going on at Echo all the time
9 and Twister, which I guess those are
10 certified as race courses and so
11 there's not a whole lot you can do
12 about that, but you still have to get
13 people from one side to the other. I
14 wonder if you could address how the
15 plan can sort of make that happen.

16 And also related to all these
17 expansions, I think the food strategy
18 at the mountain needs to get
19 addressed, because I think in order
20 to address -- I think locals are
21 really interested in, we'll bring a
22 picnic. We know how it is on the
23 mountain. That's not so big an

1 issue. But I think to really attract
2 tourists, you need a little more
3 variety and high-class cuisine, and
4 it's hard to do that under the
5 current state contracts. And I just
6 wonder if that could be addressed
7 somehow.

8 I think that, you know, this
9 idea of sort of improving local
10 recreational health goes well beyond
11 Johnsburg. Certainly, it's over in
12 my area and really beyond that. It's
13 great to get all these kids out
14 here -- and I'm really speaking on
15 behalf of my seven-year-old and
16 nine-year-old who love spending every
17 Saturday and Sunday here whenever
18 there's snow on the ground.

19 So I think the plan is terrific
20 and really critical. And I also just
21 wonder about the time frame of all
22 these plans. There's about 20 years
23 worth of projects probably in that

1 Unit Management Plan and I was
2 wondering if someone can sort of
3 vaguely give their impressions of
4 which things are more of an urgent
5 priority and which things are longer
6 term priorities.

7 I think that's all. Thank you.

8 FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. My name
9 is Bob Nessle. To give you a little
10 perspective, it was exactly 54 years
11 ago in this very room when Gore
12 Mountain Ski Center opened up. It was
13 a terribly miserable day. Cold,
14 windy, wet, icy. There was no snow
15 but there was a lot of ice all over
16 the mountain. Is this still working?
17 And the next day I was hired on as a
18 professional ski patroller and I've
19 been here ever since.

20 Now, just right off the bat, one
21 question about this skiing. I like
22 the idea of the escape route off the
23 top of Burnt Ridge. But how are you

1 going to get over that the rock wall
2 that separates Sagamore and Echo?
3 You're going to blast a tunnel
4 through there? How are you going to
5 get out?

6 MR. BAYSE: I'll tell you all
7 about it after your comments.

8 FROM THE FLOOR: (Mr. Nettle)
9 The other thing is, the Ski Bowl Park,
10 there's no doubt about it that summer
11 activities -- expanded summer
12 activities are going to be fantastic
13 for the community, for the
14 recreational -- or the recreation menu
15 for the southern -- southeastern part
16 of Adirondack Park.

17 However, estimates have been
18 pushing 40,000 participants, and
19 whether that's just going to be
20 summer or summer and winter -- but
21 the word around the skiing industry
22 is that the summer activities at ski
23 resorts is sometimes greater -- in

1 fact, in many areas is greater than
2 the wintertime.

3 Now, over at Ski Bowl Park,
4 supposing you're going to manage
5 30,000 customers from June, when
6 school is out, until say September,
7 and then into the fall period a
8 little bit. Now, how are the
9 infrastructure problems going to be
10 solved? 30,000 people are going to
11 require a very complex and well --
12 and an excellently designed sewer
13 system. Now, there are three town
14 wells within 200 feet of the base
15 area of the Village slopes and the
16 leg up -- the loading area for the
17 Hudson Trail Lift and the new lift
18 and the whole works. So depositing
19 sewage in the aquifer is probably not
20 going to work. I hope -- I certainly
21 hope that it doesn't work. So that's
22 part of the problem.

23 Also, where are all those people

1 going to park and what are they going
2 to do when they come back off the zip
3 line or the zip coaster or on the
4 mountain coaster. And are they going
5 to go to Joe Minder? Are they going
6 to take a break in the pavilion?
7 But, once again, you're dealing with
8 30,000 people over the period of
9 three or four months. That's another
10 problem.

11 So there's still some work to be
12 done, as I can see it, because, once
13 again, we have to remember that Ski
14 Bowl Park is not ORDA Ski Bowl Park.
15 It's Town of Johnsburg Ski Bowl Park.
16 Its basic design and its life since
17 the 1920s has been to provide a place
18 for Town of Johnsburg residents to
19 recreate. And I think there's got to
20 be some way to figure out a peaceful
21 coexistence and take care of the
22 sewage.

23 Thank you.

1 FROM THE FLOOR: Katy
2 Nightengale. I've been working with
3 Gore for a while now updating the town
4 contract, so I've got a lot of
5 background on a lot of this stuff.
6 And I'm for a lot of everything they
7 want to make at the main mountain and
8 at the Ski Bowl, but I have concerns
9 about the land swap.

10 I have skied those trails and
11 they are really awesome. And there
12 are already planned trails in
13 existence to come down from the top
14 of the Hudson Chair. I see economic
15 development from both Gore and what
16 they're doing for us at the main
17 mountain and at the Ski Bowl, but I
18 also see what's becoming this huge
19 backcountry draw to ski backcountry.
20 And I hate to lose those backcountry
21 trails to be not accessible anymore
22 for somebody who wants to ski up to
23 ski down, so -- that's it.

1 FROM THE FLOOR: Peter Bauer.
2 Protect the Adirondacks. So thanks
3 for the opportunity. We've been going
4 through the draft. And just three
5 comments.

6 We, too, have a lot of concerns
7 about the land swap and the Rabbit
8 Pond tract. We're not sure that's
9 the best way to go and we think
10 there's some major issues that need
11 to be looked at that we'll put in our
12 comments.

13 It has to do with backcountry
14 skiing and it has to do with -- we
15 think there's some legal issues
16 there, too, with the land that was
17 designated at the time of the
18 constitutional amendment that wasn't
19 part of it. We're not sure it can be
20 added in. So we think there's some
21 issues to look at with the Rabbit
22 Pond tract.

23 We think the scheduling is

1 important. A lot of the unit
2 management plans for forest preserve
3 tracts that enumerate a bunch of
4 different activities schedule them in
5 five-year plans. ORDA hasn't always
6 done that with detail. DEC's always
7 done that with its unit management
8 plans and that would be very helpful.

9 I think there's an awful lot of
10 good things in this plan to expand to
11 mountain, a lot of upgrades of basic
12 facilities and basic trails that are
13 very important. And, certainly,
14 there's a lot to support in that.
15 But we're concerned about Rabbit
16 Pond.

17 We also would like to see better
18 detail about the amount of acreage
19 here at Gore, and also at White Face,
20 but here at Gore, that has been used
21 pursuant to the constitutional
22 amendment that was approved, because
23 we think you're getting very close to

1 your clearing limits. We would like
2 to see a real good accounting of the
3 methodology that ORDA is using about
4 the cleared areas, the cleared
5 acreage of trails, the width of
6 trails and that sort of thing.

7 We've been looking at it
8 independently and we think that
9 you're getting very close to your
10 limits. So I think that's something
11 you need to be very mindful about, so
12 we would like to see a really good
13 accounting of that. That's not
14 really a unit management plan issue,
15 but we think it's an important issue
16 going ahead because it affects your
17 trail upgrades and your trails.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. BAYSE: Excellent. So if
20 there aren't any other comments, we'll
21 be here for a while if anyone wants to
22 talk personally.

23 I will make a comment about the

1 Rabbit Pond, because I know that
2 seemed to be a resounding concern
3 with folks. Any of the changes that
4 we have in there, the trails do not
5 encroach on the Rabbit Pond ski or
6 hiking trail. And it may be hard to
7 see a little bit on that map, but we
8 feel pretty strongly that this area
9 needs to work in harmony with
10 backcountry access, ski lift access,
11 hiking, mountain biking. It's the
12 only way we can be successful in this
13 community, is to have as much of that
14 stuff offered as possible. So we're
15 not trying to close that out.

16 But, with that comment, thanks a
17 lot, everybody, for coming and we'll
18 be kicking around and hope to meet up
19 with you.

20 MR. FRANKE: Just for the record,
21 the public hearing is closed for
22 tonight, but, just to remind people,
23 the public comment period for written

1 comments is going to stay open until
2 February 9th.


3 Thanks again for coming out and
4 we look forward to getting more
5 comments.

6 (Whereupon, the public hearing was concluded at
7 7:53 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Kelly Wegg Joseph, Shorthand Reporter
and Notary Public in and for the State of New York, do
hereby certify that the foregoing record taken by me at
the place and date noted in the heading hereof is a true
and accurate transcript of same to the best of my ability
and belief.


Kelly Wegg Joseph

Dated: February 10, 2018

1	address [3] 33/19 34/14 34/20 addressed [3] 4/21 34/19 35/6 addresses [2] 5/17 21/9 Adirondack [4] 2/18 8/22 24/18 37/16 Adirondacks [1] 41/2 adjacent [2] 8/9 26/7 advanced [1] 14/16 affects [1] 43/16 affordable [1] 28/14 after [4] 3/13 4/2 9/6 37/7 again [11] 9/16 13/12 14/7 14/15 19/15 26/15 26/18 28/15 39/7 39/13 45/3 Agency [1] 2/19 aging [1] 10/10 ago [2] 13/1 36/11 ahead [1] 43/16 Albany [2] 6/8 7/12 alignment [1] 19/18 all [21] 3/6 4/5 4/21 14/12 21/2 26/16 27/3 27/5 28/15 28/22 30/9 32/8 32/17 34/8 34/16 35/13 35/21 36/7 36/15 37/6 38/23 Alley [1] 1/19 Alliance [1] 24/17 allow [1] 14/3 along [2] 12/12 18/20 Alpine [1] 26/21 already [7] 11/10 15/7 24/6 26/13 26/22 32/6 40/12 also [23] 2/11 5/21 5/22 7/16 9/5 11/13 11/17 11/22 16/8 19/7 20/7 20/20 21/7 22/9 24/5 26/11 26/12 34/16 35/20 38/23 40/18 42/17 42/19 always [2] 42/5 42/6 am [2] 24/13 27/18 amendment [5] 7/6 7/20 8/16 41/18 42/22 amendments [2] 2/16 11/1 amenities [1] 20/19 amount [1] 42/18 announcing [1] 6/15 another [3] 15/1 29/6 39/9 answer [1] 3/22 answers [1] 3/23 any [3] 31/12 43/20 44/3 anymore [2] 26/17 40/21 anyone [4] 4/3 30/5 32/14 43/21 application [1] 2/19 appreciate [1] 9/17 approval [1] 16/12 approved [10] 11/10 11/13 14/20 15/7 15/8 18/5 18/8 20/8 26/22 42/22 aquifer [1] 38/19 are [40] 2/10 5/17 6/3 6/8 7/10 10/6 13/6 14/5 14/20 14/22 15/10 15/16 18/10 19/21 20/6 21/16 26/1 26/13 26/21 26/22 30/22 32/10 33/1 34/9 34/20 36/4 36/5 36/23 37/4 37/12 38/8 38/10 38/13 38/23 39/1 39/4 39/5 40/11 40/12 42/12 area [38] 11/19 12/14 12/16 12/17 12/18 12/21 13/5 13/6 13/10 13/13 13/17 13/20 14/4 14/7 14/13 14/17 15/2 15/5 15/14 17/7 17/8 17/9 17/14 17/15 17/18 19/3 20/5 22/12 23/9 23/11 24/21 25/17 30/16 30/18 35/12 38/15 38/16 44/8 areas [8] 14/5 14/20 18/4 18/6 18/10 25/11 38/1 43/4 aren't [1] 43/20 around [4] 4/3 29/6 37/21 44/18 Article [2] 4/14 8/23	Article 8 [1] 4/14 as [22] 2/17 2/17 3/18 5/21 6/18 10/1 11/4 17/13 19/23 19/23 22/14 22/17 22/17 22/18 26/3 33/12 34/4 34/10 36/17 39/12 44/13 44/14 ask [2] 5/7 21/20 asset [1] 32/18 associated [1] 24/13 at [52] athlete [1] 10/9 attending [1] 2/3 attention [1] 31/12 Attn [1] 9/12 attract [2] 10/19 35/1 attractions [1] 10/17 Authority [5] 1/6 2/6 3/2 7/2 9/11 available [4] 7/10 7/16 21/8 26/17 awesome [2] 30/13 40/11 awful [1] 42/9
2	B	
20 [1] 35/22 200 feet [1] 38/14 2002 [2] 7/7 11/1 2017 [3] 7/6 7/20 10/23 2018 [7] 1/11 6/14 6/17 7/4 9/4 9/8 46/11 24 [3] 1/11 7/4 9/3 25 [1] 24/13 2634 Main [1] 9/11	back [5] 16/23 24/11 29/2 33/16 39/2 backcountry [7] 22/10 29/12 40/19 40/19 40/20 41/13 44/10 background [1] 40/5 base [8] 1/13 7/5 7/23 12/14 15/2 15/5 15/14 38/14 based [2] 8/13 24/20 basic [3] 39/16 42/11 42/12 bat [1] 36/20 Bauer [1] 41/1 Bayse [1] 3/14 be [47] because [9] 27/23 31/5 32/10 33/21 34/19 39/12 42/22 43/16 44/1 become [2] 13/3 13/4 becoming [1] 40/18 been [20] 2/22 3/1 3/2 3/3 3/7 4/15 15/7 20/4 22/5 27/14 29/8 30/8 32/6 36/19 37/17 39/17 40/2 41/3 42/20 43/7 before [3] 4/8 9/5 28/22 begin [1] 26/9 beginner [6] 12/16 13/10 13/22 14/8 14/15 14/16 beginning [1] 33/3 behalf [1] 35/15 being [1] 4/12 belief [1] 46/8 believe [2] 5/20 13/17 benefit [1] 28/10 best [2] 41/9 46/7 better [6] 13/18 13/19 14/4 14/7 19/6 42/17 between [2] 20/22 31/23 beyond [2] 35/10 35/12 big [2] 29/17 34/23 bike [2] 8/11 32/8 bikes [1] 19/23 biking [4] 12/4 30/14 32/4 44/11 bit [6] 4/3 16/18 18/17 25/15 38/8 44/7 blast [1] 37/3 blue [1] 18/10 board [1] 27/11 Bob [1] 36/9 Bone [6] 3/14 4/8 6/4 6/21 9/18 22/7 Bone's [1] 5/23 both [9] 2/20 5/17 6/7 10/1 23/2 23/16 23/23 26/2 40/15 bottom [2] 14/13 15/10 Bowl [15] 2/14 12/1 13/8 17/17 18/13 20/22 31/18 33/13 37/9 38/3 39/14 39/14 39/15 40/8 40/17	
3		
30,000 [3] 38/5 38/10 39/8 300-some [1] 27/15 35 [1] 28/18		
4		
40 [2] 1/19 22/3 40,000 [1] 37/18 41866.html [1] 7/18		
5		
518-587-8100 [1] 1/20 54 [1] 36/10		
7		
7:00 [2] 1/12 7/4 7:53 [1] 45/7		
8		
80 percent [1] 27/19 8100 [1] 1/20 814 [1] 2/18 8th [1] 6/17		
9		
9th [2] 5/15 45/2		
A		
ability [1] 46/7 able [4] 16/21 22/16 23/12 23/23 about [21] 15/4 19/13 22/3 27/5 27/21 30/1 30/17 31/23 34/12 35/21 35/22 36/21 37/7 37/10 40/9 41/7 42/15 42/18 43/3 43/11 43/23 accept [1] 3/20 accepted [1] 9/3 access [6] 12/12 15/1 19/8 20/20 44/10 44/10 accessibility [1] 8/19 accessible [2] 28/14 40/21 accordance [1] 4/12 accounting [2] 43/2 43/13 accurate [2] 5/6 46/7 acreage [2] 42/18 43/5 across [1] 13/16 act [2] 4/14 14/1 action [1] 11/2 actions [3] 7/19 15/11 20/8 activities [6] 28/13 32/2 37/11 37/12 37/22 42/4 add [3] 8/3 8/18 14/22 added [2] 25/15 41/20 adding [1] 28/7 addition [1] 5/12		

E	goals [2] 10/5 28/8 goes [4] 15/2 31/18 31/19 35/10 going [35] 2/15 3/12 8/16 9/23 16/1 16/4 20/9 20/17 21/16 23/20 27/2 27/3 29/8 29/11 29/22 31/21 32/10 34/7 34/8 37/1 37/3 37/4 37/12 37/19 38/4 38/9 38/10 38/20 39/1 39/1 39/4 39/5 41/3 43/16 45/1 golf [2] 12/3 19/12 good [3] 42/10 43/2 43/12 Gore [33] 1/13 2/7 2/23 6/5 7/4 7/7 7/11 7/19 8/12 8/18 10/6 11/19 15/5 17/6 20/22 22/3 22/4 22/16 23/3 23/9 24/2 24/5 24/10 30/11 30/13 31/2 31/3 32/1 36/11 40/3 40/15 42/19 42/20 Gore's [1] 3/13 Gore.2017 [1] 9/15 got [2] 39/19 40/4 gov [1] 7/18 gov/lands/41866.html [1] 7/18 granted [2] 17/21 19/16 gravel [1] 16/20 great [6] 22/6 22/7 24/1 32/17 32/19 35/13 greater [2] 37/23 38/1 green [3] 8/2 14/5 18/6 grip [1] 19/20 groomer [1] 8/8 grooming [4] 11/11 16/9 16/13 16/16 ground [1] 35/18 group [4] 1/19 3/5 3/9 24/14 grows [1] 32/23 guess [2] 27/5 34/9 guests [1] 10/8 guys [1] 29/1	high [3] 18/20 19/3 35/3 high-class [1] 35/3 hiking [12] 8/13 12/3 22/10 25/8 25/10 25/11 25/20 25/22 30/14 32/4 44/6 44/11 Hill [1] 24/13 Himmoff [1] 32/16 hired [1] 36/17 his [1] 6/22 historically [1] 33/17 hold [1] 7/2 home [1] 22/4 honest [1] 29/12 hope [4] 28/23 38/20 38/21 44/18 host [2] 25/3 28/10 hosting [1] 10/9 how [7] 23/17 27/3 34/14 34/22 36/23 37/4 38/8 However [1] 37/17 http:www [1] 7/17 http:www/dec/ny [1] 7/17 Hudson [5] 17/22 19/14 24/17 38/17 40/14 huge [3] 25/5 30/4 40/18 hundred [1] 28/23 Hut [1] 26/5 Huts [1] 29/8
F	Face [1] 42/19 facilities [4] 8/17 10/11 10/19 42/12 facility [2] 11/15 12/6 fact [1] 38/1 fall [2] 22/22 38/7 familiar [3] 12/18 13/12 13/22 family [1] 30/21 fantastic [2] 24/3 37/12 fault [1] 23/15 feasible [1] 28/3 February [4] 5/15 9/8 45/2 46/11 federal [1] 25/2 feel [2] 16/3 44/8 feels [1] 22/17 feet [1] 38/14 few [2] 4/7 25/8 figure [1] 39/20 Final [2] 4/21 4/22 first [5] 5/8 13/9 21/21 31/11 32/17 five [1] 42/5 five-year [1] 42/5 fixed [1] 19/20 flow [2] 15/20 16/4 folks [1] 44/3 following [1] 7/21 food [1] 34/17 foregoing [1] 46/5 forest [3] 11/21 17/12 42/2 Forests [1] 7/13 former [1] 2/7 forth [1] 24/18 fortunate [1] 25/4 forward [1] 45/4 found [1] 15/20 four [1] 39/9 frame [1] 35/21 Franke [3] 1/18 3/8 4/5 friends [2] 3/4 29/14 front [1] 5/20 fueling [2] 8/8 11/12	I I'd [2] 6/19 29/16 I'll [2] 3/8 37/6 I'm [15] 2/4 2/5 9/23 22/2 24/8 26/22 27/9 27/9 28/2 28/17 29/23 30/7 31/10 35/14 40/6 I've [12] 21/2 22/3 22/12 22/13 27/13 28/18 29/8 30/8 31/12 36/18 40/2 40/4 ice [1] 36/15 icy [1] 36/14 idea [6] 12/7 29/4 30/10 30/11 35/9 36/22 identified [1] 16/10 if [27] 3/22 4/3 12/18 13/12 13/21 17/20 19/15 20/4 21/9 21/16 23/20 24/23 25/18 28/3 28/7 29/4 30/1 30/15 32/11 32/22 33/19 33/22 34/14 35/6 36/2 43/19 43/21 impact [4] 4/17 4/22 7/9 23/18 important [5] 23/22 26/3 42/1 42/13 43/15 impressions [1] 36/3 improve [6] 10/13 10/18 20/18 20/21 28/9 28/11 improvement [2] 8/16 24/16 improvements [12] 10/13 11/7 12/8 12/15 13/11 17/17 18/13 20/11 20/11 20/12 20/14 20/16 improving [1] 35/9 in [64] include [6] 2/11 7/21 11/5 12/2 18/13 28/8 includes [1] 11/17 including [1] 10/20 increase [4] 8/19 10/14 10/16 33/22 indeed [1] 25/4 independent [1] 11/8 independently [1] 43/8 industry [1] 37/21 information [2] 5/22 21/5 infrastructure [3] 10/11 20/15 38/9 Initiative [1] 26/6 inner [1] 15/4 intensive [4] 11/19 13/5 17/7 17/14 interest [1] 9/17
G	gain [1] 2/19 garage [6] 8/8 11/12 16/9 16/13 16/21 16/22 Garnet [1] 24/12 general [2] 3/13 15/19 generation [1] 10/21 Generic [1] 7/8 get [20] 4/7 5/6 5/10 6/2 12/9 14/2 15/12 15/21 15/23 16/20 21/6 21/18 23/12 32/22 33/20 34/12 34/18 35/13 37/1 37/5 gets [1] 22/21 getting [7] 11/4 14/1 33/10 33/12 42/23 43/9 45/4 give [10] 3/14 3/16 12/7 13/18 14/14 14/23 19/6 19/8 36/3 36/9 gives [5] 4/8 13/20 18/15 21/5 21/8 glimmer [1] 30/18 go [8] 11/4 13/16 14/12 21/12 21/22 32/9 39/5 41/9	

I	Let [1] 28/6 Let's [2] 18/16 21/22 lie [1] 23/23 life [1] 39/16 lift [22] 8/2 11/6 12/15 12/17 12/17 13/13 13/14 13/16 14/2 14/9 14/11 14/19 18/2 18/3 19/8 19/18 19/19 20/10 28/6 38/17 38/17 44/10 light [1] 18/10 lighter [1] 18/6 lights [1] 19/5 like [26] 3/6 6/19 16/10 17/13 17/17 17/20 22/9 22/16 23/5 23/19 24/4 24/11 24/22 25/23 27/11 27/15 27/19 29/4 29/22 30/2 33/4 33/7 36/21 42/17 43/1 43/12 limits [2] 43/1 43/10 line [1] 39/3 lines [1] 30/22 list [1] 5/5 listed [1] 10/6 little [12] 4/3 8/12 18/17 25/15 30/11 30/13 31/2 31/3 35/2 36/9 38/8 44/7 live [3] 29/13 29/15 30/7 lived [1] 28/18 load [2] 19/22 20/1 loading [1] 38/16 local [1] 35/9 locals [1] 34/20 location [2] 12/4 16/15 locations [1] 6/4 lodge [6] 1/13 7/5 7/23 8/4 8/14 20/11 long [2] 1/19 30/8 longer [1] 36/5 look [2] 41/21 45/4 looked [3] 27/15 29/22 41/11 looking [10] 11/22 12/8 13/11 13/15 15/11 17/19 19/2 19/4 19/10 43/7 looks [1] 30/2 loop [1] 8/11 lose [3] 29/7 29/16 40/20 losing [1] 29/23 lot [21] 16/2 22/15 22/22 27/14 28/1 29/9 29/14 29/18 32/20 33/15 34/11 36/15 40/4 40/5 40/6 41/6 42/1 42/9 42/11 42/14 44/17 lots [1] 12/13 love [3] 22/4 22/5 35/16 lower [2] 8/4 14/13	may [3] 9/5 28/7 44/6 maybe [6] 23/14 29/5 29/23 30/20 33/12 33/19 me [6] 24/9 28/6 29/22 30/3 33/7 46/5 mean [1] 34/3 meet [1] 44/18 meetings [1] 29/9 members [1] 27/10 mentioned [4] 10/2 13/1 19/13 21/6 menu [1] 37/14 methodology [1] 43/3 middle [1] 15/6 Mike [5] 2/4 4/6 9/20 10/2 22/7 Minder [1] 39/5 mindful [1] 43/11 mini [2] 12/3 19/12 miserable [1] 36/13 misguided [2] 25/18 26/18 mistake [2] 29/17 30/4 modernization [3] 8/17 20/13 20/15 modernize [1] 10/10 modification [2] 11/10 11/13 moments [1] 13/1 money [1] 31/16 months [1] 39/9 more [10] 10/7 10/20 11/4 16/5 21/5 31/3 31/13 35/2 36/4 45/4 Morris [1] 22/2 most [3] 5/1 22/2 24/9 mountain [37] 1/13 6/5 7/5 7/7 7/11 7/20 8/18 11/16 11/19 11/20 12/4 12/21 17/7 17/12 19/23 22/4 31/4 32/1 32/19 32/22 33/2 33/8 33/10 33/13 33/17 33/18 33/23 34/3 34/18 34/23 36/12 36/16 39/4 40/7 40/17 42/11 44/11 move [2] 29/1 29/6 moving [1] 16/14 Moxham [1] 19/4 Mr [1] 37/8 much [9] 15/1 16/5 16/5 19/6 20/2 28/16 29/4 31/5 44/13 my [12] 22/4 23/15 24/1 24/22 27/21 31/1 31/13 32/13 35/12 35/15 36/8 46/7
J	January [5] 1/11 6/14 6/17 7/3 9/3 January 10th [1] 6/14 January 8th [1] 6/17 Jill [1] 27/9 job [4] 22/6 22/7 24/2 24/3 Joe [1] 39/5 Johnsburg [10] 2/13 7/14 13/7 27/2 28/11 31/15 32/3 35/11 39/15 39/18 Joseph [2] 46/3 46/10 Julie [1] 30/7 jump [1] 18/16 June [1] 38/5 just [24] 4/6 6/19 12/6 14/21 15/9 17/18 18/16 21/15 23/1 24/5 27/20 27/20 28/1 30/22 31/4 31/6 34/4 35/5 35/20 36/20 37/19 41/4 44/20 44/22	
K	Katy [1] 40/1 keep [3] 11/3 16/4 19/17 keeping [1] 22/8 Kelly [4] 5/10 31/10 46/3 46/10 Kevin [8] 1/18 3/8 3/13 4/5 9/19 10/2 21/6 21/12 key [2] 33/8 33/12 kfranke [1] 1/21 kicking [1] 44/18 kids [1] 35/13 kind [6] 3/9 14/2 15/14 30/18 34/6 34/7 know [13] 13/21 22/2 24/9 24/21 25/15 26/19 27/13 32/11 32/19 32/21 34/22 35/8 44/1	
L	LA [3] 1/19 3/5 3/9 LA Group [2] 3/5 3/9 Lake [4] 6/9 6/10 7/13 9/11 land [11] 8/23 11/18 12/23 13/2 17/6 17/19 19/15 27/23 40/9 41/7 41/16 lands [4] 2/12 7/13 7/18 13/7 lane [5] 11/9 12/11 15/17 15/18 16/3 lanes [1] 8/5 larger [1] 33/18 lately [1] 24/14 Law [1] 4/15 least [1] 24/23 leaves [1] 31/18 leg [1] 38/16 legal [2] 6/15 41/15	N name [3] 5/9 21/17 36/8 National [2] 25/2 26/12 necessarily [1] 3/21 necessary [1] 22/17 need [6] 8/15 31/3 34/4 35/2 41/10 43/11 needed [1] 15/1 needs [2] 34/18 44/9 Nessle [3] 31/11 36/9 37/8 new [21] 1/13 1/20 7/1 7/19 7/22 8/3 11/5 11/11 12/11 12/19 14/11 14/23 15/10 16/9 23/18 23/20 24/4 31/16 33/14 38/17 46/4 news [1] 33/6 next [3] 10/21 18/14 36/17 nice [1] 14/14 nicer [1] 20/3 Nightengale [1] 40/2 nighttime [1] 19/6 nine [1] 35/16 nine-year-old [1] 35/16 no [2] 36/14 37/10 North [13] 1/13 2/13 7/15 12/1 20/6 20/23 23/12 23/13 24/20 25/7 26/11 30/7 31/19 Northwoods [2] 8/4 8/14
	M machines [1] 16/19 mail [4] 5/16 5/17 5/18 9/9 main [6] 9/11 15/5 25/12 33/16 40/7 40/16 maintain [1] 22/14 maintenance [2] 8/7 16/18 major [1] 41/10 make [14] 2/16 3/17 10/4 10/7 12/8 14/7 16/5 17/18 20/2 30/17 34/4 34/15 40/7 43/23 making [2] 28/13 32/10 manage [1] 38/4 management [8] 2/10 2/17 4/16 7/7 36/1 42/2 42/7 43/14 manager [2] 2/7 3/14 many [2] 27/17 38/1 map [6] 12/5 23/7 23/10 23/16 23/17 44/7 maps [2] 29/19 29/20 marketplace [1] 10/15 master [4] 8/23 10/5 10/22 28/8 matter [1] 6/19	

N	30/9 35/11 36/15 37/1 38/3 39/8 overlay [1] 29/20 overview [4] 11/2 11/3 12/6 18/15	35/23 38/19 problem [3] 15/22 38/22 39/10 problems [2] 25/1 38/9 procedural [2] 4/7 6/18 process [3] 2/15 3/11 3/18 professional [1] 36/18 projects [3] 2/20 2/23 35/23 property [3] 26/20 27/1 27/3 proposal [1] 30/2 proposed [9] 7/19 11/2 12/11 15/6 15/17 18/6 23/8 23/17 26/21 proposing [7] 14/6 14/11 14/22 17/22 18/11 18/19 18/22 protect [5] 22/18 23/3 23/4 24/6 41/2 provide [2] 3/23 39/17 public [28] 1/5 3/10 3/19 4/11 5/13 6/11 6/15 6/20 6/23 7/3 7/5 8/19 9/2 9/4 9/4 9/6 9/7 9/8 20/19 21/10 21/13 21/23 22/19 32/5 44/21 44/23 45/6 46/4 published [2] 6/12 6/16 pump [1] 33/4 purple [1] 18/19 purpose [1] 8/15 pursuant [1] 42/21 pursuits [1] 8/21 pushing [1] 37/18 put [9] 14/11 16/11 16/16 18/19 19/10 23/20 29/3 29/5 41/11 puts [1] 19/3 putting [1] 27/12
O	p p.m [2] 1/12 45/7 pages [1] 27/15 paid [1] 31/12 park [11] 2/18 8/22 25/3 31/18 37/9 37/16 38/3 39/1 39/14 39/14 39/15 parking [3] 12/13 16/2 20/12 part [12] 3/18 6/18 13/4 15/6 17/11 26/14 29/23 33/16 33/18 37/15 38/22 41/19 participants [1] 37/18 parts [1] 31/20 past [2] 22/6 24/3 patrol [1] 24/12 patroller [1] 36/18 pavilion [1] 39/6 peaceful [1] 39/20 people [15] 3/1 3/7 16/1 19/8 19/22 21/16 22/15 24/2 24/9 28/1 34/13 38/10 38/23 39/8 44/22 percent [2] 27/19 28/23 period [6] 4/20 5/14 9/7 38/7 39/8 44/23 permanent [1] 19/12 permits [1] 2/20 personally [1] 43/22 perspective [1] 36/10 perused [1] 27/16 Peter [1] 41/1 picnic [1] 34/22 piece [2] 13/2 17/19 place [3] 8/7 39/17 46/6 Placid [4] 6/9 6/10 7/14 9/12 plan [17] 2/10 2/17 4/17 7/8 8/23 10/5 10/22 11/1 27/13 27/19 28/8 32/18 34/15 35/19 36/1 42/10 43/14 Plan/Draft [1] 7/8 planned [1] 40/12 planning [4] 9/13 19/19 20/7 21/4 plans [8] 2/9 2/11 3/15 32/12 35/22 42/2 42/5 42/8 please [1] 21/17 plenty [1] 10/3 PM [1] 7/4 Poma [2] 12/17 14/9 Pond [17] 22/21 23/5 23/9 23/11 25/13 25/17 25/19 26/8 26/15 27/22 29/7 30/16 41/8 41/22 42/16 44/1 44/5 Ponds [3] 11/21 17/8 24/15 portions [1] 30/15 positive [1] 16/6 possible [1] 44/14 Post [1] 6/17 Post-Star [1] 6/17 potential [2] 10/15 12/22 powerful [1] 2/8 Pratt [1] 2/5 preface [1] 24/22 premiere [2] 10/9 26/8 presentation [9] 2/4 2/8 3/15 4/2 4/9 6/1 6/22 9/23 21/1 preserve [1] 42/2 president [1] 2/5 pretty [1] 44/8 previous [3] 16/11 19/13 20/8 previously [4] 14/20 15/8 18/5 18/8 priorities [1] 36/6 priority [1] 36/5 probably [5] 27/18 28/20 31/21	Q quad [1] 8/3 quality [2] 4/13 10/18 question [5] 3/21 26/19 31/13 31/14 36/21 questions [3] 4/4 21/21 27/6 quick [1] 30/6 quite [3] 16/18 23/1 26/2
		R Rabbit [17] 22/21 23/4 23/9 23/11 25/13 25/17 25/19 26/8 26/15 27/22 29/7 30/16 41/7 41/21 42/15 44/1 44/5 race [2] 11/15 34/10 racers [1] 34/8 Raymond [3] 25/14 26/6 26/14 read [1] 6/19 real [1] 43/2 realign [1] 17/22 realigning [1] 19/14 realignment [1] 28/5 realize [1] 33/3 really [21] 14/14 25/11 25/21 28/5 28/23 29/3 29/10 30/12 31/11 31/13 33/6 33/14 33/21 34/21 35/1 35/12 35/14 35/20 40/11 43/12 43/14 reasons [1] 3/10 receive [4] 4/18 4/20 5/13 7/5 received [1] 31/16 reclassification [6] 11/18 12/23 17/6 17/21 19/16 27/22 reclassified [3] 17/10 17/13 17/20 recognize [1] 3/8 reconfigure [1] 8/7 record [6] 5/7 5/11 6/20 21/18 44/20 46/5 recreate [1] 39/19 recreation [5] 11/23 20/19 24/20 30/11 37/14 recreational [7] 8/20 10/8 10/19

R		36/2 43/6
recreational... [4] 28/13 30/19 35/10 37/14	served [1] 8/2	southeastern [1] 37/15
reference [1] 14/19	Service [1] 25/3	southern [1] 37/15
Regional [4] 1/6 2/6 7/1 9/10	session [1] 3/22	speak [2] 5/3 21/17
regular [2] 5/16 25/23	seven [2] 24/10 35/15	speakers [1] 5/4
related [1] 34/16	seven-year-old [1] 35/15	speaking [1] 35/14
remain [1] 5/14	sewage [2] 38/19 39/22	speaks [1] 3/13
remember [1] 39/13	sewer [1] 38/12	spectacular [1] 20/6
remind [2] 21/16 44/22	shaded [4] 14/5 14/19 15/9 18/4	spending [1] 35/16
replace [3] 13/15 16/12 18/3	sheet [1] 5/2	spent [1] 29/18
Reporter [1] 46/3	sheets [1] 5/19	spring [2] 22/22 26/10
request [2] 11/17 17/5	Shorthand [1] 46/3	Springs [1] 1/20
requesting [1] 17/9	should [1] 23/2	staff [1] 3/6
require [1] 38/11	show [3] 18/5 18/6 18/10	staging [1] 14/4
reservations [1] 27/21	showing [2] 23/16 23/17	Star [1] 6/17
reservoir [5] 8/10 11/8 12/22 18/9 18/11	shown [1] 21/2	start [2] 5/8 21/13
residents [2] 28/12 39/18	shows [5] 12/5 15/16 17/5 17/16 19/15	starting [1] 31/21
resorts [1] 37/23	shuttle [7] 8/5 11/9 12/11 15/17 15/18 15/22 16/3	state [8] 4/13 7/1 8/23 21/17 31/16 32/21 35/5 46/4
resounding [1] 44/2	Siamese [3] 11/21 17/8 24/15	statement [4] 4/18 4/23 7/9 31/14
respect [1] 25/6	side [3] 33/9 33/20 34/13	station [2] 8/8 11/12
restate [1] 5/9	sides [1] 26/2	stay [1] 45/1
revenue [1] 32/20	sign [1] 5/2	stenographer [3] 5/5 5/10 21/18
review [2] 4/13 7/11	sign-up [1] 5/2	still [4] 19/18 34/12 36/16 39/11
Rick [3] 22/2 24/14 27/20	signs [1] 26/13	strategy [1] 34/17
Ridge [8] 7/22 12/20 14/17 14/18 33/11 33/11 33/15 36/23	simple [1] 3/23	Street [1] 9/11
right [12] 3/5 4/5 12/5 13/14 14/23 15/16 16/22 19/1 23/16 26/7 30/12 36/20	simultaneously [3] 2/14 2/21 8/21	strong [1] 20/21
River [2] 30/8 31/19	since [2] 36/19 39/16	strongly [1] 44/8
road [3] 12/12 16/1 16/20	single [1] 8/11	stuff [4] 29/11 33/5 40/5 44/14
Robertson [1] 28/18	single-track [1] 8/11	submitted [4] 5/16 5/19 9/5 9/9
rock [1] 37/1	ski [34] 2/13 7/22 12/1 13/5 13/8 13/13 17/14 17/16 18/5 18/7 18/13 19/8 20/22 22/10 22/21 24/12 25/10 31/18 33/13 36/12 36/18 37/9 37/22 38/3 39/13 39/14 39/15 40/8 40/17 40/19 40/22 40/23 44/5 44/10	successful [1] 44/12
room [1] 36/11	skied [4] 22/3 28/19 30/9 40/10	sudden [1] 32/8
ropes [3] 12/2 18/20 19/9	skier [2] 31/1 33/22	suggest [1] 28/7
round [1] 10/17	skiers [3] 13/22 14/8 14/16	summer [15] 10/17 11/23 18/12 19/11 19/22 20/4 22/22 30/10 30/19 32/2 37/10 37/11 37/20 37/20 37/22
route [2] 33/14 36/22	skiing [6] 12/18 19/7 25/20 36/21 37/21 41/14	Sunday [1] 35/17
S	slide [7] 13/9 15/13 17/5 17/16 18/15 19/13 21/4	Sunway [8] 8/1 8/4 8/9 12/17 13/13 13/16 13/16 14/13
safety [1] 8/20	slides [3] 10/1 12/10 21/3	support [1] 42/14
Sagamore [1] 37/2	slopes [1] 38/15	supported [1] 3/4
said [3] 25/7 27/20 27/20	smoother [1] 16/5	supposed [1] 26/9
same [4] 23/17 24/14 28/19 46/7	snow [6] 16/17 16/22 16/23 31/7 35/18 36/14	supposing [1] 38/4
Saratoga [1] 1/20	snowmaking [4] 8/10 11/7 12/22 20/13	sure [3] 28/3 41/8 41/19
Saturday [1] 35/17	snowshoe [1] 22/11	swap [2] 40/9 41/7
saw [2] 5/1 33/5	snowshoeing [1] 25/20	system [2] 22/19 38/13
say [3] 24/11 31/8 38/6	so [38] 2/14 2/19 2/22 3/5 5/7 5/10 10/5 10/21 14/21 16/2 16/13 21/1 21/11 21/18 24/1 24/18 26/2 27/17 28/3 29/6 30/4 30/14 31/8 31/13 34/10 34/23 35/19 38/18 38/21 39/11 40/4 40/23 41/2 41/20 43/10 43/11 43/19 44/14	T
saying [1] 24/23	Society [1] 24/16	table [1] 5/20
Scenic [1] 26/12	solutions [1] 33/20	take [4] 15/11 30/15 39/6 39/21
Schaeffer [1] 25/12	solved [1] 38/10	taken [1] 46/5
schedule [1] 42/4	some [18] 12/9 13/11 21/5 21/9 22/5 22/13 23/2 25/1 26/20 27/15 30/20 33/3 34/7 39/11 39/20 41/10 41/15 41/20	takes [2] 27/14 30/18
scheduling [1] 41/23	somebody [1] 40/22	talk [1] 43/22
Schenectady [1] 32/6	somehow [1] 35/7	talking [1] 15/4
school [1] 38/6	someone [1] 36/2	taught [1] 28/19
Scott [1] 28/17	something [1] 43/10	teases [1] 26/16
screen [1] 5/23	sometime [1] 31/22	tell [1] 37/6
season [1] 25/21	sometimes [2] 13/23 37/23	term [1] 36/6
section [3] 2/18 15/9 15/10	sorry [1] 28/21	terminate [1] 17/23
Section 814 [1] 2/18	sort [7] 33/23 34/1 34/3 34/15 35/9	terminates [2] 13/14 18/1
see [17] 12/10 14/21 16/8 18/18 23/6 23/23 24/4 26/1 28/6 29/20 39/12 40/14 40/18 42/17 43/2 43/12 44/7		terrain [2] 31/3 31/7
seemed [1] 44/2		terribly [1] 36/13
seems [3] 23/19 33/7 34/6		terrific [1] 35/19
seen [4] 23/14 23/16 28/4 31/4		than [3] 27/6 31/14 38/1
send [1] 21/10		thank [10] 3/6 9/19 9/20 24/6 27/8 27/12 28/15 36/7 39/23 43/18
sensitive [1] 27/23		thanks [9] 2/3 4/6 9/16 9/21 27/7 31/9 41/2 44/16 45/3
separate [1] 15/19		that [121]
separates [1] 37/2		that's [29] 4/15 11/9 11/15 12/12 15/8 15/14 17/3 18/14 22/5 23/5 24/1 27/5 28/15 29/13 29/14 30/2 30/4 31/8 32/5 32/11 34/23 36/7 37/19 38/21 39/9 40/23 41/8 43/10 43/13
September [1] 38/6		
SEQRA [5] 1/5 2/15 3/11 3/18 6/23		

T		
their [7] 14/1 26/8 27/12 32/1 32/3 32/4 36/3 thelagroup.com [1] 1/21 them [5] 13/20 14/3 22/14 23/21 42/4 then [9] 6/21 12/9 12/13 13/6 17/1 19/17 31/19 33/11 38/7 there [23] 5/2 5/17 6/3 6/14 14/12 14/21 18/16 18/20 19/1 19/5 19/15 21/12 23/2 29/20 33/1 36/14 36/15 37/4 38/13 40/11 41/16 43/20 44/4 there's [22] 3/22 6/5 6/6 6/9 14/10 25/11 27/15 29/10 32/18 32/20 34/1 34/11 35/18 35/22 37/10 39/11 39/19 41/10 41/15 41/20 42/9 42/14 these [10] 2/23 10/1 12/8 14/19 22/13 29/10 30/13 34/16 35/13 35/22 they [13] 2/11 13/23 14/2 23/23 29/15 32/9 32/10 39/1 39/2 39/4 39/5 40/6 40/11 They'll [1] 16/21 they're [3] 14/2 20/1 40/16 thing [2] 37/9 43/6 things [4] 29/10 36/4 36/5 42/10 think [32] 23/1 25/4 25/18 26/13 26/18 28/2 29/17 30/3 30/12 32/17 33/1 33/2 33/15 33/21 34/1 34/17 34/19 34/20 35/1 35/8 35/19 36/7 39/19 41/9 41/15 41/20 41/23 42/9 42/23 43/8 43/10 43/15 this [62] those [12] 5/2 5/18 6/8 10/23 16/19 18/7 20/2 25/16 34/9 38/23 40/10 40/20 thought [2] 30/23 33/3 three [4] 25/12 38/13 39/9 41/4 through [8] 2/15 10/1 12/13 16/2 21/22 31/19 37/4 41/4 throughout [1] 4/20 tie [1] 18/7 time [10] 13/23 21/11 21/13 27/14 29/18 30/9 31/12 34/8 35/21 41/17 today [2] 4/16 27/16 together [2] 14/1 27/13 told [2] 21/3 27/14 tonight [7] 2/9 3/11 4/19 5/6 5/13 9/17 44/22 tonight's [3] 2/4 4/11 9/22 too [4] 29/4 29/15 41/6 41/16 top [7] 8/12 14/18 15/9 17/18 20/5 36/23 40/13 tough [1] 13/23 tourists [1] 35/2 towards [1] 15/3 town [14] 2/12 6/6 7/14 8/12 13/7 27/1 28/11 31/15 31/20 32/3 38/13 39/15 39/18 40/3 track [1] 8/11 tract [2] 41/8 41/22 tractors [1] 16/16 tracts [1] 42/3 traditional [1] 2/11 traffic [4] 15/20 15/23 16/4 19/22 trail [40] 7/22 8/9 8/11 8/12 11/5 11/6 12/15 12/19 12/20 14/23 15/7 15/12 19/4 20/9 20/10 22/18 22/21 22/23 23/4 24/16 25/13 25/13 25/14 25/19 25/22 25/23 25/23 26/7 26/8 26/12 26/14 26/15 29/1 29/3 29/6 29/16 29/23 38/17 43/17 44/6 trails [36] 8/1 8/2 14/6 14/20 18/5 18/7 22/10 22/11 22/11 22/13 23/10	23/19 23/20 23/22 24/17 24/20 25/10 25/12 25/16 26/21 29/21 30/14 30/14 31/17 32/4 32/4 32/9 34/5 40/10 40/12 40/21 42/12 43/5 43/6 43/17 44/4 trails-based [1] 24/20 training [1] 10/9 transcript [1] 46/7 Trecks [1] 24/18 trees [1] 26/1 tremendous [1] 32/18 Trial [1] 13/17 tried [1] 29/19 trip [1] 26/9 triple [1] 8/3 true [1] 46/6 trying [3] 2/16 10/7 44/15 tubing [1] 19/11 tunnel [2] 34/7 37/3 turn [1] 6/21 twelve [1] 27/10 Twister [2] 8/1 34/9 typographical [1] 29/19	wants [3] 4/4 40/22 43/21 Warrensburg [2] 6/7 7/12 was [16] 6/12 6/14 6/16 16/12 19/16 23/11 33/6 36/1 36/10 36/12 36/14 36/15 36/17 41/16 42/22 45/6 wasn't [1] 41/18 way [8] 4/8 5/1 14/12 23/2 28/1 39/20 41/9 44/12 we [53] we'd [1] 5/7 we'll [12] 3/15 4/2 4/19 5/4 6/21 11/3 12/9 20/20 34/21 41/11 43/20 44/17 we're [32] 2/14 3/12 3/23 10/6 11/22 12/7 13/10 13/14 14/6 14/11 15/11 17/9 17/18 17/22 18/19 18/22 19/1 19/4 19/10 20/7 20/9 20/17 21/3 21/11 24/19 25/4 29/22 32/9 41/8 41/19 42/15 44/14 we've [4] 2/22 3/3 41/3 43/7 Wednesday [1] 7/3 Wegg [2] 46/3 46/10 well [8] 2/17 5/21 15/15 19/23 22/17 26/4 35/10 38/11 wellness [1] 28/12 wells [1] 38/14 went [1] 29/21 were [1] 17/21 West [1] 30/7 wet [1] 36/14 what [19] 3/12 10/6 10/23 14/22 15/17 16/15 21/3 23/5 23/7 23/14 24/6 29/13 29/14 29/18 30/2 31/8 31/22 39/1 40/15 what's [2] 14/21 40/18 whatever [1] 31/6 when [8] 5/8 14/1 15/2 15/3 16/18 36/11 38/5 39/2 whenever [1] 35/17 where [21] 5/18 6/2 12/7 12/10 13/10 14/5 14/10 15/8 15/14 15/15 16/9 16/10 17/2 17/3 18/10 21/6 23/23 26/1 29/2 29/21 38/23 Whereupon [1] 45/6 whether [1] 37/19 which [13] 11/12 12/16 13/6 17/14 19/3 22/19 23/11 24/15 26/7 26/9 34/9 36/4 36/5 while [5] 8/21 23/1 30/21 40/3 43/21 White [1] 42/19 who [5] 3/9 5/3 6/8 35/16 40/22 whole [2] 34/11 38/18 wide [1] 25/11 widen [3] 7/23 8/1 14/6 widening [2] 11/6 20/10 width [1] 43/5 Wild [2] 11/20 17/12 wilderness [3] 11/22 13/3 17/8 will [18] 3/9 3/14 4/21 5/14 5/22 7/2 8/18 9/3 13/18 14/3 14/23 16/15 16/17 19/6 19/7 25/19 32/22 43/23 windy [1] 36/14 winter [5] 18/12 19/11 22/23 30/17 37/20 wintertime [1] 38/2 wish [1] 5/3 within [1] 38/14 wobbly [1] 14/3 wonder [4] 33/19 34/14 35/6 35/21 wondering [2] 26/23 36/2 woods [1] 26/1 word [1] 37/21 work [8] 22/5 24/17 27/4 31/21 38/20 38/21 39/11 44/9
	U	
	UMP [14] 4/10 4/22 6/2 7/9 7/10 7/15 7/20 8/15 9/15 11/11 11/14 16/11 21/7 23/15 UMP/DGEIS [3] 7/9 7/10 7/15 UMPs [1] 20/8 under [2] 34/7 35/4 understand [1] 28/5 unit [8] 2/10 2/16 4/16 7/7 36/1 42/1 42/7 43/14 unless [1] 34/6 unloading [1] 13/19 until [4] 5/14 9/6 38/6 45/1 up [18] 5/2 5/4 5/22 16/1 17/23 18/2 18/9 19/2 19/3 19/5 22/8 26/13 31/18 32/8 36/12 38/16 40/22 44/18 updating [2] 2/9 40/3 upgrades [2] 42/11 43/17 Upper [1] 24/16 urgent [1] 36/4 us [10] 3/7 3/20 10/23 13/18 15/13 15/16 16/16 17/16 19/17 40/16 use [7] 11/19 13/5 17/7 17/14 22/20 22/22 23/13 used [1] 42/20 user [1] 8/19 using [4] 26/6 29/19 33/11 43/3 utilize [1] 25/15	
	V	
	vaguely [1] 36/3 Vanderwhacker [2] 11/20 17/11 variety [1] 35/3 venues [1] 10/7 Vermont [1] 32/7 vertical [1] 25/16 very [12] 2/22 25/8 27/18 28/16 33/6 36/11 38/11 42/8 42/13 42/23 43/9 43/11 via [1] 9/9 views [1] 20/5 Village [5] 18/23 18/23 20/23 25/7 38/15 visitors [2] 10/20 23/13	
	W	
	walk [1] 9/23 wall [1] 37/1 want [3] 21/9 32/5 40/7 wanted [1] 31/8	

W		
worked [4] 22/12 22/14 24/10 24/12 working [4] 2/22 10/22 36/16 40/2 works [2] 24/15 38/18 worry [1] 31/22 worth [1] 35/23 would [39] 3/6 12/2 13/2 13/3 13/4 14/12 14/14 15/18 15/19 16/10 17/4 17/12 17/17 17/20 18/2 18/3 18/7 19/17 20/2 21/13 21/15 22/16 23/5 23/18 23/22 24/4 24/11 24/21 25/23 26/17 27/11 28/8 29/17 30/3 32/12 42/8 42/17 43/1 43/12 written [7] 5/15 5/18 9/2 9/4 9/8 21/10 44/23 wrong [1] 30/1		
X		
XIV [1] 9/1		
Y		
year [5] 10/17 31/22 35/15 35/16 42/5 year-round [1] 10/17 years [6] 22/3 24/10 24/13 28/19 35/22 36/10 York [5] 1/13 1/20 7/1 31/17 46/4 you [50] you'll [1] 10/3 you're [10] 12/18 13/12 13/21 15/3 23/20 37/3 38/4 39/7 42/23 43/9 You've [1] 24/2 younger [1] 10/20 your [12] 3/20 5/8 5/9 9/17 9/18 21/17 29/20 37/7 43/1 43/9 43/16 43/17		
Z		
zip [6] 12/2 18/14 18/18 30/22 39/2 39/3		

Appendix 11
DGEIS Written Public Comments

Law Office of Sterling T. Goodspeed

Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 11
North Creek, NY 12853
scgstg@gmail.com

Sterling T. Goodspeed, Esq.

Susan C. Goodspeed
Legal Assistant

January 24, 2018

Mr. Mike Pratt
President/CEO
ORDA
2634 Main St.
Lake Placid, NY 12946

Re: Summer Operations/Public Hearing


Dear Mike:


We will be unable to attend tonight's public hearing due to a scheduling conflict but wanted to write to you to express our strongest possible support for the ORDA summer operation at the Ski Bowl. Between the two of us, dating back to 1991, we have operated four businesses within the North Creek area. These include a law firm, a newspaper, a grocery store and a laundromat. We are well aware of both the potential our region offers and the challenges doing business here can present.

ORDA's commitment to a summer operation builds on the growing partnership between the Authority, Town government and local businesses. Creating this venue during the summer season will add new vitality to our existing businesses and will likely attract other businesses to open shop. The proposal also builds off the important heritage that the Ski Bowl and North Creek have always shared with regards to the ski industry. It is fitting that summer operation at the Ski Bowl should provide such a crucial element of our long sought goal to become a four season destination community. The project also marks a welcome commitment to permit an ORDA operation on the edge of our Main Street business district and builds on the significance of the interconnect of the mountains completed several years ago.

Thank you for your time and attention in reviewing this correspondence.

Very truly yours,


Sterling T. Goodspeed


Susan C. Goodspeed

Office Location: Pearsall Real Estate Building 2361 State Route 28, Wevertown, NY 12886

Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 6:53 AM
To: Mark Taber; Kevin Franke
Subject: FW: Rabbit Pond Trail

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

From: Rick and Anne Morse [<mailto:morses2@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 9:42 PM
To: Gore_2017_UMP_comments <Gore_2017_UMP_comments@orda.org>
Subject: Rabbit Pond Trail

I feel that the
proposed
Gore Mountain Amendment to the

UMP does not recognize the
importance of the
Rabbit Pond Trail.

This is a trail which is used by a lot of people during all four seasons. Rabbit Pond is a pristine pond which has not been adversely impacted by human development. I personally worked to build this trail with Steve Ovitt, DEC Forest Ranger. I work to maintain this trail, along with other members of the Siamese Ponds Trail Improvement Society.

Where is there a map in the proposed amendment which shows the location of the Rabbit Pond Trail as well as the location of the proposed Gore ski trails?

Where does the proposed amendment describe how the Rabbit Pond Trail, and Rabbit Pond, will be impacted by the Gore development? What will be the setback of the Gore trail construction from Rabbit Pond?

I oppose the reclassification of the land from wild forest to intensive use unless the Rabbit Pond trail and Rabbit pond are not adversely affected.

Richard Morse

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com

[Remove](#) this sender from my allow list

From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

I would like to echo the comments made by several other speakers at the Public Hearing on the 2018 Gore Mountain UMP update. As a hiker and back country skier, I have a great interest in this area. I am the Siamese Ponds Trail Improvement Society trail steward for the Schaefer Trail on Gore (named after my family), and have spent many days clearing trails in the Siamese Pond Wilderness so that they remain open for year round use. As an aside, my father also built and ran the first rope tow in New York State in the Historic Ski Bowl beginning in December 1935. Thus, all can understand my affinity for this beautiful and unique area affected by the plan.

I fully support the intentions of ORDA to increase recreational opportunities on Gore, and see many positive aspects to the plan. If completed there will be an increase in recreational and (much needed) related economic activity. However, I have are two concerns, mostly related to preserving the historic recreational opportunities that currently exist, and coordinating future ones.

The first is the need to keep development away from Rabbit Pond, the Rabbit Pond Trail, and its environs. Besides its historic value as one of the original "Ride Up, Slide Down" trails from the 1930s, this is a beautiful, quiet and pristine area that needs to be preserved. It is used by many and will continue to be a wonderful recreational resource for the town and all outdoor enthusiasts. I have not seen any topographic maps that show definitively where new facilities and trails will be located in relation to the Rabbit Pond trail. This should be a high priority so we can clearly see the plan, and then keep a **substantial buffer zone** between areas. I urge those involved in the planning to produce such a map as soon as possible.

The second concern is that of overall planning:

- Along with the Gore expansion plan, there are already plans afoot to expand hiking/biking trails in the Historic Ski Bowl. How do these fit in?
- The North Country National Scenic Trail now comes through the Bowl. This trail only passes through two towns in the Adirondack Park, and North Creek is one of them. Impact? How do we maximize benefit? How does it fit in?
- There are ongoing plans for Hut to Hut skiing in the area. Impact?
- Raymond Brook BC skiers frequently end their trips in the Ski Bowl on the Connector Trail. Impact?
- A NYS Museum of Skiing is planned for the Bowl. Has this been considered as part of the overall plan?

I have not seen anywhere this **nexus of recreational activity addressed as a whole**. It is a tremendous opportunity for the Town of Johnsburg and the Greater Gore Mountain Region, but the Gore Mountain UMP must completely address these issues for the benefit of all concerned.

Gregory J. Schaefer
North River, NY
518-251-5451

Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Kevin Franke; Mark Taber
Subject: FW: Comment on Gore Mt. Unit Management Plan

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

From: Richard Salz [<mailto:rfs54@aol.com>]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 12:47 PM
To: Gore_2017_UMP_comments <Gore_2017_UMP_comments@orda.org>
Subject: Comment on Gore Mt. Unit Management Plan

Dear Sir or Madam:

As an avid cross-country skier and hiker, I am writing to express my concern about the possible adverse impact to the Rabbit Pond Trail as a result of the proposed construction of a new downhill trail adjacent to Rabbit Pond. The draft UMP calling for the reclassification of the Rabbit Pond area from Wild Forest to Intensive Use fails to address the impact that the new downhill trail will have on the Rabbit Pond Trail. In a significant omission, the draft amendment does not even show the Rabbit Pond Trail on any of the maps.

The Cumulative Impact Analysis (Part C, Section III, Subsection K, pp. 6 -7) incorrectly states that "[r]ecreational opportunities could be enhanced at both locations with the implementation of the proposed actions. This will result in a positive cumulative impact." No mention is made of the potential negative impact to the Rabbit Pond Trail or to Rabbit Pond itself by a new downhill trail.

Please note my opposition to the proposed reclassification if this will result in harm to the Rabbit Pond Trail or to Rabbit Pond.

Sincerely,

Richard Salz
171 Van Guilder Rd.
Chestertown, NY 12817

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com [Remove](#) this sender from my allow list
From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 2:43 PM
To: Kevin Franke; Mark Taber
Subject: FW: Public Comment on the Gore Mountain UMP Draft Amendments - Rabbit Pond Trail

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

From: Roy Keats [<mailto:royskipaddle@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 12:59 PM
To: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Cc: Keats <royskipaddle@gmail.com>
Subject: Public Comment on the Gore Mountain UMP Draft Amendments - Rabbit Pond Trail

Dear Mr. Hammond,

I feel that the
proposed
Gore Mountain Amendment to the

UMP does not recognize the
importance of the
Rabbit Pond Trail.

This is a trail which is used by many people during all four seasons. It is both a backcountry ski trail and a hiking trail. Rabbit Pond is a pristine pond which has not been adversely impacted by human development. I work to maintain this trail, along with other members of the Siamese Ponds Trail Improvement Society.

The proposed amendment does not have a map showing the location of the Rabbit Pond Trail and the location of the proposed Gore ski trails.

Where does the proposed amendment describe how the Rabbit Pond Trail, and Rabbit Pond, will be impacted by the Gore development? What will be the setback of the Gore trail construction from Rabbit Pond?

I oppose the reclassification of the land from wild forest to intensive use unless the Rabbit Pond Trail and Rabbit Pond are not adversely affected.

Sincerely,

Roy Keats
171 Garnet Lake Road
Johnsburg, NY 12843

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com

[Remove](#) this sender from my allow list

From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 7:28 AM
To: Kevin Franke; Mark Taber
Subject: FW: comment gore mountain unit management plan UMP 2018 Draft Amendment/DGEIS

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

From: Robin Bell [<mailto:robinb@ldeo.columbia.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 5:37 PM
To: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Subject: comment gore mountain unit management plan UMP 2018 Draft Amendment/DGEIS

Dear Mr. Hammond,

I am writing in regards to the expansion of the gore mountain ski area to the west.

I frequently ski the schaefer trail from the halfway brook trailhead all the way into town along with a growing group of backcountry skiers. Backcountry skiers of all ages have been enjoying this unique wilderness trail. the land that would be provided in exchange for this is not in anyway comparable. North Creek is beginning to be known as a destination for backcountry skiers. People's eye light up when I describe this backcountry skiing to them. It is an attraction to the region. The loss of this trail would be a setback for the town and the region.

In part to the attraction of the backcountry trails I have purchased land close to Gore and built a ski cabin. There are few wilderness backcountry trails in New York that compare with the Schaefer/Rabbit Pond trails. My children have begun to use this unique resource and I hope my grandchildren will be able to enjoy the North County Wilderness experience.

Sincerely your,

Dr. Robin Elizabeth Bell
37 van houten field

west nyack ny 10994

V 845 - 365 - 8827

F 845 - 365 - 8179

C 845 - 729 - 8697

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com

[Remove](#) this sender from my allow list

From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 7:31 AM
To: Mark Taber; Kevin Franke
Subject: FW: Comment on the Gore Mountain UMP 2018 Draft Amendment/DGEIS

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

From: Coplan, Prof. Karl S. [<mailto:kcoplan@law.pace.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 5:28 PM
To: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Subject: Comment on the Gore Mountain UMP 2018 Draft Amendment/DGEIS

Dear Mr. Hammond:

I submit the following comment on the proposed 2018 Gore Mountain UMP/DGEIS Amendments, specifically in reference to the proposed reclassification of the Rabbit Pond Wild Forest Lands to Intensive Use. As an avid backcountry skier, I oppose the proposed reclassification.

The existing cross country ski trail connecting the Schaefer Trail via Rabbit Pond to the Raymond Brook/ Ski Bowl connector trail is a unique resource, and should be maintained in its current form. The DGEIS improperly discounts the value of this trail by saying that it is merely an "out and back" cross country ski trail. This ignores the potential connections to the Schaefer Trail from the top of the Raymond Brook ski trail. It also ignores the fact that the Rabbit Pond ski trail is not just a typical cross country ski trail - it is one of only a handful of trails in the Southern Adirondacks that has enough pitch to make it a challenging and exhilarating backcountry telemark skiing run. The drops just above Rabbit Pond and below the pond to the intersection with the Raymond Brook trail are the best drops for telemark skiing in the Gore region wild forest area.

Gore Mountain has plenty of groomed downhill trails, and the proposed reclassification would terminate a unique Adirondack wilderness ski opportunity for no apparent reason. A cynic might think that the only purpose of the reclassification seems to be to add monetary value to the private condominium development that would gain a "ski-in, ski-out" lift service. That is not a good reason to destroy a Wild Forest.

I am a regular visitor to the North Creek region, and have recently invested in property in North River specifically because of the backcountry ski opportunities in the region.

My home address is

Karl Coplan
37 Van Houten Fields
West Nyack, NY 10994

I assume that e-mail submission of this comment is sufficient so that it will be included in the record. If you require a paper submission, please advise.

Thank you for your consideration,

Karl Coplan

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com [Remove](#) this sender from my allow list
From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 12:40 PM
To: Mark Taber; Kevin Franke
Subject: FW: Comments - Gore UMP

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

-----Original Message-----

From: Richard Carlson [<mailto:diccarlson@frontiernet.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 12:30 PM
To: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Cc: Johnsbury Supervisor <supervisor@johnsburny.com>
Subject: Comments - Gore UMP

Greetings: These comments are for:

The 2017 Amendment to the 2002 Gore Mountain Unit Management Plan

My chief concern is the land swap - swapping Vanderwhacker Wild Forest Land for an insignificant portion of Intensive Use Land to become part of the Siamese Ponds Wilderness.

The current uses of this Wild Forest Parcel includes an intimate hiking/skiing/snowshoeing trail near Rabbit Pond. Offering the use of the proposed ski trail in the off season for hiking is of no importance since the nature of hiking on wide alpine ski trails is of limited and mostly shunned value. This area has a long history with backcountry skiers and it's loss would be paramount. The gain for increased trail development is minimal. This has no benefit except for the private development at Front Street. That said - this is the 10 year anniversary of "permits in place" for the Front Street development at the Ski Bowl. To date - 4 duplex units have been build with no additional development on the horizon.

The current Hudson (46er) lift has operated sporadically at best during the ski season in the last 10 years and was still not operating for the 2017-2018 season as of this writing. It did operate for a special "History Weekend" last summer as a scenic chairlift ride. It was well received and it could be a cornerstone of Summer Operations - EVEN WITH IT'S EXISTING PLACEMENT and operating constraints (ie running slow to accommodate loading/unloading).

There is a network of multiple use and mt. bike trails on adjacent Town of Johnsbury property. These trails need to operate as is - currently free to users and not be disrupted or displaced by future construction and structures like the zip coaster. The land ownership and lease/lessee structure is incredibly confusing with some of the land owned by the Town of Johnsbury leased to Gore/ORDA, and additional land is owned by Front Street and pending swap deals between the Town and Front Street makes even the best map reader confused.

Gore has had a non-existent to poor off-season profile with incredibly abbreviated lift schedules (just 10 days for 2017 Summer season). This in an environment that sees other Ski Areas garnering up to 40% of revenues in the off season. The chief summer entertainment is scenic chairlift or gondola rides with hiking and biking options if available.

This poor performance for the last 20 years is even more perplexing with one of the state's largest summer tourist venues just 30 minutes away in Lake George.

Quite frankly Gore's poor off-season activity leaves many workers in seasonal limbo seeking additional summer season employment to dovetail with their employment at Gore or leaving the recreation industry entirely for full time work.

Submitted February 6, 2018

Richard Carlson

--

Richard Carlson
PO Box 73
North River, NY 12856
518-251-0829

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com [Remove](#) this sender from my allow list

From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 12:40 PM
To: Mark Taber; Kevin Franke
Subject: FW: Gore UMP Comments

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

From: Brandon J. Himoff [<mailto:brandon@himoff.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Gore_2017_UMP_comments <Gore_2017_UMP_comments@orda.org>
Subject: Gore UMP Comments

As a member of the public, a regional business owner, and a member of our local business organizations, I applaud the strong effort that ORDA is making to keep these valuable assets in terrific condition. As times change, these facilities need to adapt and maintain their attraction. Looking carefully at these plans, I feel that they will significantly improve the potential of Gore to attract tourists. Any revenue brought in to the mountain will be accompanied by a significant multiplier in local spending, boosting and supporting many other local businesses and thereby expanding our local employment base. Especially critical are the season expanders such as the improvements in the ski bowl.

I would suggest that ORDA also consider that these capital investments must be accompanied by additional operating spending. By expanding the pumps, Gore will be able to make more snow which of course requires more groomer hours and more support. More lifts and more connectivity mean that more of the mountain can be operating, requiring appropriate staffing. The additional tourists will not only want more and better skiing, but better amenities on the mountain, especially including better and more diverse food offerings. The current food offerings and dining experience are significant detractors to our tourists, and improvements in this area are some of the most necessary but perhaps easiest to address. A change to the current food contractor and exploration of new vendors that are more appropriate to the desired mountain experience and who would be more accountable to ORDA should be considered.

Brandon Himoff

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com [Remove](#) this sender from my allow list
From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 8:12 AM
To: Kevin Franke; Mark Taber
Subject: FW: Save the Rabbit Pond Area! Crucial to 4-Season Activities in North Creek

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

From: Judith Harper [<mailto:juditheharper@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 7:26 PM
To: Gore_2017_UMP_comments <Gore_2017_UMP_comments@orda.org>
Subject: Save the Rabbit Pond Area! Crucial to 4-Season Activities in North Creek

ORDA's move to reclassify and acquire the Rabbit Pond Trail Area for Gore Mountain use jeopardizes North Creek's four-season use of open spaces for hikers and tourists.

North Creek and the town of Johnsbury depend on tourist dollars 12 months of the year. Ski tourism dollars flow in during a very limited number of weeks, and are solely dependent on frigid weather and natural snowfall. Snowmaking is limited, despite what Gore Mountain claims. The statistics show that the most ski dollars flow in when there is the most natural snow. Facts provided by Gore Mountain. (I'm a former employee.)

North Creek and the entire region are in desperate need of FOUR-SEASON, LOW-COST tourist activities. We must maintain as much free, open to all open space as possible in the North Creek region. We don't have much hiking space in North Creek, yet it is the hamlet in Johnsbury which draws the most tourists. Take Note!

Last fall 2017 ORDA totally rejected the Town of Johnsbury what it reasonably requested. ORDA, when pressed, said it would offer ski tickets to residents, although most Johnsbury residents do not ski at Gore. Thanks, but no thanks.

This LAND GRAB is totally unacceptable to me, a 12-year resident of Johnsbury and a former owner of a business in Johnsbury, and a former member of the Chamber of Commerce.

The trails at Rabbit Pond--this pristine "wild" area--is worth far more to North Creek businesses and to Johnsbury residents than additional Gore Mountain trails and chairlifts, etc.

If Gore and ORDA wanted to acquire this land, they could have cooperated with the Town of Johnsbury last fall 2017. ORDA and Gore chose to ignore Johnsbury residents. But Gore Mountain and ORDA have never considered the needs of the residents of this area.

Judith E. Harper
P.O. Box 122
293 Coulter Rd.
Johnsburg, MA 12843
518-251-3006

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com

[Remove](#) this sender from my allow list

From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 8:12 AM
To: Kevin Franke; Mark Taber
Subject: FW: Gore MT UMP comments

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

From: Julia West [<mailto:juliawest60@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 9:59 PM
To: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Subject: Gore MT UMP comments

Dear Mr. Hammond,

I'm writing in regard to the proposed 2018 Gore Mountain UMP/DGEIS Amendments, specifically in reference to the proposed reclassification of the Rabbit Pond Wild Forest Lands to Intensive Use. I am in strong opposition to the "land swap" that is being proposed. A large portion of Wild Forest Land would be added onto Gore for the development of trails, in trade for a much smaller portion near the Gore summit that would become part of the Siamese Ponds Wilderness area.

That small parcel is useless for public use, just as it is not useful for Gore to develop on it. It's a bad trade!

I am an avid backcountry skier, hiker, etc. The trail system near North Creek is unique and special, and many people enjoy the opportunity to ski there. It also gets good use as a hiking trail in summer (I've read the trail registers!).

It would be a shame to lose that to development. Hiking on a developed ski trail is just not fun - it's not the intimate woods experience that hikers want. And skiers would be cut off from some of the best backcountry terrain the southern Adirondacks has to offer.

The Hudson chair at "Little Gore" is rarely open. We just don't get enough snow. It has not been open yet this year (possibly today because of the snow), and we are well into February. Why does Little Gore need more trails? I don't see that it would attract more people. The development of Burnt Ridge, which opened a lot of terrain at Gore several years ago, doesn't even get a lot of skiers. To create those trails, a massive amount of clearing (and burying the trees) had to be done on some very beautiful land, destroying the original Schaefer trail that allowed for an incredible nature experience for hikers before it was lost.

The North Creek Ski Bowl does NOT need new trails! This land swap is extremely concerning to me- it is a BAD idea! It would be a real shame to lose that beautiful wilderness terrain.

I live in North River; this is my home. Please do not carry through with this land swap. The other improvements to the existing trails at the main mountain are all excellent ideas. Please keep the focus on improving what is already there, not adding more terrain and wasting my taxpayer dollars.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Julia West
429 Harvey Rd
North River, NY 12856
518-251-3930

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com

[Remove](#) this sender from my allow list

From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.



The mission of the ADIRONDACK COUNCIL is to ensure the ecological integrity and wild character of the ADIRONDACK PARK for current and future generations.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

February 9, 2018

ROBERT J. KAFIN
Chair

MICHAEL A. BETTMANN, M.D.
Vice-Chair

SARAH C. HATFIELD
Vice-Chair

DANIEL J. RYTERBAND
Treasurer

CHARLES D. CANHAM, Ph.D.
Secretary

EMILY M. BATESON
JILL CHOATE BEIER
DAVID E. BRONSTON
LIZA COWAN
GEORGINA CULLMAN, Ph.D.
THOMAS CURLEY
PHILIP R. FORLENZA
ETHAN FRIEDMAN
CHRISTOPHER J. GORAYEB
KEVIN MCNULTY
SARAH J. MEYLAND, MS, JD
SHERRY NEMMERS
JUSTIN POTTER
MEREDITH M. PRIME
BRIAN RUDER
KATE RUSSELL
DOUGLAS SCHULTZ
LAUREL SKARBINSKI
DOUGLAS STEWART
CURTIS R. WELLING
ETHAN WINTER

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
WILLIAM C. JANEWAY



Robert W. Hammond, Director of Planning & Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
Olympic Center, 2634 Main Street
Lake Placid, NY 12946
(Via electronic submission)

RE: Draft Amendments to the Gore Mountain and Whiteface Mountain Unit Management Plans

Dear Mr. Hammond,

On behalf of the Adirondack Council, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to offer the following comments on the *Draft Amendments to the Gore Mountain and Whiteface Mountain Unit Management Plans*. We appreciate the Olympic Regional Development Authority's (ORDA) efforts to conduct meaningful public outreach while taking questions and feedback on technical elements for the proposals. Given the important role these recreational facilities play in the Adirondack Park, the Adirondack Council supports ORDA's efforts to modernize the facilities, increase energy efficiency and improve infrastructure reliability, *if the facilities, operations and improvements are legal and environmentally responsible*.

In reviewing the detailed amendments for both the Gore Mountain (Gore Mtn.) and Whiteface Mountain (Whiteface Mtn.) Unit Managements Plans (UMPs), the Council believes that most of the proposed actions are warranted and necessary to maintain these Adirondack Park ski centers as world-class facilities. They need to be updated, funded and protected. As a whole the facilities complement our region's world-class wilderness areas and provide for beneficial recreational opportunities for a wide spectrum of users within our mountain communities. When designed and managed properly these facilities thrive in areas designated for intensive recreation in the largest Wilderness Park in the contiguous United States.

The details of these plans are of critical importance in realizing the recreational and economic benefits of the huge investment of taxpayer dollars in these facilities. The Council is concerned with some of the UMPs' important details that are missing, including: compliance with all constitutional requirements, net positive land reclassifications for Wilderness, regional planning, and other environmental considerations. The following comments note our concerns:

DEFENDING THE EAST'S GREATEST WILDERNESS

Whiteface Mtn. UMP

The Council suggests that select changes be made. Particularly, we request that glades be counted towards the total trail mileage allowed under the constitutional amendment. This would require ORDA to adjust the proposed management actions to adhere to the 25 mile limit. And, we request that an updated, detailed trail mileage calculation be included in the plan to reflect these changes.

Based on Article XIV of the NY Constitution, trail mileage and width requirements are applied to trails that are constructed and maintained. The constitutional amendment language does not exclude glades from the trail mileage calculation as this UMP suggests. Because glade skiing areas are maintained and treated as trails, they should be considered trails and counted towards total trail mileage. Glades are trails for the following reasons:

1. There is physical preparation, such as clearing of brush, or grubbing, and/or cutting of down logs or small growth;
2. Drawing 3 of the draft amendment illustrates where glades and trails less than 30 feet are located. These downhill routes are also advertised as trails available to the public in the map published for Whiteface visitors, serving as an invitation for public use (see map, below);
3. At various times the glades are posted as "open" or "closed;" and,
4. They are patrolled by Ski Patrol.

According to the draft UMP, there are 21.30 miles of currently constructed or approved to be constructed trails for this Intensive Use Area, and with this draft amendment, 0.89 miles of trails are proposed to be constructed. These numbers combined bring the total trail mileage to 22.19 – well within the 25 mile cap. However, according to this draft UMP, this number excludes glades from the total trail mileage, thus excluding 2.86 miles of trail; if the glade mileage is counted, the constitutional cap would be (very slightly) exceeded. There must be a modest change to honor the cap.

The Slides are not counted towards the constitutional limit within this draft. However, the Council believes that if the following criteria are met, a reasonable argument could be made that the Slides should count:

- a. Ski area maps and promotional materials show the slides as skiing terrain (as is currently done), and;
- b. They are listed as "open" or "closed," and/or;
- c. They are patrolled (by ski patrol), and/or;
- d. Access to the slides from the top lift and access from the bottom of the slides to other trails is maintained (cleared, etc.).

The constitutional protections of Article XIV are not such that they must be complied with when convenient and easy. They are not a policy, regulation or law. If there are issues with compliance, and therefore issues with the legality of proposed UMP amendments and ORDA plans, either the plans or the constitution (or both) must be changed.

We ask ORDA to be transparent with its methodology in determining ski trail mileage totals and how they relate to the overall mileage cap. A change in almost three miles of trails between the proposed 2018 and approved 2006 amendments is significant. Although these changes can be

reasonably attributed to improved aerial photos and technology, a map showing where the totals were miscalculated should be included for public review. ORDA should include a detailed account of the calculations it used to arrive at the total trail mileage, including which trails were chosen to be counted as one or two trails where two or more trails merge.

Gore Mtn. UMP

The two land reclassifications proposed in this UMP, though conceptual, raise questions over the amount of land requested for re-classification to Intensive Use or Wilderness. Specifically, the 33 acres of proposed Wilderness is insufficient compared to the 159 acres proposed to be classified as Intensive Use. When looking at past land reclassifications, there is a precedent to re-classify or add Wilderness lands to the Forest Preserve at a two to one, or greater, ratio. As a reference point, the NYCO land swap amendment passed with the state suggesting a ratio of seven to one, committing to add 1,500 to 2,000 acres or more of Wilderness to the Forest Preserve in a swap for 200 acres of Wild Forest coming out of the Forest Preserve. As the Council noted at the January 25th public hearing held for Whiteface Mtn. UMP, state land dedicated for Intensive Use should be combined with expanded Wilderness in the same general area for a net positive for Wilderness. If these reclassifications are pursued in a separate UMP process, a net positive for Wilderness approach should be employed.

Lastly, based on the trail mileage information provided within the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement, Gore Mtn. is well within its constitutionally allotted 40 miles of trail limit. The Council requests that ORDA clearly outline how it arrived at the listed 32.9 miles of total mileage within this UMP.

Additional Comments

In addition to those above, the Council provides the following comments for both UMPs:

- Compliance with Forever Wild: The facilities on state lands must comply with the strict and not always convenient requirements of the “Forever Wild” clause of the constitution. These requirements include: constitutional amendments that provide for functions and facilities at Whiteface and Gore that would not otherwise be allowed; adherence to the tightly restricted total miles and widths of downhill ski trails; and, no new tree cutting, clearing, disturbance, or expansion to year-round activities beyond what is now allowed without a constitutional amendment. (Under the constitution, all uses must be winter recreation based.)
- Planning Sensitive to other Regional Adirondack Needs: The state lands and operations at Whiteface Mtn. are part of a larger network of state lands, recreational uses, trails, and trailheads within the very popular High Peaks region. As the state looks at making important upgrades to the ORDA facilities, and simultaneously develops plans to manage the overuse of the Rt. 73 corridor and the High Peaks, planning needs to be coordinated. For example, one element of overlap could be relocation of parking for the Cascade and Porter Mountains on popular weekends to the Mt. Van Hoevenberg complex, as was done on an experimental basis on Columbus Day weekend in 2017.

- Climate Smart, Energy Smart Models: Climate change threatens to redefine Adirondack winter recreation as we now know it. The ORDA facilities can and should combat climate change and be showcases for visitors from across the country and around the world for the latest and best in climate smart renewable energy practices. The facilities should support the Governor's renewable energy goals and comply with Adirondack Park Agency policies.
- Additional Environmental Issues: These upgrades provide an opportunity to:
 - Improve protections for fish and wildlife, including the rare Bicknell Thrush on Whiteface and Adirondack trout in the Ausable River.
 - Address light pollution, by protecting rare dark skies and reducing light pollution (at the Mt Van Hoevenberg sliding center, for example).
 - Protect water quality.
 - Expand recycling.

As Intensive Use Areas, Whiteface Mtn. and Gore Mtn. ski centers are integral to the identity and vibrancy of the Adirondack Park. Environmental planning and review of these plans should not be "segmented" from other ORDA facilities. Together these facilities support our region's world class wilderness areas, provide for necessary recreational opportunities across a wide spectrum of users close to or within our mountain communities, and continue to be economic staples for many surrounding communities. The proposed management actions will allow these ORDA facilities to remain competitive and attractive to both professional and amateur users. And while we understand and appreciate the unique nature of these ski resorts, we must not forget that these lands are still Forest Preserve and as such are subject to a level of accountability, protection, and process that make the Adirondacks one of America's true conservation success stories and make our ski centers especially appealing to visitors because of the limited on-mountain development and the exceptional beauty of nature that is part of the skiing experience.

In closing, the Adirondack Council supports legal improvements to ORDA facilities and programs that comply with the constitution, the law and the legal protections which are what keep the Adirondacks a national treasure, a legacy we've inherited, and hold in trust for future generations.

Thank you for reviewing our comments. We appreciate the opportunities to meet leading up to this point, and suggest and hope that we can meet again to review these points and your proposed responses.

Sincerely,



William C. Janeway
Executive Director



Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2018 6:35 AM
To: Mark Taber; Kevin Franke
Subject: FW: Rabbit pond trail.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

-----Original Message-----

From: Dspzp [<mailto:dspzp@aol.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 9:44 PM
To: Gore_2017_UMP_comments <Gore_2017_UMP_comments@orda.org>
Subject: Rabbit pond trail.

I am writing in response to the proposed changes to the Rabbit Pond trail expansion.

I am sure many others have written to express their concern in this matter an they have most definitely expressed it better.

My comment is that the Adirondack Park was designated to protect and preserve this wonderful wilderness we call the ADK.

We must all understand that growth will always adversely effect this wilderness. And I feel that there is a greater need to protect and preserve than to continually expand when I believe current facilities are under utilized.

Reclassifying and developing this land will remove one of the more pristine wilderness areas that may be accessed year round. Not just for a single purpose of skiing.

Also, without complete documentation and maps to outline what will actually be done, I can only strongly speak against this plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com

[Remove](#) this sender from my allow list

From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Middlebury College Box 2493
14 Old Chapel Road
Middlebury, VT 05753
sferguson@middlebury.edu

February 9, 2018

Michael Pratt
Olympic Center
2634 Main St.
Lake Placid, NY 12946

Dear Mr. Pratt,

Across the country, ski resorts are changing. Lifts are going faster, lodge food is getting better, villages are being developed, and year-round attractions are being built. These changes have helped the ski industry adapt to climate change and maintain corporate profits. As you consider how to develop the Adirondack resorts, I encourage you to also ask the question of to what extent *should* these resorts be developed. Governor Cuomo announced a vast and expensive expansion plan for Whiteface, Gore, and Mt. Van Hoevenberg, and some of these changes, such as updates to base lodge facilities, are long since overdue. Other amenities, however, seem to be unnecessary expansions that have no place within the Adirondacks.

The Adirondack resorts are unique because they are state-owned facilities focused on serving New York residents. They are not private corporations solely focused on increasing profits. In the winter, these resorts attract millions of visitors and are an important part of the Adirondack experience. However, in the summer, these resorts play a secondary role as people come from all over to hike the High Peaks and conquer the 46ers. When considering future developments, it is important that the developments are not seen as an addition to the individual resorts, but as added amenities to Adirondack Park as a whole. Route 73 is already overburdened during the summer months, and adding summer attractions to these ski resorts would increase the strain on the already existent infrastructure.

Specifically, I urge ORDA to consider how the proposed 'mountain coaster' fits within the culture of the Adirondacks. The Whiteface Mountain Unit Management Plan states that "Whiteface development will blend with the Adirondack environment and have minimum adverse impacts on surrounding state lands." The metal track of a mountain coaster would not blend into the Adirondack environment, but instead it would stick out like a sore thumb. The Adirondack environment, and especially publicly owned land, is fundamentally made up of wilderness. Constitutional exceptions already had to be made in order to allow ski resort infrastructure, and adding a mountain coaster would further contradict the 'forever wild' promise. A mountain coaster is a tamed and controlled way to experience nature. Riders would not be exposed to the real Adirondack wilderness, but instead they would glimpse nature from a man-made metal track. Outdoor recreation is an important part of the Adirondacks, but a

mountain coaster is something that belongs in an amusement park, not the Adirondack wilderness.

All this is not to say that Whiteface, Gore, and Van Hoevenberg should ignore profits, but instead of adding unnecessary infrastructure, they should focus on thriving within their ski industry niche. As other resorts continue to develop, Adirondack resorts should fall back on their skiing roots. They are located in a protected wilderness area that will never have the storefronts and commercial villages of Vail and Jackson Hole, yet the ski mountains themselves offer some of the best terrain east of the Mississippi. While a mountain coaster offers tempting profits, I urge you to embrace the ski culture that already exists at these mountains. Keep them as wild mountains nestled in the middle of the Adirondacks, and people will continue to come and enjoy these resorts for what they are—ski resorts where skiing comes first.

Sincerely,

Samuel Ferguson

Kevin Franke

From: Bob Hammond <BHammond@orda.org>
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2018 6:35 AM
To: Mark Taber; Kevin Franke
Subject: FW: Rabbit Pond Trail

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Robert W. Hammond
Director of Environmental, Planning and Construction
NYS Olympic Regional Development Authority
(518) 302-5332

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message is intended exclusively for the party or parties to whom it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not one of the named addressees, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete/destroy all copies of the message.

-----Original Message-----

From: Allison St Pierre [<mailto:allison1@nycap.rr.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 9:31 PM
To: Gore_2017_UMP_comments <Gore_2017_UMP_comments@orda.org>
Subject: Rabbit Pond Trail

Hello,

I am writing in response to the proposal by ORDA to reclassify the Rabbit Pond area from Vanderwacker Mountain Forest Preserve to Gore Mountain Intensive Use. I am in disagreement with this proposal, as it will adversely impact a pristine pond and an area of preserve unnecessarily.

Currently Gore has many underutilized areas, such as trails that do not open for most, or all of the season. Before expanding into lands that should remain protected, Gore Mountain should put those resources into the area's currently delegated for this use.

The public should have access to a map clearly outlining the location of proposed areas to be reclassified. Another concern is how would this expansion be staffed? Additional parking, where would this be? I feel Gore must consider expansion within it's current boundaries, expand existing trails, staff and open all trails, and configure trails to travel around the mountain, prior to impacting protected lands, that are precious to maintaining the integrity of the Adirondack Park Preserve.

Thank you for considering the alternate options.

Kindly,
Allison St. Pierre
Bakers Mills, NY

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: kfranke@thelagroup.com

[Remove](#) this sender from my allow list

From: bhammond@orda.org

You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.

Appendix 12
DGEIS Comments and Responses to Comments

Responses to Public Comments Regarding the 2018 Amendment to the 2002 Gore Mountain Unit Management Plan and Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement

Comment Topics

1. Suggested Land Reclassification Including Rabbit Pond Trail
2. Planning for Gore Mountain and North Creek Ski Bowl
3. Management Actions and Goals
4. Constitutional Limits
5. Regional Planning
6. Renewable Energy
7. Project Support

1. SUGGESTED LAND RECLASSIFICATION INCLUDING RABBIT POND TRAIL

(1.A) Richard Morse, January 30, 2018

I feel that the proposed Gore Mountain Amendment to the UMP does not recognize the importance of the Rabbit Pond Trail.

This is a trail which is used by a lot of people during all four seasons. Rabbit Pond is a pristine pond which has not been adversely impacted by human development. I personally worked to build this trail with Steve Ovitt, DEC Forest Ranger. I work to maintain this trail, along with other members of the Siamese Ponds Trail Improvement Society.

Where is there a map in the proposed amendment which shows the location of the Rabbit Pond Trail as well as the location of the proposed Gore ski trails?

Where does the proposed amendment describe how the Rabbit Pond Trail, and Rabbit Pond, will be impacted by the Gore development? What will be the setback of the Gore trail construction from Rabbit Pond?

I oppose the reclassification of the land from wild forest to intensive use unless the Rabbit Pond trail and Rabbit pond are not adversely affected.

Response: The suggested land reclassification cannot take place through the adoption of the proposed Gore Mountain Unit Management Plan Amendment. The following explanation appears on page iii of the Executive Summary of the Draft Unit Management Plan Amendment/DEIS:

“(Note: The Adirondack Park Agency cannot find that a UMP Amendment proposing management actions on lands to be reclassified conforms to the Adirondack Park State Land Master Plan (APSLMP) before the land is reclassified. First, the Agency must receive a request to reclassify, accompanied by a UMP for the proposed Intensive Use lands. The Agency must follow SEQRA regulations regarding public notice and comment and must hold hearings inside and outside the Adirondack Park on the request to reclassify, pursuant to the APSLMP. After notice, comment and hearings, the reclassification proposals would be presented to the Agency for a recommendation to the Governor for approval of the classification. The process culminates in the Governor's action on that recommendation. This UMP Amendment does not assume that a reclassification request will be

approved and does not authorize any actions on lands requested to be reclassified, based on a proposed future classification. The actual request for reclassification and a UMP Amendment for those actions on the lands proposed for reclassification would be presented separately from this UMP Amendment. Discussion of actions on those lands in this UMP is conceptual only, and those actions cannot be authorized by this UMP Amendment.)”

The Rabbit Pond Trail was among the early ski trails created in the North Creek/North River area in the 1930's and 1940's. The circa 1940's map on the following page entitled "Precise Ski Data of North Creek, N.Y., A Stone's Throw from Train to Tow" (Figure 1) shows the intermediate Rabbit Pond Trail located at the "Village Slopes". The trail and Rabbit Pond itself also appear on the 1958 USGS map of the area shown on Figure 2.

Figure 3 shows the current mapping of the Rabbit Pond Trail, the 1958 USGS mapping of the Rabbit Pond Trail and the UMP-proposed ski trail. Mapping of the current Rabbit Pond Trail was produced from GPS data collected by Wilderness Property Management Inc. (Steve Ovitt) and mapped by Warren County GIS Department (Ski Bowl Park 2017 Smart Growth Grant Long Trail to Little Gore Summit). Approximately 600 feet of the existing Rabbit Pond Trail would be within or very near the proposed ski trail.

Figure 4 shows how this section of the existing Rabbit Pond Trail could be easily relocated slightly to the north and away from the proposed ski trail where it would pass over terrain similar to what is currently crossed. Figure 4 shows the area within which the trail could be relocated. ORDA will work with NYSDEC, Steve Ovitt and members of the local hiking and backcountry skiing community to select the best Rabbit Pond Trail location within this area, including a location that provides adequate setbacks from the proposed ski trail.

Creation of the alpine trail and relocation of the section of Rabbit Pond Trail are not anticipated to cause any significant adverse impacts to the ecology of Rabbit Pond. Water quality within the pond will not be impacted. Data in previous UMP's have demonstrated that creation of ski trails in previously wooded areas do not impact nutrient and solids levels in nearby receiving waters. Data in previous UMP's have also demonstrated that snowmaking within a drainage basin does not significantly alter rates of stormwater runoff. The pond itself will not be physically affected. The mapping in Figure 4 shows that both the ski trail and the hiking trail will be no closer to the pond than what currently exists.


(1.B) Richard Salz, February 1, 2018

As an avid cross-country skier and hiker, I am writing to express my concern about the possible adverse impact to the Rabbit Pond Trail as a result of the proposed construction of a new downhill trail adjacent to Rabbit Pond. The draft UMP calling for the reclassification of the Rabbit Pond area from Wild Forest to Intensive Use fails to address the impact that the new downhill trail will have on the Rabbit Pond Trail. In a significant omission, the draft amendment does not even show the Rabbit Pond Trail on any of the maps.


The Cumulative Impact Analysis (Part C, Section III, Subsection K, pp. 6 -7) incorrectly states that "[r]ecreational opportunities could be enhanced at both locations with the implementation of the proposed actions. This will result in a positive cumulative impact." No mention is made of the potential negative impact to the Rabbit Pond Trail or to Rabbit Pond itself by a new downhill trail.





Precise Ski Data of North Creek, N. Y.



“A Stone’s Throw From Train to Tow”







LEGEND	
	EXISTING LAND USE BOUNDARY
	PROPERTY LINE
	PROPOSED LAND USE BOUNDARY
	HISTORIC RABBIT POND SKI TRAIL
	HIKING AND XC SKI TRAILS
	EXISTING SKI TRAILS
	PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SKI TRAILS
	PROPOSED SKI TRAILS
	EXISTING GLADES
	EXISTING LIFTS
	PROPOSED LIFTS
	EXISTING BUILDING

The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
People. Purpose. Place.
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs
NY 12866
p: 518-587-8100
f: 518-587-0180
www.thelagroup.com

Unauthorized alteration or addition to this document is a violation of Section 7209 of the New York State Education Law.
© the LA Group 2017

Prepared for:

**OLYMPIC REGIONAL
NEW YORK
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

**Olympic Regional
Development Authority**
2634 Main Street
Lake Placid, New York 12946

**GORE
MOUNTAIN**

Project Title:
**Gore Mountain: 2018 Unit Management Plan Amendment &
Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement**

Drawing Title
**Rabbit Pond Trail
Relocation Area**

Date:	Feb. 25, 2018
Scale:	1"=300'
Design:	MJT
Drawn:	KMK
Ch'k'd:	KJP
Project No.:	2015037

Drawing No:
Figure 4

Please note my opposition to the proposed reclassification if this will result in harm to the Rabbit Pond Trail or to Rabbit Pond.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A.

(1.C) Gregory Schaeffer, February 1, 2018 (via e-mail)

I would like to echo the comments made by several other speakers at the Public Hearing on the 2018 Gore Mountain UMP update. As a hiker and back country skier, I have a great interest in this area. I am the Siamese Ponds Trail Improvement Society trail steward for the Schaefer Trail on Gore (named after my family), and have spent many days clearing trails in the Siamese Pond Wilderness so that they remain open for year round use. As an aside, my father also built and ran the first rope tow in New York State in the Historic Ski Bowl beginning in December 1935. Thus, all can understand my affinity for this beautiful and unique area affected by the plan.

I fully support the intentions of ORDA to increase recreational opportunities on Gore, and see many positive aspects to the plan. If completed there will be an increase in recreational and (much needed) related economic activity. However, I have are two concerns, mostly related to preserving the historic recreational opportunities that currently exist, and coordinating future ones.

The first is the need to keep development away from Rabbit Pond, the Rabbit Pond Trail, and its environs. Besides its historic value as one of the original “Ride Up, Slide Down” trails from the 1930s, this is a beautiful, quiet and pristine area that needs to be preserved. It is used by many and will continue to be a wonderful recreational resource for the town and all outdoor enthusiasts. I have not seen any topographic maps that show definitively where new facilities and trails will be located in relation to the Rabbit Pond trail. This should be a high priority so we can clearly see the plan, and then keep a substantial buffer zone between areas. I urge those involved in the planning to produce such a map as soon as possible.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A, including the accompanying mapping.

(1.D) Roy Keats, February 2, 2018

I feel that the proposed Gore Mountain Amendment to the UMP does not recognize the importance of the Rabbit Pond Trail.

This is a trail which is used by many people during all four seasons. It is both a backcountry ski trail and a hiking trail. Rabbit Pond is a pristine pond which has not been adversely impacted by human development. I work to maintain this trail, along with other members of the Siamese Ponds Trail Improvement Society.

The proposed amendment does not have a map showing the location of the Rabbit Pond Trail and the location of the proposed Gore ski trails. Where does the proposed amendment describe how the Rabbit Pond Trail, and Rabbit Pond, will be impacted by the Gore development? What will be the setback of the Gore trail construction from Rabbit Pond?

I oppose the reclassification of the land from wild forest to intensive use unless the Rabbit Pond Trail and Rabbit Pond are not adversely affected.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A, including the accompanying mapping.

(1.E) Robin Bell, February 4, 2018

I am writing in regards to the expansion of the Gore Mountain ski area to the west.

I frequently ski the Schaefer trail from the Halfway Brook trailhead all the way into town along with a growing group of backcountry skiers. Backcountry skiers of all ages have been enjoying this unique wilderness trail. The land that would be provided in exchange for this is not in anyway comparable. North Creek is beginning to be known as a destination for backcountry skiers. People's eyes light up when I describe this backcountry skiing to them. It is an attraction to the region. The loss of this trail would be a setback for the town and the region.

In part to the attraction of the backcountry trails I have purchased land close to Gore and built a ski cabin. There are few wilderness backcountry trails in New York that compare with the Schaefer/Rabbit Pond trails. My children have begun to use this unique resource and I hope my grandchildren will be able to enjoy the North County Wilderness experience.

Response: None of the actions proposed in the 2018 UMP Amendment will affect the Schaeffer trail. See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A regarding the Rabbit Pond Trail.

From the overall perspective of the attractiveness of the area's backcountry character and the benefits that are derived therefrom, ORDA believes that the relocation of +/- 600 feet of one trail within a network that consists of miles of interconnected trails will not cause a significant impact

(1.F) Karl Coplan, February 4, 2018

I submit the following comment on the proposed 2018 Gore Mountain UMP/DGEIS Amendments, specifically in reference to the proposed reclassification of the Rabbit Pond Wild Forest Lands to Intensive Use. As an avid backcountry skier, I oppose the proposed reclassification.

The existing cross country ski trail connecting the Schaefer Trail via Rabbit Pond to the Raymond Brook/Ski Bowl connector trail is a unique resource, and should be maintained in its current form. The DGEIS improperly discounts the value of this trail by saying that it is merely an "out and back" cross country ski trail. This ignores the potential connections to the Schaefer Trail from the top of the Raymond Brook ski trail. It also ignores the fact that the Rabbit Pond ski trail is not just a typical cross country ski trail - it is one of only a handful of trails in the Southern Adirondacks that has enough pitch to make it a challenging and exhilarating backcountry telemark skiing run. The drops just above Rabbit Pond and below the pond to the intersection with the Raymond Brook trail are the best drops for telemark skiing in the Gore region wild forest area.

Gore Mountain has plenty of groomed downhill trails, and the proposed reclassification would terminate a unique Adirondack wilderness ski opportunity for no apparent reason. A cynic might think that the only purpose of the reclassification seems to be to add monetary value to the private

condominium development that would gain a “ski-in, ski-out” lift service. That is not a good reason to destroy a Wild Forest.

I am a regular visitor to the North Creek region, and have recently invested in property in North River specifically because of the backcountry ski opportunities in the region.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A that describes the relocation of a small section of the Rabbit Pond Trail. The remainder of the trail would remain unchanged.

Also, see the second part of the previous response regarding the proposed action in the context of the overall area trail network. ORDA believes that the proposed conceptual action will not cause significant economic or experiential issues.

(1.G) Richard Carlson, February 6, 2018

My chief concern is the land swap - swapping Vanderwhacker Wild Forest Land for an insignificant portion of Intensive Use Land to become part of the Siamese Ponds Wilderness.

The current uses of this Wild Forest Parcel includes an intimate hiking/skiing/snowshoeing trail near Rabbit Pond. Offering the use of the proposed ski trail in the off season for hiking is of no importance since the nature of hiking on wide alpine ski trails is of limited and mostly shunned value. This area has a long history with backcountry skiers and it's loss would be paramount. The gain for increased trail development is minimal. This has no benefit except for the private development at Front Street. That said - this is the 10 year anniversary of "permits in place" for the Front Street development at the Ski Bowl. To date - 4 duplex units have been build with no additional development on the horizon.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A.

(1.H) Judith Harper, February 7, 2018

ORDA's move to reclassify and acquire the Rabbit Pond Trail Area for Gore Mountain use jeopardizes North Creek's four-season use of open spaces for hikers and tourists.

North Creek and the town of Johnsbury depend on tourist dollars 12 months of the year. Ski tourism dollars flow in during a very limited number of weeks, and are solely dependent on frigid weather and natural snowfall. Snowmaking is limited, despite what Gore Mountain claims. The statistics show that the most ski dollars flow in when there is the most natural snow. Facts provided by Gore Mountain. (I'm a former employee.)

North Creek and the entire region are in desperate need of FOUR-SEASON, LOW-COST tourist activities. We must maintain as much free, open to all open space as possible in the North Creek region. We don't have much hiking space in North Creek, yet it is the hamlet in Johnsbury which draws the most tourists. Take Note!

Last fall 2017 ORDA totally rejected the Town of Johnsbury what it reasonably requested. ORDA, when pressed, said it would offer ski tickets to residents, although most Johnsbury residents do not ski at Gore. Thanks, but no thanks.

This LAND GRAB is totally unacceptable to me, a 12-year resident of Johnsbury and a former owner of a business in Johnsbury, and a former member of the Chamber of Commerce.

The trails at Rabbit Pond--this pristine "wild" area--is worth far more to North Creek businesses and to Johnsbury residents than additional Gore Mountain trails and chairlifts, etc.

If Gore and ORDA wanted to acquire this land, they could have cooperated with the Town of Johnsbury last fall 2017. ORDA and Gore chose to ignore Johnsbury residents. But Gore Mountain and ORDA have never considered the needs of the residents of this area.

Judith E. Harper

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A.

(1.I) Julia West, February 7, 2018

I'm writing in regard to the proposed 2018 Gore Mountain UMP/DGEIS Amendments, specifically in reference to the proposed reclassification of the Rabbit Pond Wild Forest Lands to Intensive Use. I am in strong opposition to the "land swap" that is being proposed. A large portion of Wild Forest Land would be added onto Gore for the development of trails, in trade for a much smaller portion near the Gore summit that would become part of the Siamese Ponds Wilderness area.

That small parcel is useless for public use, just as it is not useful for Gore to develop on it. It's a bad trade!

I am an avid backcountry skier, hiker, etc. The trail system near North Creek is unique and special, and many people enjoy the opportunity to ski there. It also gets good use as a hiking trail in summer (I've read the trail registers!).

It would be a shame to lose that to development. Hiking on a developed ski trail is just not fun - it's not the intimate woods experience that hikers want. And skiers would be cut off from some of the best backcountry terrain the southern Adirondacks has to offer.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A.

Additionally, the land proposed to be added to the Siamese Pond Wilderness Area has high natural resource value with its high elevation spruce fir habitat favored by a number of species including Bicknell's thrush.

(1.J) Edward Cunningham, February 9, 2018

I am writing in response to the proposed changes to the Rabbit Pond trail expansion.

I am sure many others have written to express their concern in this matter and they have most definitely expressed it better.

My comment is that the Adirondack Park was designated to protect and preserve this wonderful wilderness we call the ADK.

We must all understand that growth will always adversely effect this wilderness. And I feel that there is a greater need to protect and preserve than to continually expand when I believe current facilities are under utilized.

Reclassifying and developing this land will remove one of the more pristine wilderness areas that may be accessed year round. Not just for a single purpose of skiing.

Also, without complete documentation and maps to outline what will actually be done, I can only strongly speak against this plan.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A including the accompanying mapping.

(1.K) Alison St. Pierre, February 9, 2018

I am writing in response to the proposal by ORDA to reclassify the Rabbit Pond area from Vanderwacker Mountain Forest Preserve to Gore Mountain Intensive Use. I am in disagreement with this proposal, as it will adversely impact a pristine pond and an area of preserve unnecessarily.

Currently Gore has many underutilized areas, such as trails that do not open for most, or all of the season. Before expanding into lands that should remain protected, Gore Mountain should put those resources into the area's currently delegated for this use.

The public should have access to a map clearly outlining the location of proposed areas to be reclassified. Another concern is how would this expansion be staffed? Additional parking, where would this be? I feel Gore must consider expansion within it's current boundaries, expand existing trails, staff and open all trails, and configure trails to travel around the mountain, prior to impacting protected lands, that are precious to maintaining the integrity of the Adirondack Park Preserve.

Thank you for considering the alternate options.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A and accompanying mapping regarding the realignment of a small section of the Rabbit Pond Trail. It is not anticipated that the relocation of Lift 12 and the addition of some small sections of ski trail will result in significant increased demands on staffing or for parking.

(1.L) William Janeway (Adirondack Council), February 9, 2018

The two land reclassifications proposed in this UMP, though conceptual, raise questions over the amount of land requested for re-classification to Intensive Use or Wilderness. Specifically, the 33 acres of proposed Wilderness is insufficient compared to the 159 acres proposed to be classified as Intensive Use. When looking at past land reclassifications, there is a precedent to reclassify or add Wilderness lands to the Forest Preserve at a two to one, or greater, ratio. As a reference point, the NYCO land swap amendment passed with the state suggesting a ratio of seven to one, committing to add 1,500 to 2,000 acres or more of Wilderness to the Forest Preserve in a swap for 200 acres of Wild Forest coming out of the Forest Preserve. As the Council noted at the January 25th public hearing held for Whiteface Mtn. UMP, state land dedicated for Intensive Use should be combined with expanded Wilderness in the same

general area for a net positive for Wilderness. If these reclassifications are pursued in a separate UMP process, a net positive for Wilderness approach should be employed.

Response: The referenced past land reclassifications, including the “NYCO land swap”, involved amendments to the NYS Constitution. No such constitutional amendment is required for the land reclassification suggested in the UMP. The referenced NYCO land swap also involved taking lands out of the Forest Preserve. Under the suggested land reclassification, no lands would be taken out of the Forest Preserve.

(1.M) Rick Morris, Public Hearing Transcript pp. 22-23

The Rabbit Pond Ski Trail gets a lot of use spring, summer, fall and winter. It's an existing trail for quite a while now. And I just think there should be some way to both expand Gore and to protect the existing trail and to protect Rabbit Pond. And that's what I would like to see. And what I have, I have a map here of the proposed expansion of Gore into the Rabbit Pond area and I have a map of the existing trails in the Rabbit Pond area, which I was able to get from North Creek for visitors to North Creek to use. But what I haven't seen, and maybe this is my fault, in the UMP, I haven't seen a map showing both right on the same map and showing how the proposed new development would impact the existing trails. And it seems like, if you're going to put new trails in and have them coexist with existing trails, it would be important to be able to see where they both lie.

Response: See the response (and accompanying mapping) to substantively similar comment 1.A.

(1.N) Dick Carlson, Public Hearing Transcript pp. 25-27

The Village of North Creek has very few hiking opportunities. And I have to discount hiking on ski trails and hiking on wide areas. There's really three main trails. The Schaeffer Trail, the Rabbit Pond Trail and the Raymond Brook Trail. And to, you know, utilize one little bit of added vertical for those trails that come down from the Rabbit Pond area, I think is misguided, especially if it will eliminate the Rabbit Pond Trail from hiking, snowshoeing and skiing in season. It's really a delightful trail. And it's an intimate hiking trail, like a regular trail you would see in the woods where the trees are quite close to you on both sides. So it's an important consideration, as well. And the Hamlets to Hut Initiative is using the Raymond Brook Trail, which is right adjacent to the Rabbit Pond Trail, for their premiere trip, which is supposed to begin this spring. And, also, the North Country National Scenic Trail is also – I think the signs are up already. The Raymond Brook Trail is part of that. And, again, the Rabbit Pond Trail teases into all this and to have that not be available anymore would be, again, I think misguided. The question I had, and I know that Crikelair property is some of the Alpine Trails that are proposed that are already approved. And I'm wondering, is this development on Crikelair's property? Is it Town of Johnsburg? Is it going to be ORDA property? How is that all going to work?

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A regarding the continued use of Rabbit Pond Trail.

The involved areas were shown on Draft UMP/GEIS Figure 2, New Management Actions (North), and are as follows:

- ***Proposed Trail 12-L: currently Wild Forest land connecting to currently Intensive Use land***
- ***Proposed Trail 12-M: currently Wild Forest connecting to currently private land to become Town land***

- ***Proposed Trail 12-A: currently Wild Forest Land***
- ***Proposed Trails 12I-A and 12J-A: currently private land to become Town Land.***

(1.O) Jill Broderick, Public Hearing Transcript pp.27-28

I do have my reservations about the Rabbit Pond reclassification of that land, only because it's sensitive. A lot of people enjoy it just the way it is and I don't think it's -- I'm not sure if it's feasible, so -- I haven't seen the numbers and I don't really understand the realignment of the lift.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A.

(1.P) Scott Robertson, Public Hearing Transcript pp. 28-30

I really hope you guys can move the trail either back to where you originally had it or put in a trail -- I don't really like this idea too much, but if we have to compromise, maybe put in another trail to move around so we don't lose Rabbit Pond. I'd hate to lose this trail. I think it would be a big mistake. What I did, I spent a lot of time using topographical maps and tried to overlay your maps on there to see exactly where the trails went, and it looked to me like we're going to be losing part of the trail. Maybe I'm wrong about that, but if we do the proposal, that's what it looks like to me. And I think that would be a huge mistake.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A regarding the continued use of Rabbit Pond Trail including a section of relocated trail.

(1.Q) Julie West, Public Hearing Transcript p. 30

The summer recreation idea at Little Gore I think is really exciting. And right at Little Gore we have these awesome hiking trails and biking trails, so if you take the portions -- the Rabbit Pond area that the everyone is concerned about and make it a winter area, it kind of takes the glimmer out of the summer recreational opportunities that maybe some of the family could be doing while the others are on the zip lines.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A regarding the continued use of Rabbit Pond Trail.

(1.R) Katy Nightengale, Public Hearing Transcript p. 40

I have concerns about the land swap. I have skied those trails and they are really awesome. And there are already planned trails in existence to come down from the top of the Hudson Chair. I see economic development from both Gore and what they're doing for us at the main mountain and at the Ski Bowl, but I also see what's becoming this huge backcountry draw to ski backcountry. And I hate to lose those backcountry trails to be not accessible anymore for somebody who wants to ski up to ski down.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A regarding the continued use of Rabbit Pond Trail.

(1.S) Peter Bauer (Protect the Adirondacks), Public Hearing Transcript p. 41

We, too, have a lot of concerns about the land swap and the Rabbit Pond tract. We're not sure that's the best way to go and we think there's some major issues that need to be looked at that we'll put in our comments. It has to do with backcountry skiing and it has to do with – we think there's some legal issues there, too, with the land that was designated at the time of the constitutional amendment that wasn't part of it. We're not sure it can be added in. So we think there's some issues to look at with the Rabbit Pond tract.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A regarding the continued use of Rabbit Pond Trail.

It is not clear from the comment what “legal issues” there may be. Rabbit Pond Trail is located on the east flank of Pete Gay Mountain. Article XIV of the NYS Constitution expressly allows for ski trails “on the slopes of Gore and Pete Gay mountains in Warren County”. The attached Figure 5, Mountains Near North Creek, shows Gore Mountain, Pete Gay Mountain and South Mountain.

2. PLANNING FOR GORE MOUNTAIN AND SKI BOWL

(2.A) Gregory Schaeffer February 1, 2018 (via e-mail)

The second concern is that of overall planning:

- Along with the Gore expansion plan, there are already plans afoot to expand hiking/biking trails in the Historic Ski Bowl. How do these fit in?
- The North Country National Scenic Trail now comes through the Bowl. This trail only passes through two towns in the Adirondack Park, and North Creek is one of them. Impact? How do we maximize benefit? How does it fit in?
- There are ongoing plans for Hut to Hut skiing in the area. Impact?
- Raymond Brook BC skiers frequently end their trips in the Ski Bowl on the Connector Trail. Impact?
- A NYS Museum of Skiing is planned for the Bowl. Has this been considered as part of the overall plan?

I have not seen anywhere this nexus of recreational activity addressed as a whole. It is a tremendous opportunity for the Town of Johnsburg and the Greater Gore Mountain Region, but the Gore Mountain UMP must completely address these issues for the benefit of all concerned.

Response: All ORDA improvements in Ski Bowl Park will be constructed in accordance with the 2017 Agreement between the Town of Johnsburg and ORDA, a copy of which is included in Section 4 of Part B of the draft UMP Amendment/GEIS. Other than the short section of Rabbit Pond Trail discussed previously, there does not appear to be any conflicts between the currently proposed ORDA development activities and existing and future Town use of Ski Bowl Park.

(2.B) Richard Carlson, February 6, 2018

The current Hudson (46er) lift has operated sporadically at best during the ski season in the last 10 years and was still not operating for the 2017-2018 season as of this writing. It did operate for a special "History Weekend" last summer as a scenic chairlift ride. It was well received and it could be a cornerstone of Summer Operations - EVEN WITH IT'S EXISTING PLACEMENT and operating constraints



Background image source: USGS 1:24,000
Thirteenth Lake Quadrangle (1954) and
USGS 1:24,000 North Creek Quadrangle (1958)

(ie running slow to accommodate loading/unloading).

There is a network of multiple use and mt. bike trails on adjacent Town of Johnsbury property. These trails need to operate as is - currently free to users and not be disrupted or displaced by future construction and structures like the zip coaster. The land ownership and lease/lessee structure is incredibly confusing with some of the land owned by the Town of Johnsbury leased to Gore/ORDA, and additional land is owned by Front Street and pending swap deals between the Town and Front Street makes even the best map reader confused.

Gore has had a non-existent to poor off-season profile with incredibly abbreviated lift schedules (just 10 days for 2017 Summer season). This in an environment that sees other Ski Areas garnering up to 40% of revenues in the off season. The chief summer entertainment is scenic chairlift or gondola rides with hiking and biking options if available. This poor performance for the last 20 years is even more perplexing with one of the state's largest summer tourist venues just 30 minutes away in Lake George.

Quite frankly Gore's poor off-season activity leaves many workers in seasonal limbo seeking additional summer season employment to dovetail with their employment at Gore or leaving the recreation industry entirely for full time work.

Response: The proposed development activities at the Ski Bowl are geared to greatly enhancing summer visitation. The draft UMP Amendment/GEIS Section 2.B, Purpose and Need, in Part B (page 1) states the following:

“The purpose of the project is to enhance existing recreational opportunities at the Ski Bowl. These enhancements will improve winter recreation. These enhancements, perhaps more importantly, will provide recreational opportunities outside of the ski season.

There is a need for increased economic activity in North Creek outside of the ski season that can be stimulated by increased visitation at the nearby Ski Bowl.”

Furthermore the continuing cooperative commitment to improving recreational opportunities in North Creek is evidenced by the Johnsbury Town Board’s unanimous November 9, 2017 approval of a new Operating Agreement with ORDA for continued development, operation and maintenance of Ski Bowl Town Park facilities for the next 20 years. Included in the Agreement is a condition that ORDA will “make every effort to operate a vibrant year round operation, with a minimum of 100 days of operation at the Ski Bowl Park between the months of June and October”.

(2.C) Julia West, February 7, 2018

The Hudson chair at "Little Gore" is rarely open. We just don't get enough snow. It has not been open yet this year (possibly today because of the snow), and we are well into February. Why does Little Gore need more trails? I don't see that it would attract more people. The development of Burnt Ridge, which opened a lot of terrain at Gore several years ago, doesn't even get a lot of skiers. To create those trails, a massive amount of clearing (and burying the trees) had to be done on some very beautiful land, destroying the original Schaefer trail that allowed for an incredible nature experience for hikers before it was lost.

The North Creek Ski Bowl does NOT need new trails! This land swap is extremely concerning to me- it is a BAD idea! It would be a real shame to lose that beautiful wilderness terrain.

I live in North River; this is my home. Please do not carry through with this land swap. The other improvements to the existing trails at the main mountain are all excellent ideas. Please keep the focus on improving what is already there, not adding more terrain and wasting my taxpayer dollars.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 1.A.

(2.D) Julie West, Public Hearing Transcript p. 30

My other concern is skier numbers here at Little Gore. Do we need more terrain at Little Gore? I just haven't seen the mountain even open that much because of climate change or whatever. We just don't have the terrain or snow for it.

Response: Gore communicates the North Creek Ski Bowl as its "Original Base Camp." Thousands of visitors are there each winter, and it is a critical hub of Gore for parking and ticketing. The Ski Bowl's usage has been growing for both alpine and Nordic users. The 2016/2017 season recorded the highest number of lift days (91) at the Ski Bowl in Gore's history. A Thursday/Friday night youth program there has increased in attendance exponentially. During the two seasons that the Nordic Center has been open, the Ski Bowl is attracting large premier race events and increased visits by 117% year over year.

Additionally, the snowmaking improvements contained in this UMP Amendment will enable Ski Bowl terrain to be open earlier and more frequently

(2.E) Bob Nettle, Public Hearing Transcript pp. 38-39

Now, over at Ski Bowl Park, supposing you're going to manage 30,000 customers from June, when school is out, until say September, and then into the fall period a little bit. Now, how are the infrastructure problems going to be solved? 30,000 people are going to require a very complex and well -- and an excellently designed sewer system. Now, there are three town wells within 200 feet of the base area of the Village slopes and the leg up -- the loading area for the Hudson Trail Lift and the new lift and the whole works. So depositing sewage in the aquifer is probably not going to work. I hope -- I certainly hope that it doesn't work. So that's part of the problem. Also, where are all those people going to park and what are they going to do when they come back off the zip line or the zip coaster or on the mountain coaster. And are they going to go to Joe Minder? Are they going to take a break in the pavilion? But, once again, you're dealing with 30,000 people over the period of three or four months. That's another problem.

Response: The 30,000 customers comes from Part B, Section 6, page 4. This is based on estimated peak use numbers of 400 people per day in the spring, 600 per day in the summer and 500 per day in the fall.

During larger events at the Ski Bowl such as nordic competitions, Waynestock, etc., portable toilets are brought into the Ski Bowl. ORDA plans on bringing portable restroom trailers to the site for guests to use. These trailers will not discharge wastewater on the site.

Adequate parking currently exists at the Ski Bowl to accommodate the projected use. Based on numbers in Part B, Section 6, page 4, item 12, 200 cars and 4 buses are expected on weekdays between the peak hours of 10:00 AM and 4:00 PM. This is an average of 33 cars and <1 bus per hour. On weekends between 10:00 AM and 6:00 PM there will be an average of 38 cars and <1 bus per hour. It is estimated that there are currently +/- 190 parking spaces at the Ski Bowl (Part B, Section 6, page 8).

3. MANAGEMENT ACTIONS AND GOALS

(3.A) Brandon Himhoff, February 6, 2018

I would suggest that ORDA also consider that these capital investments must be accompanied by additional operating spending. By expanding the pumps, Gore will be able to make more snow which of course requires more groomer hours and more support. More lifts and more connectivity mean that more of the mountain can be operating, requiring appropriate staffing. The additional tourists will not only want more and better skiing, but better amenities on the mountain, especially including better and more diverse food offerings. The current food offerings and dining experience are significant detractors to our tourists, and improvements in this area are some of the most necessary but perhaps easiest to address. A change to the current food contractor and exploration of new vendors that are more appropriate to the desired mountain experience and who would be more accountable to ORDA should be considered.

Response: The comment is correct that with expanded pumping capability Gore Mountain will be able to make more snow, especially during the increasingly shorter weather windows that seem to have become all too common during our Adirondack winters. Gore Mountain believes that we will ultimately also see energy cost savings as we can better take advantage of those weather windows.

The need for better mountain amenities are certainly something Gore Mountain is aware of. The newly enlarged Saddle Lodge, the new Straight Brook Lodge and Northwoods Lodge expansion are a step in the right direction and have been well received. We are also currently reviewing plans for some renovation and improvements in the base lodge as well. Customer surveys have echoed this comment about food offerings and dining experience. Gore Mountain is working with our food contractor to make improvements in the current food offerings.

(3.B) Samuel Ferguson, February 9, 2018

Across the country, ski resorts are changing. Lifts are going faster, lodge food is getting better, villages are being developed, and year-round attractions are being built. These changes have helped the ski industry adapt to climate change and maintain corporate profits. As you consider how to develop the Adirondack resorts, I encourage you to also ask the question of to what extent should these resorts be developed. Governor Cuomo announced a vast and expensive expansion plan for Whiteface, Gore, and Mt. Van Hoevenberg, and some of these changes, such as updates to base lodge facilities, are long since overdue. Other amenities, however, seem to be unnecessary expansions that have no place within the Adirondacks.

The Adirondack resorts are unique because they are state-owned facilities focused on serving New York residents. They are not private corporations solely focused on increasing profits. In the winter, these resorts attract millions of visitors and are an important part of the Adirondack experience.

However, in the summer, these resorts play a secondary role as people come from all over to hike the High Peaks and conquer the 46ers. When considering future developments, it is important that the developments are not seen as an addition to the individual resorts, but as added amenities to Adirondack Park as a whole. Route 73 is already overburdened during the summer months, and adding summer attractions to these ski resorts would increase the strain on the already existent infrastructure.

Specifically, I urge ORDA to consider how the proposed 'mountain coaster' fits within the culture of the Adirondacks. The Whiteface Mountain Unit Management Plan states that "Whiteface development will blend with the Adirondack environment and have minimum adverse impacts on surrounding state lands." The metal track of a mountain coaster would not blend into the Adirondack environment, but instead it would stick out like a sore thumb. The Adirondack environment, and especially publicly owned land, is fundamentally made up of wilderness. Constitutional exceptions already had to be made in order to allow ski resort infrastructure, and adding a mountain coaster would further contradict the 'forever wild' promise. A mountain coaster is a tamed and controlled way to experience nature. Riders would not be exposed to the real Adirondack wilderness, but instead they would glimpse nature from a man-made metal track. Outdoor recreation is an important part of the Adirondacks, but a mountain coaster is something that belongs in an amusement park, not the Adirondack wilderness.

All this is not to say that Whiteface, Gore, and Van Hoevenberg should ignore profits, but instead of adding unnecessary infrastructure, they should focus on thriving within their ski industry niche. As other resorts continue to develop, Adirondack resorts should fall back on their skiing roots. They are located in a protected wilderness area that will never have the storefronts and commercial villages of Vail and Jackson Hole, yet the ski mountains themselves offer some of the best terrain east of the Mississippi. While a mountain coaster offers tempting profits, I urge you to embrace the ski culture that already exists at these mountains. Keep them as wild mountains nestled in the middle of the Adirondacks, and people will continue to come and enjoy these resorts for what they are—ski resorts where skiing comes first.

Response: Proposed activities at Gore Mountain will not impact NYS Route 73.

There is no mountain coaster proposed.

The proposed zip coaster is proposed in the North Creek Ski Bowl and not on NYS Forest Preserve land.

(3.C) Jill Broderick, Public Hearing Transcript p. 28

If I may suggest adding to the master plan goals, I would include to improve and enhance the economy for the host benefit community of the Town of Johnsburg, and to improve the health and wellness for the residents by making recreational activities affordable and accessible.

Response: The Management Goals and Objectives contained in section III.C of the draft UMP Amendment/GEIS include the following (emphasis added):

Gore Mountain will seek to modernize facilities at Gore in order to enhance the guest experience, improve skier safety, and increase local and regional economic benefits, while maintaining environmental quality.

Gore Mountain will work closely with the North Creek community and Town of Johnsbury to provide information to visitors about the area and to cooperate in the establishment of a shuttle link between the Ski Center and North Creek and a physical ski link to Ski Bowl Park in order that public use may better help promote the economy of the area.

Other local benefits that are included in the 2017 twenty-year ORDA-Town Agreement include the following:

- *ORDA will provide a full season pass for skiing privileges for all students from the Johnsbury Central School or residing in the Town of Johnsbury.*
- *ORDA will also sponsor six tickets for each resident good for winter or summer.*
- *ORDA will assist with finding grants and funding, provide free access one day per week for the Johnsbury Youth Program, and develop a sliding hill.*
- *ORDA will own and operate the Joe Minder Lodge and lease it for \$1 to the Johnsbury Youth Commission between May and October.*
- *ORDA will also include the Town of Johnsbury in marketing and advertising initiatives.*
- *Individual businesses within the Town of Johnsbury will receive a discounted opportunity to market and purchase advertising in ORDA publications.*
- *ORDA will add a feature to its website that portrays the Town of Johnsbury as an authentic ski town.*

(3.D) Kelly Nessel, Public Hearing Transcript pp. 31-32

The Town of Johnsbury has received money from the State of New York for a design of trails that leaves from Ski Bowl Park and goes up through to North River and then goes to other parts of the town. And that work is probably going to be starting sometime this year. And what I worry about is a collision between the interests of Gore Mountain and their summer activities and the interests of the Town of Johnsbury with their hiking trails and their biking trails. And I don't want the public that's been coming already from Schenectady and Vermont and everything else coming up here to bike, all of the sudden they can't go on trails that we're making because they are going to be charged. And I don't know if that's in the plans or not, but that would be my concern.

Response: ORDA does not have the authority to charge a fee for recreational uses on facilities that they do not control. There would be no day use fees for public trails entering and leaving the Ski Bowl.

(3.E) Brandon Himhoff, Public Hearing Transcript pp. 33-34

One of the key issues of the mountain is the connectivity of this side of the mountain here and getting to Burnt Ridge, and then using Burnt Ridge maybe as the key to getting down the mountain to the Ski Bowl. The new route really helps a lot, I think, to connect Burnt Ridge back to the main part of the mountain -- or historically the larger part of the mountain. And I wonder if maybe we can address solutions to get to the other side, because I don't think you really increase the skier numbers if the mountain is sort of disjointed. And I think that there's a sort of design issue. I mean, the mountain sort of is as it is. We just need to make trails to connect A to B. And it seems that, unless you kind of create some kind of tunnel

going under the races going on at Echo all the time and Twister, which I guess those are certified as race courses and so there's not a whole lot you can do about that, but you still have to get people from one side to the other. I wonder if you could address how the plan can sort of make that happen.

Response: Connectivity from the central part of Gore Mountain to Burnt Ridge and the Ski Bowl already exists, constructed over the last several years as part of a significant improvement effort to re-establish and bolster the connection to the Ski Bowl. Trail connections from the central part of Gore Mountain to Burnt Ridge are available in three general locations. The first is via Twister, over to Echo, then to The Gully and Cedar's Traverse to the base of Burnt Ridge. This is possibly the easiest route from a user's standpoint. However, as noted in the comment, sometimes this route is not available due to ski racing on Twister and/or Echo. A tunnel or a ski bridge to cross over these trails when racing is happening is not a practical alternative. The second route is from the base area to Burnt Ridge via Cedar's Traverse, which is available during days where racing occurs on Twister and Echo. The third route is available from the upper part of Gore Mountain down the North Side via Pipeline Traverse. From the Pipeline trail one can connect to either Burnt Ridge or the Ski Bowl. Given the existing terrain, landform and configuration of the mountain, these are the most viable locations for suitable trail connections from central Gore to Burnt Ridge. Access from the top of Burnt Ridge to the Ski Bowl is currently available via Hedges, then to Pipeline and Peaceful Valley. An additional future ski trail connection is already approved in the vicinity of the Barkeater glade. When constructed, this trail will provide more direct access to the Ski Bowl from Burnt Ridge.

(3.F) Brandon Himhoff, Public Hearing Transcript p. 35

To really attract tourists, you need a little more variety and high-class cuisine, and it's hard to do that under the current state contracts. And I just wonder if that could be addressed somehow.

Response: There is a trend in the ski industry of offering more upscale food options. ORDA regularly renews its concessionaire contracts, including food services. See the response to substantively similar comment 3.A.

(3.G) Brandon Himhoff, Public Hearing Transcript pp. 35-36

I also just wonder about the time frame of all these plans. There's about 20 years worth of projects probably in that Unit Management Plan and I was wondering if someone can sort of vaguely give their impressions of which things are more of an urgent priority and which things are longer term priorities.

Response: See draft UMP Amendment/GEIS section IV.D, Prioritization of Management Actions (p. IV-11), which lists top, moderate and lower priority management actions.

(3.H) Bob Nessle, Public Hearing Transcript pp. 36-37

I like the idea of the escape route off the top of Burnt Ridge. But how are you going to get over that the rock wall that separates Sagamore and Echo? You're going to blast a tunnel through there? How are you going to get out?

Response: The proposed new trail can start a little ways down the Sagamore trail and get around the rock wall referenced. The bottom of the new trail would merge with the last few hundred feet of the Echo trail and continue into the base area. The proposed new trail also shows a slight widening of the

bottom of the Echo trail on skiers right to allow for this trail merger and to accommodate both public skiers on the new trail and still allow for events on Echo.

(3.I) Peter Bauer (Protect the Adirondacks), Public Hearing Transcript pp. 41-42

We think the scheduling is important. A lot of the unit management plans for forest preserve tracts that enumerate a bunch of different activities schedule them in five-year plans. ORDA hasn't always done that with detail. DEC's always done that with its unit management plans and that would be very helpful.

Response: Most DEC UMP's do not include management actions that require the level of capital expenditures required for many of the management actions undertaken at Gore Mountain such as new ski lifts, major building renovations/expansions, etc. The capital expenditures mean that implementation of management actions at Gore, and at other ORDA venues, is dependent on funding from the NYS budget. For this reason, it is difficult to project an implementation schedule. However, per the response above, proposed management actions were prioritized in the draft UMP Amendment/GEIS.

4. CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS

(4.A) William Janeway (Adirondack Council), February 9, 2018

Based on the trail mileage information provided within the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement, Gore Mtn. is well within its constitutionally allotted 40 miles of trail limit. The Council requests that ORDA clearly outline how it arrived at the listed 32.9 miles of total mileage within this UMP.

Response: An accounting of miles is provided on Table 1A in the draft UMP Amendment/GEIS. The methodologies used to calculate mileage is provided in Appendix 5 (Sections 2.0 and 3.2).

(4.B) William Janeway (Adirondack Council), February 9, 2018

- Compliance with Forever Wild: The facilities on state lands must comply with the strict and not always convenient requirements of the "Forever Wild" clause of the constitution. These requirements include: constitutional amendments that provide for functions and facilities at Whiteface and Gore that would not otherwise be allowed; adherence to the tightly restricted total miles and widths of downhill ski trails; and, no new tree cutting, clearing, disturbance, or expansion to year-round activities beyond what is now allowed without a constitutional amendment. (Under the constitution, all uses must be winter recreation based.)

Response: See the substantively similar comment 4.A and the response thereto.

(4.C) Peter Bauer (Protect the Adirondacks), Public Hearing Transcript p. 42-43

We also would like to see better detail about the amount of acreage here at Gore, and also at White Face, but here at Gore, that has been used pursuant to the constitutional amendment that was approved, because we think you're getting very close to your clearing limits. We would like to see a real good accounting of the methodology that ORDA is using about the cleared areas, the cleared acreage of

trails, the width of trails and that sort of thing. We've been looking at it independently and we think that you're getting very close to your limits. So I think that's something you need to be very mindful about, so we would like to see a really good accounting of that. That's not really a unit management plan issue, but we think it's an important issue going ahead because it affects your trail upgrades and your trails.

Response: See the response to substantively similar comment 4.A.

5. REGIONAL PLANNING

(5.A) William Janeway (Adirondack Council), February 9, 2018

- Planning Sensitive to other Regional Adirondack Needs: The state lands and operations at Whiteface Mtn. are part of a larger network of state lands, recreational uses, trails, and trailheads within the very popular High Peaks region. As the state looks at making important upgrades to the ORDA facilities, and simultaneously develops plans to manage the overuse of the Rt. 73 corridor and the High Peaks, planning needs to be coordinated. For example, one element of overlap could be relocation of parking for the Cascade and Porter Mountains on popular weekends to the Mt. Van Hoevenberg complex, as was done on an experimental basis on Columbus Day weekend in 2017.

Response: All ORDA UMP's for their Adirondack venues are prepared in consultation with NYS DEC and in cooperation with NYS APA. This ensures that proper consideration is given to regional planning issues during the preparation of ORDA venue UMP's.

6. RENEWABLE ENERGY

(6.A) William Janeway (Adirondack Council), February 9, 2018

- Climate Smart, Energy Smart Models: Climate change threatens to redefine Adirondack winter recreation as we now know it. The ORDA facilities can and should combat climate change and be showcases for visitors from across the country and around the world for the latest and best in climate smart renewable energy practices. The facilities should support the Governor's renewable energy goals and comply with Adirondack Park Agency policies.

Response: See section X of the draft UMP Amendment/GEIS, Effects on the Use and Conservation of Energy, which states in part:

"Gore is contracting two 25-year solar power purchase agreements, which combine into a massive 5.325 MW system. Using remote net metering, 85% of Gore's electrical is poised to be offset. In cooperation with Borrego Solar, Gore Mountain is efficiently harvesting sunlight for its energy needs, utilizing 14,589 ground-mounted solar panels across 20 acres of otherwise fallow farmland. The electricity generated credits Gore's meter at a rate higher than power that is traditionally produced, while providing a cleaner, more sustainable source of energy to its electric distribution zone. The agreement is projected to save Gore Mountain approximately \$10 million over the life of the contract, while offsetting 113,919 tons of carbon dioxide, 71,634 pounds of nitrogen oxide emissions, and 131,835 pounds of sulfur. Gore's purchase agreement received support from Governor Cuomo's NY-Sun incentive through the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA)."

7. PROJECT SUPPORT

(7.A) Sterling and Susan Goodspeed, January 24, 2018

We will be unable to attend tonight's public hearing due to a scheduling conflict but wanted to write to you to express our strongest possible support for the ORDA summer operation at the Ski Bowl. Between the two of us, dating back to 1991, we have operated four businesses within the North Creek area. These include a law firm, a newspaper, a grocery store and a laundromat. We are well aware of both the potential our region offers and the challenges doing business here can present.

ORDA's commitment to a summer operation builds on the growing partnership between the Authority, Town government and local businesses. Creating this venue during the summer season will add new vitality to our existing businesses and will likely attract other businesses to open shop. The proposal also builds off the important heritage that the Ski Bowl and North Creek have always shared with regards to the ski industry. It is fitting that summer operation at the Ski Bowl should provide such a crucial element of our long sought goal to become a four season destination community. The project also marks a welcome commitment to permit an ORDA operation on the edge of our Main Street business district and builds on the significance of the interconnect of the mountains completed several years ago.

Response: Comment is noted, no response is required.

(7.B) Brandon Himhoff, February 6, 2018

As a member of the public, a regional business owner, and a member of our local business organizations, I applaud the strong effort that ORDA is making to keep these valuable assets in terrific condition. As times change, these facilities need to adapt and maintain their attraction. Looking carefully at these plans, I feel that they will significantly improve the potential of Gore to attract tourists. Any revenue brought in to the mountain will be accompanied by a significant multiplier in local spending, boosting and supporting many other local businesses and thereby expanding our local employment base. Especially critical are the season expanders such as the improvements in the ski bowl.

Response: Comment is noted, no response is required.

(7.C) William Janeway (Adirondack Council), February 9, 2018

In closing, the Adirondack Council supports legal improvements to ORDA facilities and programs that comply with the constitution, the law and the legal protections which are what keep the Adirondacks a national treasure, a legacy we've inherited, and hold in trust for future generations.

Response: Comment is noted, no response is required.

Appendix 13
Errata – Narrative Summary of Changes Made
to the DGEIS in the FGEIS

Errata – Narrative Summary of Changes Made to the DGEIS in the FGEIS

1. The executive summary and section I.E have both been supplemented with descriptions of the additional steps taken in the SEQRA process following the issuance of the Public Draft UMP/DGEIS and leading up to the issuance of this Proposed Final UMP/FGEIS.
2. Section IV.A.8 has been changed to better describe how a new ski trail located in the area of proposed land exchange adjacent to Ski Bowl Park could affect the existing Rabbit Pond Trail. Mapping (figures 27A, 27B, 27C and 27D) is also provided that shows the Rabbit Pond Ski trail history, location and how a +/- 600 feet section of the trail could be rerouted to accommodate the new ski trail while at the same time maintaining the character of the Rabbit Pond Ski Trail and preserving its use for hiking and for backcountry skiing.
3. The following appendices have been added; Appendix 10 DGEIS Public Hearing Transcript, Appendix 11 DGEIS Written Public Comments, Appendix 12 DGEIS Comments and Responses to Comments, Appendix 13 Errata – Narrative Summary of Changes Made to the DGEIS in the FGEIS.