EXHIBIT A

Location Map
EXHIBIT B

Management Accomplishment Summary for Cary State Forest
FY 2000-2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FY 00/01</th>
<th>FY 01/02</th>
<th>FY 02/03</th>
<th>FY 03/04</th>
<th>FY 04/05</th>
<th>FY 05/06</th>
<th>FY 06/07</th>
<th>FY 07/08</th>
<th>FY 08/09</th>
<th>FY 09/10</th>
<th>FY 10/11</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reforestation &amp; TSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site preparation (Ac/Method)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chopping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbicide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120/ Aerial*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102/ Aerial*</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforestation (Ac/Species)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60/L 36/L 64/S 221/L 408/S</td>
<td>0 317/L 542/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI-Mechanical (Ac/Method)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65/Mow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42/PMT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65/Mow 36 PMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI-Herbicide (Ac/Method)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75/ Aerial*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire (No./Ac)</td>
<td>1/0.1</td>
<td>1/0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>4 / 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Fire (Ac/Season)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>408/D</td>
<td>1,115/D</td>
<td>443/D</td>
<td>763/D</td>
<td>1,081/D</td>
<td>426/D</td>
<td>642/D</td>
<td>1,632/D</td>
<td>1,428/D</td>
<td>317/D</td>
<td>8,255/D 789/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireline Maint./Installation (Miles)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marked/Maintained (Miles)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Harvests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Sales (No./Ac)</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>1/72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/95</td>
<td>1/195</td>
<td>1/113</td>
<td>2/473</td>
<td>10/1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulpwood Sold (Tons)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>4,984</td>
<td>6,586</td>
<td>23,584</td>
<td>46,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip &amp; Saw Sold (Tons)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>8,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw timber Sold (Tons)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasives Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Treated</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads Maintained/Rebuilt (Mi)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culverts Installed Replaced (No.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWC &amp; Bridges (B) Rebuilt/Installed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 LWC 1 B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 LWC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 LWC 1 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails Maintained or Restored (Miles)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>FY 00/01</td>
<td>FY 01/02</td>
<td>FY 02/03</td>
<td>FY 03/04</td>
<td>FY 04/05</td>
<td>FY 05/06</td>
<td>FY 06/07</td>
<td>FY 07/08</td>
<td>FY 08/09</td>
<td>FY 09/10</td>
<td>FY 10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Visitor Use</td>
<td>Day Use (No. Visitors)</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>3,338</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>10,094</td>
<td>11,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camping (No. Visitors)</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Programs and Articles</td>
<td>14/-</td>
<td>21/862</td>
<td>11/-</td>
<td>12/1,078</td>
<td>17/797</td>
<td>10/290</td>
<td>4/-</td>
<td>4/-</td>
<td>10/-</td>
<td>8/153</td>
<td>8/550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(No. / No. Visitors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Timber Sales ($/year)</td>
<td>$8,312</td>
<td>$857</td>
<td>$8,525</td>
<td>$58,536</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$67,457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$75,192</td>
<td>$76,076</td>
<td>$129,335</td>
<td>$433,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day Use Fees (Net $/year)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$354</td>
<td>$551</td>
<td>$698</td>
<td>$597</td>
<td>$562</td>
<td>$512</td>
<td>$644</td>
<td>$876</td>
<td>$1,365</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primitive Camping Fees (Net $/year)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$403</td>
<td>$443</td>
<td>$679</td>
<td>$371</td>
<td>$568</td>
<td>$1,121</td>
<td>$1,057</td>
<td>$1,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B = Bridge  
D = Dormant season (November-February)  
G = Growing season (March – October)  
LWC = Low water crossing  
L = Longleaf pine (*Pinus palustris*)  
S = Slash pine (*Pinus elliottii*)  
PMT = Pre-merchantable thinning  
TSI = Timber stand improvement  
- = not tracked  
* = Aerial helicopter application of Velpar ULW herbicide  

**Note:** Revenue figures are in thousands of dollars.
EXHIBIT D

Management Prospectus
Northeast Florida Timberlands and Watershed Reserve

Duval, Nassau and Clay Counties

Purpose for State Acquisition
Public acquisition of this project will contribute to the following Florida Forever goals: (1) Increase the protection of Florida’s biodiversity at the species, natural community, and landscape levels – known to harbor four FNAI-listed species of vascular flora and four rare animals; (2) Increase the amount of open space available in urban areas – conserve spaces suitable for greenways or outdoor recreation that are compatible with conservation purposes; (3) Increase natural resource-based public recreation and educational opportunities – camping, picnicking, nature appreciation, hiking, and horseback riding are possible; and (4) Protect, restore, and maintain the quality and natural functions of land, water, and wetland systems of the state – 75-80% of land is disturbed with restoration a primary objective.

Manager
Division of Forestry (DOF) of the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. The City of Jacksonville is manager for the 172-acre Jacksonville-Baldwin Rail Trail.

General Description
This project describes a northeast-southwest diagonal along the west side of Duval County, stretching from the Nassau River north of Jacksonville to Trail Ridge in Clay County, near the town of Lawtey. Another section of the project makes a north-south connection about 12 miles long, between the Camp Blanding Military Reservation and the Etoniah Creek State Forest. About 75 percent of this land is used, or has been used, for silviculture. It also includes mesic flatwoods, cypress and hardwood swamp, sandhills and associated plant communities.

Public Use
The Division of Forestry will promote recreation and environmental education in the natural environment. There is a possibility of an intermediate and long-term need for some type of developed recreation facilities. If such facilities are developed, the use of low-impact, rustic facilities will be stressed. If an organized recreation area is desired, it will be assessed and evaluated to minimize any possible adverse effects on the natural environment. Unnecessary roads, firelines and hydrological disturbances will be abandoned and/or restored to the greatest extent practical.

Acquisition Planning
On December 6, 2001, the Acquisition & Restoration Council (ARC) added the Northeast Florida Timberlands and Watershed Reserve project to Group A of the Florida Forever (FF) 2001 Priority list. This fee-simple and less-than-fee acquisition, located in Clay, Duval and Nassau counties, and sponsored by the Nature Conservancy (TNC), the City of Jacksonville and St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD), consisted of approximately 132,450 acres, more than 150 landowners, and a 2001 taxable value of $50,158,195.

Placed on List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Area (acres)</th>
<th>146,164</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres Acquired</td>
<td>60,091*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Cost of</td>
<td>$141,069,450*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Remaining</td>
<td>86,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Estimated (tax assessed) Value of</td>
<td>$30,705,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes acreage and expenditures by the City of Jacksonville, JEA and SJRWMD.
The following 37 ownerships were identified as essential: Gilman, Jackson, Carter, Owen, Nemours, Miller, Bostwick, Klieg, Bullock, 1st Bank & Trust, Rayonier, International Paper, Motes, Boyd, South Regional Industrial Realty, East Fiftone Partners, Monticello Drugs, St. Joe, Barnett Bank Trustee, Anheuser-Busch, Inc., Travelers Ins., Foster, Tison, Castleton, Wright, Buck, Logan, Higgenbotham, Betz, Ogilvie, Milne, Kaleel & Roberts, Grey, Sythe, Pharr, Wilkinson, and Helmer.

On June 6, 2003, the ARC approved a 506-acre addition, known as the Norfolk Southern property, to the project boundary in Duval County. The fee-simple acquisition, sponsored by TNC, consisted of a single owner, Southern Region Industrial Realty Inc., and had a 2002 taxable value of $408,700.

On December 5, 2003, the ARC approved a 7,043-acre addition, known as the Four Creeks Forest tract, to the project boundary in Nassau County. The fee-simple acquisition, sponsored by the SJRWMD, consisted of one landowner, Rayonier Timberlands Operating Co. LP, and had a 2002 taxable value of $1,478,838.

On December 3, 2004, the ARC approved a 3,500-acre addition, known as the Bull Creek tract, to the project boundary in Clay County. The fee-simple acquisition, sponsored by the SJRWMD, consisted of one landowner, Ventura LLC, and had a taxable value of $760,646.

On June 30, 2006, the Board of Trustees purchased 1,651 acres within the Florida Forever project boundary.

On February 16, 2007, the ARC approved a fee-simple, 2,665-acre addition to the Bull Creek portion of the project boundary. It was sponsored by the SJRWMD, consisted of one landowner, 1621 Venture II LLC, nine parcels, and a taxable value of $445,189. The Division of Forestry will manage these essential parcels.

In 1992 the 172-acre Jacksonville-Baldwin Rail Trail was acquired with Florida Greenways & Trails funds. This is managed by the City of Jacksonville.

**Coordination**

The SJRWMD is an acquisition partner in areas of the project to help protect the multiple creeks and rivers. The National Guard Bureau through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is an acquisition partner in areas of the project to help buffer and prevent encroachment of Camp Blanding. TNC, City of Jacksonville, duval County, FCT, and the U.S. Navy are considered partners on this project.

**Management Policy Statement**

The Division of Forestry proposes to manage the project under a multiple-use management regime consistent with the DOF management of the Cary State Forest, the Jennings State Forest and the Cecil Field Conservation Corridor, all of which are adjacent to this project. The acquisition goals and objectives as approved by ARC would include timber management and restoration, low-impact diverse recreation uses, and management of archeological and historic sites, habitat and other biological resources.

**Management Prospectus**

**Qualifications for state designation**

The project’s size and diversity makes it desirable for use and management as a state forest. Management by the Division of Forestry as a state forest is contingent on acquiring fee-simple title to the core parcels adjacent to the existing state forests and to approximately 60 percent of the project. **Manager** DOF is recommended to be the lead managing agency.

**Conditions affecting intensity of management**

Much of the parcel has been disturbed by past pine plantings and will require restoration work. This area of Florida is experiencing rapid urban growth, so that any prescribed burning to restore the forest will have to be carefully planned. The level of management and the related management costs are expected to initially be high to obtain necessary information to restore and manage portions as a state forest. It is recognized that a portion of the project will be less-than-fee simple. This technique is valuable on the fringes of urban growth because it allows the landowners to manage the property as they have been managing it, and continuing to produce forest products for Florida’s economy, while protecting the property from conversion to urban growth. **Timetable for implementing management, and provisions for security and protection of infrastructure**

Once the core areas of the project are acquired and assigned to the Division of Forestry, initial public access will be provided for diverse, low-intensity outdoor recreation activities. Initial and intermediate management efforts will concentrate on site security, public and resource management access, prescribed burns, reforestation, and restoration activity.
Revenue-generating potential  Timber sales will be conducted as needed to improve or to maintain the desirable ecosystem conditions. These sales will primarily take place in the marketable pine stands and will provide a variable source of revenue, depending on a variety of factors. The existing condition of the timber stands on the property is such that the revenue-generating potential is expected to be moderate. Other compatible state forest sources of income will be considered.

Cooperators in management activities  The Division of Forestry will cooperate with, and seek the assistance of, other state agencies, local government agencies, other interested parties as appropriate, and with the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI). The Division intends to coordinate with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) regarding game and non-game management activity and related public use of the property.

Management costs and sources of revenue  It is anticipated that management funding will come from the Conservation and Recreation Lands Trust Fund. Budget needs for interim management are estimated as follows:

Management Cost Summary/FWC (including salaries for 4 full-time employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary (4 FTEs)</td>
<td>$154,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$148,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$887,007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baldwin Bay/St. Marys River
Duval and Nassau Counties

Purpose for State Acquisition
The 9,500 acres of the Baldwin Bay/St. Marys River project would preserve relatively intact forests and flatwoods of older growth trees. This project would also assist in the development of an ecological connector between Cary State Forest and Jennings State Forest, and provide a corridor from the Northeast Florida Timberlands and Watershed Reserve Florida Forever project to the St. Marys River. The proposal will connect to the Jacksonville-Baldwin Rail Trail, and will increase the recreational opportunities for all trail users. The Jacksonville-Baldwin Rail Trail connection occurs in an area where the City of Jacksonville is developing its primary equestrian facility access point.

Manager
The Division of Forestry proposes to manage the project with a multiple use management regime consistent with the state forest system. Management would be designed to accomplish the goals and measures for this project.

General Description
The Baldwin Bay/St. Marys River project is located in Nassau and Duval counties and is approximately 9,500 acres in size. The proposal is characterized by its bottomland forests and wet flatwoods that contain numerous older growth trees. These communities exhibit high species diversity and should provide habitat for numerous rare plant and animal species. Portions of the property have been converted to pine plantation but several of these areas have intact ground cover. The project borders Cary State Forest and the Northeast Florida Timberlands and Watershed Reserve Florida Forever project. The evaluation team visited the site on September 10, 2002.

Public Use
If public access of and through these properties is acquired, the project has potential for a variety of forest related recreational activities. Access to the St. Marys River could allow activities such as canoeing, swimming, bird watching, environmental education, nature study and photography.

Due to the connectivity with the Northeast Florida Timberlands and Watershed Reserve Florida Forever project and Cary State Forest, this project contributes to governmental efforts to protect and restore the regional land and water resources.

The project, as proposed, has potential for diverse forms of resource-based recreation. For those areas that would be acquired in fee title, the project can accommodate such activities as hiking, natural resource appreciation and education, picnicking, camping, bicycling and horseback riding. Depending on management emphasis, hunting is also supportable. For lands that might be acquired in less-than-fee, the degree of public use would be dependent on the willingness of the landowner to allow public access.

The general resource-based recreation potential for the project is considered low to moderate, depending on the extent of fee title acquisition. Hunting potential is considered medium to high.

Acquisition Planning
The Baldwin Bay/St. Marys River project was added to the 2003 Florida Forever project list at the December 5, 2002 meeting of the

Placed on List 2002
Project Area (Acres) 9,500
Acres Acquired 0
at a Cost of $0
Acres Remaining 9,500
with Estimated (Tax Assessed) Value of $3,587,753

Baldwin Bay/St. Marys River
FNAI Elements
Ciliate-leafe Tickseed 1
G1G2/S1
1 rare species is associated with the project
The essential parcels are identified as the Baldwin Bay LLC, Brandy Branch LLC, International Paper, and International Paper Realty ownerships. The essential parcels should be mapped and appraised before the other parcels, which are important, but not critical to the project as a whole.

On December 8, 2006, ARC approved moving the project from Group B to Group A of the Florida Forever (FF) Priority list.

**Coordination**

Portions of this project may be acquired in partnership with Duval County. The St. Johns River Water Management District is also interested in acquisition of the project.

**Management Policy Statement**

The primary land management goal for the Division of Forestry is to restore, maintain and protect all native ecosystems in perpetuity; to integrate compatible human use; and to insure long-term viability of populations and species considered rare. This ecosystem approach will guide the Division of Forestry’s management activities on this project.

**Management Prospectus**

**Qualifications for State Designation** Based upon a review of the Florida Forever Act, this project meets the following Goals and Measures, as outlined in Statute, for significant landscapes, for increasing natural-resource based recreation, and for restoring such natural functions as protection of the floodplain, surface waters, and functional wetland systems. This project also has a great prospect for sustainable forestry.

**Manager** The Division of Forestry proposes to manage the project under a multiple use management regime consistent with the state forest system. Management would be designed to accomplish the goals and measures for this project.

**Conditions affecting intensity of management** There are major restoration challenges that will need to be addressed if the Baldwin Bay/St. Marys River proposal is purchased. The entire site is affected by logging roads and ditches that have impacted hydrology. The decreased hydroperiod has allowed exotic and upland species to encroach into wetlands, particularly in the areas around Baldwin Bay and in the wet flatwoods and dome swamps that are surrounded by pine plantations. To restore normal hydrology, ditches will need to be filled and plugged and roads closed and lowered to grade.

Much of this site (59 percent) has been converted to intensive silviculture. Recent clearcuts and slash piles mar the landscape. Intensive site prep activities such as roller chopping and bedding have severely disturbed the ground vegetation and soils. Fire suppression has led to woody species encroachment and deep needle litter build-up in the understories of some of the pine plantations.

Invasive exotic plant and animals were documented on the Baldwin Bay/St. Marys River site, but if measures are taken soon, these invasives can be controlled with reasonable effort. Chinese tallow tree (*Sapium sebiferum*), Japanese climbing fern (*Lygodium japonicum*), and Cogon grass (*Imperata cylindrica*) were observed. There were also numerous signs of feral hog digging within the site.

**Timetable for implementing management, and provisions for security and protection of infrastructure**

Once the project area is acquired and assigned to the Division of Forestry, public access will be provided for low intensity outdoor recreation activities. The Division of Forestry proposes to manage the site as a part of Cary State Forest, and the Jacksonville District personnel will carry out management activities and coordinate public access and use.

**Revenue-generating potential** As mentioned above, timber sales will be conducted as needed to improve or maintain desirable ecosystem conditions. These sales will primarily take place in pine stands and will provide a variable source of revenue dependent upon a variety of factors. Due to the existing condition of the timber resource on the property, revenue generating potential of this project is expected to be low-medium.

**Management costs and sources of revenue** It is anticipated that management funding will come from the CARL trust fund. Budget needs for interim management are estimated as follows:

| SALARY (X FTE) | $231,839 |
| EXPENSE       | $140,000 |
| OPERATING CAPITAL OUTLAY | $354,600 |
| TOTAL         | $ 726,439 |
EXHIBIT E

Optimal Management Boundary
EXHIBIT F

Compliance with Local Comprehensive Plan
December 12, 2011

Corinne Hermle, Land Planning Specialist
Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
Florid Forest Service
3125 Conner Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1650


Ms. Hermle,

Thank you for contacting the City of Jacksonville Planning and Development Department. This letter is in response to your letter dated December 2, 2011 requesting confirmation of the consistency of the draft Ten-Year Resource Management Plan for the Cary State Forest with the City of Jacksonville’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

The draft document is consistent with the City of Jacksonville’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan including the following goals and objectives:

**Future Land Use Element Goal 1**
To ensure that the character and location of land uses optimize the combined potentials for economic benefit and enjoyment and protection of natural resources, while minimizing the threat to health, safety and welfare posed by hazards, nuisances, incompatible land uses and environmental degradation.

**Future Land Use Element Goal 2**
To enhance and preserve for future generations geographic areas with unique economic, social, historic or natural resource significance to the City.

**Conservation Coastal Management Element Goal 1**
Protect, conserve and appropriately manage the natural resources of the City in order to maintain or enhance environmental quality for present and future generations.

**Conservation Coastal Management Element Objective 3.5**
Protect and manage endangered and threatened species and species of special concern so there is no reduction in numbers of species that are found in the City and no significant loss of population size.
Thank you for inquiring with the City of Jacksonville. Please let me know if I may be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Kristen D. Reed
Kristen Reed, AICP
City Planner Supervisor
Community Planning Division
December 19, 2011

Attn: Corinne Hermle
Florida Department of Agriculture
Consumer Services
3125 Conner Boulevard
Tallahassee, Fl 32399-1650

RE: Cary State Forest Ten-Year Resource Management Plan

Ms. Hermle,

Nassau County Growth Management has reviewed the Cary State Forest Ten-Year Resource Management Plan for consistency with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Nassau County Comprehensive Plan. With a vested interest in Nassau County we recognize the outstanding economic, environmental, and recreational opportunity the Cary State Forest represents for the citizens of Nassau County and the State of Florida.

The proposed management plan details the utilization of sustainable forestry practices to ensure the health and longevity of the ecosystem as well as the responsible production of timber, the restoration and preservation of natural areas, invaluable watershed protection, and year-round recreational opportunities. A Staff review concludes the Ten-Year Resource Management Plan for the Cary State Forest is not contradictory to the Goals, Objectives, or Policies of the Nassau County Comprehensive Plan.

If this office can be of further assistance do not hesitate to call. If I am unavailable Peter King, Interim Planning Director, can respond in my absences.

Sincerely,

[Taco Pope]
Planner II
Nassau County Growth Management
96161 Nassau Place
Yulee, Fl 32097
office(904)491-7328
fax(904)491-3611
tpope@nassaucountyfl.com
EXHIBIT G

Land Management Review(s)
Land Management Review of Cary State Forest

Nassau County (Lease No. 3687): April 16, 2002

Prepared by Division of State Lands Staff

William Howell, OMC Manager
Ginny Morris, Administrative Assistant

For
The Cary State Forest Review Team

Final: July 31, 2002

Land Manager: DOF
Area: 3413 Acres
County: Nassau County
Mngt. Plan Revised: 10/17/00
Mngt. Plan Update Due: 10/17/05
Management Review Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Represented</th>
<th>Team member Appointed</th>
<th>Team member In attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEP/DRP</td>
<td>Kelly McPherson</td>
<td>Kelly McPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP Northeast District</td>
<td>Erin Gawera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACS/DOF</td>
<td>Bill Korn</td>
<td>Bill Korn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWCC</td>
<td>Dan Miller</td>
<td>Dan Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil and Water Conservation</td>
<td>Phil Caldwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Commission</td>
<td>Nick Deonas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Organization</td>
<td>Barbara Blonder</td>
<td>Barbara Blonder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Land Manager</td>
<td>Michael Stokes</td>
<td>Michael Stokes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process for Implementing Regional Management Review Teams

**Legislative Intent and Guidance:**
Chapter 259.036, F. S. was enacted in 1997 to determine whether conservation, preservation, and recreation lands owned by the state Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund (Board) are being managed properly. It directs the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to establish land management review teams to evaluate the extent to which the existing management plan provides sufficient protection to threatened or endangered species, unique or important natural or physical features, geological or hydrological functions, and archaeological features. The teams also evaluate the extent to which the land is being managed for the purposes for which it was acquired and the degree to which actual management practices, including public access, are in compliance with the adopted management plan. If a land management plan has not been adopted, the review shall consider the extent to which the land is being managed for the purposes for which it was acquired and the degree to which actual management practices are in compliance with the management policy statement and management prospectus for that property. If the land management review team determines that reviewed lands are not being managed for the purposes for which they were acquired or in compliance with the adopted land management plan, management policy statement, or management prospectus, DEP shall provide the review findings to the Board, and the managing agency must report to the Board its reasons for managing the lands as it has. A report of the review findings are given to the managing agency under review, the Acquisition and Restoration Council, and to the Division of State Lands. Also, DEP shall report the annual review findings of its land management review teams to the Board no later than the second board meeting in October of each year.

**Review Site**
The management review of Cary State Forest considered approximately 3,413 acres in Nassau County that are managed by Division of Forestry. The team evaluated the extent to which current management actions are sufficient, whether the land is being managed for the purpose for which it was acquired, and whether actual management practices, including public access, are in compliance with the management plan. The Division of Forestry revised the management plan on 10/17/00, and the management plan update is due on 10/17/05.
Review Team Determination

Is the land being managed for the purpose for which it was acquired?

After completing the checklist, team members were asked to answer “yes” or “no” to this question. All team members agreed that Cary State Forest is being managed for the purpose for which it was acquired.

Are actual management practices, including public access, in compliance with the management plan?

After completing the checklist, team members were asked to answer “yes” or “no” to this question. All team members agreed that actual management practices, including public access, were in compliance with the management plan for this site.

Commendations to the Managing Agency

1. The Team commends the manager and staff for their outstanding effort with outreach to the community, particularly with school and Scout organizations. (4+, 0-)
2. The team commends the manager for her outstanding efforts to incorporate resource data and management activities into a Geographic information system (GIS). (4+, 0-)

Exceptional Management Actions

The following items received high scores on the review team checklist (see attachment 1), which indicate that the management actions exceeded expectations.

Protection and restoration of mesic and wet flatwoods, baygall communities;
Wildlife habitat; hunting quality
Management of non-native animals and plants;
Restoration of ditches;
Monitoring of groundwater quantity and quality;
Boundary survey, gates and fencing, and signage;
Law enforcement presence;
Roads, waste disposal, sanitary facilities, and parking;
Recreational opportunities;
Interpretive facilities and signs;
Environmental education and outreach.

Recommendations and Checklist Findings

The management plan must include responses to the recommendations and checklist items that are identified below.
Recommendations:
1. The Team recommends that DOF pursue funding for baseline hydrological data. (4+,0-)
   Manager’s Response:
   The DOF Forest Hydrologist has visited the forest and prepared some preliminary options as it relates to drainage crossings at several specific sites. We will review funding options with our Hydrology Section and based on legislative appropriation and the Agency’s statewide funding priorities, initiate survey and restoration projects as recommended by the hydrology staff.

2. The Team recommends that DOF fund a baseline biological inventory, including natural community determinations including floral and faunal inventories. (4+,0-)
   Manager’s Response:
   This issue is identified as a management need in our current 5-year resource management plan in section D.1. The DOF Forest Ecologist has made a recent site visit to CSF. We will coordinate with him to evaluate priority site schedule for floral and faunal surveys. Outsourcing such surveys with organizations such as FNAI will be considered, as well as using in-house biological staff. In addition, natural community mapping will be initiated by local DOF forest staff.

3. The Team recommends that DOF develop language that clarifies the agencies desired future conditions for the Cary State Forest (4+,0-)
   Manager’s Response:
   We agree and language in the next management plan will address the target condition being managed for in each ecological community. Local forest staff will also initiate planning that will identify goals and objectives for current and future restoration efforts.

4. The Team finds that the expansion of the ballpark is incompatible with the management and purpose of acquisition of the Forest and should not occur on the Cary State Forest, (4+, 0-)
   Manager’s Response:
   We concur. The current forest management plan includes the input of a Management Plan Advisory Group who in March 2000 agreed that development of any additional state forestland into ball fields would be inappropriate. This continues to be the position of the Division of Forestry.

5. The Team recommends that the DOF make it a priority to acquire lands within the optimal boundary for this forest. (4+, 0-)
   Manager’s Response:
   This Division has aggressively pursued CARL/P2000 acquisitions on all of its 30+ state forests. The current 5-year resource management plan for CSF includes an optimal management boundary that includes these adjacent timberlands. These areas are also being included in a new Florida Forever project known as Northeast Florida Timberlands. DOF will actively pursue and support acquisition of parcels within the optimum boundary from willing sellers.

Checklist findings:

The following items received low scores on the review team checklist (see Attachment 1), which indicates that management actions, in the field, were insufficient (f) or that the issue was not sufficiently addressed in the management plan (p). These items need to be addressed in the management plan update.

1. Inadequate restoration of planted pine areas. (p)
   Manager’s Response:
   CSF managers have initiated restoration efforts of selected planted slash pine stands (80 acres converted to longleaf pine) and are continuing to identify additional priorities for reestablishment of longleaf pine in the flatwoods communities. Local staff will be developing
an operational plan that will identify and map out these stands, set priorities and lay out specific restoration methods. This information will be included in the next 5-year plan.

2. Inadequate discussion of ground water quantity and quality in the management plan. (p)
Manager’s Response:
The current 5-year resource management plan provides general information and direction regarding water resources and protection. This would seem to be adequate. However the next 5-year management plan will provide greater information regarding water flows, hydrological monitoring and drainage restoration efforts.

3. Inadequate discussion of the existing ballpark (p)
Manager’s Response:
See response to Recommendation #4 above. The current management plan identifies the current five-acre lease to Nassau County for a community park. The plan also states that no other alternate uses are being considered and would not be unless compatible with other uses and management objectives for the forest. This seems adequate to reflect DOF’s position against any future expansion of this fifty-year lease.

4. Inadequate Buildings and funding. (f)
Manager’s Response:
We concur that overall resource management and public use opportunities could be enhanced with greater funding and construction of additional facilities. As this is not a CARL project, there are fewer sources and opportunities to attain the funding needed to make the suggested improvements. Continued efforts will be made to increase DOF funding on project specific activities at CSF

5. Inadequate acquisition of inholdings and additions. (f)
Manager’s Response:
See response to Recommendation # 5 above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTACHMENT I</th>
<th>PLAN REVIEW</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mesic and Wet Flatwoods</td>
<td>I.A.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayheads/Cypress Ponds/Dome Swamp</td>
<td>I.A.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baygall</td>
<td>I.A.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>I.B.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>I.B.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>II.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection and Preservation</td>
<td>II.B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Being Burned</td>
<td>III.A.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>III.A.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>III.A.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planted Pines</td>
<td>III.B.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Habitat</td>
<td>III.C.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting/Fishing Quality</td>
<td>III.C.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>III.D.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>III.D.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/Culverts</td>
<td>III.E.1a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditches</td>
<td>III.E.1b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.67</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water Quality</td>
<td>III.E.2a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water Quantity</td>
<td>III.E.2b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Quality</td>
<td>III.E.3a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Quantity</td>
<td>III.E.3b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary survey</td>
<td>III.F.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates &amp; fencing</td>
<td>III.F.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>III.F.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement presence</td>
<td>III.F.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Development</td>
<td>III.G.1a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water</td>
<td>III.G.1b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded County Park</td>
<td>III.G.1c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inholdings/additions</td>
<td>III.G.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silviculture</td>
<td>III.H.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>IV.1a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>IV.1b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>IV.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive facilities and signs</td>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Education/Outreach</td>
<td>IV.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Access</td>
<td>VI.A.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>VI.A.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>VI.A.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>VI.A.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive Camping</td>
<td>VI.A.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Watching</td>
<td>VI.A.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>VI.A.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>VI.A.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD REVIEW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesic and Wet Flatwoods</td>
<td>I.A.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayheads/Cypress Ponds/Dome Swamp</td>
<td>I.A.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baygall</td>
<td>I.A.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>I.B.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>I.B.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>II.A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection and Preservation</td>
<td>II.B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Being Burned</td>
<td>III.A.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>III.A.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>III.A.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planted Pines</td>
<td>III.B.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Habitat</td>
<td>III.C.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting/Fishing Quality</td>
<td>III.C.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>III.D.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>III.D.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/Culverts</td>
<td>III.E.1a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditches</td>
<td>III.E.1b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water Quality</td>
<td>III.E.2a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water Quantity</td>
<td>III.E.2b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Quality</td>
<td>III.E.3a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Quantity</td>
<td>III.E.3b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary survey</td>
<td>III.F.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates &amp; fencing</td>
<td>III.F.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>III.F.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement presence</td>
<td>III.F.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Development</td>
<td>III.G.1a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water</td>
<td>III.G.1b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded County Park</td>
<td>III.G.1c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inholdings/additions</td>
<td>III.G.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silviculture</td>
<td>III.H.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>IV.1a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>IV.1b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>IV.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive facilities and signs</td>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Education/Outreach</td>
<td>IV.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal</td>
<td>V.1a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Facilities</td>
<td>V.1b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>V.2a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>V.2b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>V.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>V.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Name of Site:** Cary State Forest  
**County:** Duval/Nassau

**Managed by:** DACS  
**Acres:** 10260 Acres

**Review Date:** 11/16/07

**Review Team Determination**

Managed in accordance with acquisition purpose? Yes = 4, No = 0

Management practices, including public access, in compliance with the management plan? Yes = 4, No = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Management Plan Review</th>
<th>Field Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Communities</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Species</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Fire</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Management</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exotic Species</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Monitoring</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Monitoring</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Protection</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Property Concerns</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access &amp; Education</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Resources</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Area Uses</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings, Equipment, Staff &amp; Funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consensus Commendations to the Managing Agency

The following commendations resulted from discussion and vote of the review team members.

1. The team commends the manager and staff on the long term, consistent and productive prescribed fire program which has maintained low fuel levels and is helping to maintain the quality of the mesic flatwoods of the forest. We encourage the increase of growing season fire to further enhance biodiversity. (VOTE 4+, 0-)

2. The team commends the manager and staff on their efforts to survey for invasive exotic plants on the property. (VOTE: 4+, 0-)

Consensus Recommendations to the Managing Agency

The following recommendations resulted from a discussion and vote of review team members. The management plan must include responses to the recommendations identified below.

1. The team recommends that DOF seek funding for upgrades to the environmental education facilities at the forest to ensure the quality of the ongoing educational programs can continue. (VOTE: 4+, 0-)

   Managing Agency Response: Requested funding to enclose and upgrade the environmental education pavilion in the 2008-2009 CARL Legislative Budget Request. We have specifically mentioned upgrading the bathrooms/showers facility and rebuilding or replacing the environmental education pavilion in the CSF Ten Year Resource Management Plan Draft. We will seek funding in the 2008-2009 CARL Budget Request, 2009-2010 CARL Legislative Budget Request, and future budget requests. The Division of Forestry will pay $12,000 to replace the drain field for the bathrooms/showers facility.

2. The team recommends that DOF work to increase volunteer opportunities at the forest. (VOTE: 4+, 0-)

   Managing Agency Response: We will look for opportunities to build and maintain a volunteer group to assist with trail maintenance, and other duties as needed. Boy Scout and Eagle Scout projects have assisted with various projects in the past. This group can also provide mutually benefiting projects.

3. Given the increase of land acquisition on this property and elsewhere in the district, the team recommends the addition of a law enforcement officer and park ranger position at this forest. (VOTE: 4+, 0-)

   Managing Agency Response: We will ask for a Law Enforcement Officer in the 2009-2010 Legislative Budget Request. A Park Ranger Position will be requested in the following budget request.

4. The team recommends that DOF pursue the collection of baseline data on surface and groundwater quality and quantity. (VOTE: 4+, 0-)

   Managing Agency Response: We will ask the SJRWMD for lead assistance on this project. The USGS has at least one ground water monitoring well located within the Monticello Tract. We will look into the type of data collected. Additionally, we can evaluate the need for more ground water monitoring wells.

5. The team recommends that DOF continue to follow-up on initial surveys for rare species, as growing season fires are increased on the forest. (VOTE: 4+, 0-)
Managing Agency Response: We will follow-up on initial surveys for rare species as more summer fire is reintroduced into CSF’s ecological communities. This year we have started reintroducing summer fire on 193 acres of the mesic flatwoods community.

Checklist Findings

The following items received high scores on the review team checklist, which indicates that management actions exceeded expectations.

- Management of the Natural Communities including, mesic flatwoods, wet flatwoods, dome swamp, and baygall.
- Protection and preservation of listed species including, animal inventory, fox squirrel, plant inventory and pitcher plants.
- Resource management, prescribed fire of area being burned, frequency and quality.
- Management of wildlife management including wildlife habitat and hunting/fishing quality.
- Management of non-native, invasive and problem species including, animals and plants.
- Management of hydrologic/geologic function including, roads/culverts and ditches.
- Resource protection with boundary survey, gates and fencing and signage.
- Management of adjacent property concerns including expanding development and inholdings/additions.
- Management of public access and education including, roads, parking, recreational opportunities, management of visitor impacts, interpretive facilities and signs.
- Management resources including, waste disposal and buildings.

The following items received low scores on the review team checklist, which indicates that management actions noted during the Field Review (FR) were not considered sufficient (less than 2.5 score on average), or that the text noted in the Management Plan Review (PR) does not sufficiently address this issue (less than .5 score on average.). The management plan must include responses to the checklist items identified below:

1. Management of infrastructure including the need for additional funding. (FR)

Managing Agency Response: As previously indicated we have addressed the need for improvements to both the bathrooms/showers facility and educational pavilion in the Draft CSF Ten Year Resource Management Plan.
EXHIBIT H

Management Plan
Advisory Group Summary
Cary State Forest (CSF)
10-Year Resource Management Plan

Management Plan Advisory Group (MPAG)
Public Meeting / Public Hearing summary
January 11, 2012, 6:00 p.m.
7247 Big Oaks Road, Bryceville, FL 32009

**MPAG Members Present:**
- Scotland Talley
  - Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
- Dana Bell
  - Nassau County Soil and Water Conservation District
- Connie Holt
  - Jacksonville Executive Council Assistant (Representing Council Member Ray Holt, District 11)
- Barry Holloway
  - Nassau County Commissioner/District 4
- Matt Corby
  - St. Johns River Water Management District
- Brian Burkert
  - City of Jacksonville
- Doug Moore
  - Hunting Representative & owner of M & M Dairy, private land owner
- Raymond Seth III
  - Hiking Representative & active with BSA
- Sam Silcox
  - Equestrian Representative & CSF volunteer, private land owner
- George Barbour
  - Florida Native Plant Society, private land owner
- Bruce Hill
  - Florida Forest Service District Manager & Chairperson

**MPAG Members Absent:**
- Sebastian Alexander
  - Duval County Soil and Water Conservation district

**FFS Staff Present:**
- Todd Knapp
  - Jacksonville Resource Administrator
- Bill Korn
  - Environmental Manager / Meeting Facilitator
- Devon McFall
  - Forester, Cary State Forest
- Brian Camposano
  - District Biological Scientist
- Jenn Hart
  - Forester, Four Creeks/ Ralph Simmons State Forest
- Dianne Fleming
  - Administrative Assistant - Scribe

**6:00 p.m. Pre-Public Meeting:**

Bill Korn called the meeting to order with the Management Plan Advisory Group (MPAG) and explained the purpose and procedures of the public hearing by giving an overview of the roles of the members emphasizing the expectations and how they’re governed by the Florida Sunshine Laws in a decision making process. He instructed the group not to discuss agenda items outside the publicly noticed meeting. He explained they are to conduct a public hearing and to provide input to FFS in developing the final management plan.

Mr. Korn then called for a nomination of a Chairperson upon motion and seconded, Bruce Hill was elected by the members of the board for the MPAG proceedings. He then gave a brief history background on the 10 yr management plan draft process. He explained the group is there to listen to the public input and the staff’s presentation to provide input in developing the FFS management plan at tomorrow’s meeting. He further explained upon review and procedure, the proposed plan would be submitted to our director for review and approval before going to Acquisition and Restoration Council.
Bruce Hill briefly commented by thanking the group for their patients and explained the steps in getting to this stage of development by reform and reconstruction of the 10 yr management plan.
Cary State Forest (CSF)
10-Year Resource Management Plan

Management Plan Advisory Group (MPAG)
Public Meeting / Public Hearing summary
January 11, 2012, 6:30 p.m.
7247 Big Oaks Road, Bryceville, FL 32009

MPAG Members Present: Affiliation:
Scottland Talley Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Dana Bell Nassau County Soil and Water Conservation District
Connie Holt Jacksonville Executive Council Assistant (Representing Council Member
Ray Holt, District 11)
Barry Holloway Nassau County Commissioner/District 4
Matt Corby St. Johns River Water Management District
Brian Burket City of Jacksonville
Doug Moore Hunting Representative & owner of M & M Dairy, private land owner
Raymond Seth III Hiking Representative & active with BSA
Sam Silcox Equestrian Representative & CSF volunteer, private land owner
George Barbour Florida Native Plant Society, private land owner
Bruce Hill Florida Forest Service District Manager & Chairperson

MPAG Members Absent:
Sebastian Alexander Duval County Soil and Water Conservation district

FFS Staff Present:
Todd Knapp Jacksonville Resource Administrator
Bill Korn Environmental Manager / Meeting Facilitator
Devon McFall Forester, Cary State Forest
Brian Camposano District Biological Scientist
Jenn Hart Forester, Four Creeks/ Ralph Simmons State Forest
Dianne Fleming Administrative Assistant - Scribe

Other Attendees:

6:30 p.m. Public Hearing:

Chairperson, Bruce Hill called the meeting to order thanking everyone for their attendance and briefly explained looking for public input on the 10 yr Management Plan.

Bill Korn introduced all the members of the MPAG group and the FFS staff and outlined the agenda for the hearing and provided an overview of the procedures for how the plan will proceed through the evaluation process. He asked the public to fill out a speaker /comment form and mentioned that if they did not want to speak, they could put their comment into the record.

Eleven (11) MPAG members, (16) interested citizens and (6) FFS staff were in attendance for the public hearing.
Devon McFall presented a power point presentation on Cary State Forest the overall mission, background, history, goals and accomplishments. After the presentation, the following questions were asked;

**Question 1. Tim Ellis**  
**If we increase camping will we have manned stations?**  
Answer: Devon McFall – we do not have manned check in stations.

**Question 2. Larry Motes**  
Wants a no hunting border along his property.  
Answer: Mr Korn asked Mr. Motes to express this during the second part of the meeting.

**Question 3: Jean Provost**  
**East side of Monticello area of concern. Is there a way to stop hunting along fence line?**  
Answer: ScottTalley - there is an FWC process for this.  
Answer: Mr. Korn – Buffers – Not our first approach (signage and fencing) they can write it down and MPAG will review.

**Question 4: Tim Ellis**  
**Can we go to a 3- point on 1 side rule?**  
Answer: Bruce Hill – We are working on it – waiting for results of FWC study.

**Question 5: Tim Ellis**  
**How do we know what comes off of Cary?**  
Answer: Bruce Hill – It comes down to money.

**Question 6: Tim Ellis**  
**Does it cost to ride in forest?**  
Answer: Bruce Hill – No

**Question 7: Tim Ellis**  
**Why don’t we have an entry fee to raise money?**  
Answer: Devon McFall – We have a day use fee for specific recreation.  
Answer: Bruce Hill – We follow our agencies Policy and procedures. Enforcement is an issue of getting people to pay and its gets too complicated.

**Question 8: Tim Ellis**  
**Can a quota hunt specify a tract for hunting on Cary?**  
Answer: Bruce Hill – Norfolk So. Closed to hunting because of no public access. FWC does not do that generally.  
Answer: Scott Talley – Zone tags are an issue, but have to have a check station operator and people are waiting the night before. This procedure is currently not used on Cary State Forest

**Question 9: Tim Ellis**  
**Are they going to save the oak trees out front?**  
Answer: Bruce Hill – Yes, they are fenced.
Question 10: Jean Provost
Any plans for more horseback trails?
Answer: Bruce Hill – yes
Question: Bill Korn – Single or multi use?
Answer: Bruce Hill- Depends. Some may overlap, but hope to separate.

Question 11: Jean Provost
What location?
Answer: Devon McFall – Monticello and Thomas Creek tracts.
Answer: Bruce Hill – you can ride on roads and fire-lines. Trying to keep horse trails off lime rock and in the stand.

At this point, with no further questions, Mr Korn closed this section of the public meeting and announced the meeting would now enter the public hearing phase.

Speaker 1: Cindy Vogel (Garden St and Jones Rd area)
We enjoy the area. Limerock rd at Garden Street is very difficult for people with horse trailers to access forest and the ditch is no good. The limerock is hard on the horses. Need trails to get there. A lot of families want to go back in this area. No water, picnic area or tie offs for the horses.

Speaker 2: Sam Silcox
Appreciative of forest. Limerock roads have divided trails. Want to be able to tie those trails together and have some strategic utilization. Cleaning up the firebreaks at Garden Street. Get a staging area for parking.

Speaker 3: Larry Motes
Showed on the map how his property (next to red road) is sandwiched between the two buffers. He believes his property falls under the 300 ft discharge of a public road. Needs help to try and keep people from getting on his forest and hunting deer in his pasture. He has put up fencing and it’s becoming dangerous.

Mr. Korn mentioned the Management Plan Advisory meeting at 9:30 a.m. 1/12/2012 in which the staff will modify the management plan based on a consensus of members. Then it will be submitted to the director for review.

Bruce Hill and the staff will help and listen to any issue you may have and he thanked the public and members for attending.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.
A FEW COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCERNING THE CARY STATE FOREST

TEN YEAR DRAFT PLAN

John Hendricks
P O Box 1846
Callahan FL 32011
JHendricks459@aol.com

1: I would to see a continuing of the Cary State Forest (CSF) 75th anniversary celebration on a yearly basis as an Annual Forest Day. On a Saturday evening this past September, Ranger McFall and his crew hosted the 75th anniversary celebration of CSF at certain facilities in the Forest. He and other rangers gave a history presentation of CSF, held hay rides, set up exhibits, hosted tours of the fire tower and staffed certain points along the nature trail to answer questions from the hikers. They also provided refreshments and lit campfires so visitors could roast hot dogs and make s'mores on palmetto fronds. Ranger McFall and his crew should be commended for doing such a superb job in hosting this event. I attended the celebration and thought it was an excellent way to introduce CSF and its many amenities to residents and visitors of Duval and Nassau Counties. It is also a great way to educate the public about forest conservation, wildlife preservation and fire safety. I hope CSF sees the importance of hosting such events on an annual or biannual basis to bring more people into CSF so they can experience the various ways the State Forestry Service is preserving its natural beauty.

2: (V. Public Access and Recreation). Construction of a bike friendly trail* for cyclists, hikers and equestrians that would connect the planned bike lanes on US 301 at Jennifer Road with Thomas Creek/Acree Road and Plummer Road. This would allow the public to keep their vehicles at home and visit CSF’s Thomas Creek Tract via “green” transportation. The initial costs would primarily go to improving the existing 4-mile long Cross County Road from US 301 to Thomas Creek Road and the 1.5-mile Venison and Frog Service Roads section from Acree Road to Plummer Road. This would allow visitors from nearby Ratliff, North Florida Ranch, Sunowa Springs and Ford Road neighborhoods to ride to the Thomas Creek Tract on their bikes without having to drive to Cary State Forest. This also would allow better access into the forest from area fire departments in case of wild fire or other emergency.
3: (V. Public Access and Recreation) I would like to see the planned construction of bike friendly trail* at the proposed extension of Pritchard Road in the Norfolk Southern Tract (See exhibit L in the draft) expanded into a trans- Cary trail/path that will connect the Jax-Baldwin Rail Trail to the bike lanes planned along a newly widened US 301. The Jax-Baldwin Rail Trail is very popular trail used by cyclists, hikers and equestrians, three groups that CSF is centering their recreational plans around. According to Exhibit L, there are already parking and bike paths planned in the Norfolk Southern Tract close to the Jax-Baldwin Trail and there is existing parking on Pavilion Road as well. There are advantages to constructing a trans-Cary Trail. Firstly, it would allow better access to CSF by cyclists and hikers without them having to drive their vehicles to CSF. This will cut down the number of vehicles entering CSF which will help the very environs that the State is trying to conserve. Secondly, a bike friendly trail could double as a fire break or as a forest road so Rangers and Foresters can quickly access the remote Monticello and Norfolk Southern Tracts in case of emergencies such as illegal activities, poaching, or fires. Ninety percent of the trans-Cary trail can be built by following existing forest roads, with the only costs being spent on the improvement of said roads to a safe, level, ride-able surface. Ten percent of the trans-Cary trail would have to be constructed along the eastern boundary between Palmetto Service Road, Surge Service Road, and the southern extension of Grassy Road. On surface this may seem like an insurmountable problem, but this section could also give CSF some opportunities to create something special and unique to CSF like a specially designed boardwalk. It could follow the existing fenced boundary line as to disturb as little of the natural environment as possible

*(A bike friendly trail is a level path with a solid surface and no sharp curves. Although a paved surface is ideal, it is not cost effective in a forest situation. A hard pan dirt surface, grass surface, or limerock surface are more cost effective and can be used for the casual bike rider or hiker. If the path or trail is also to be used by equestrians, it will be need to be wide enough for cyclists to safely pass the horses).

4. Somehow utilize the power line right of way to connect CSF with the Thomas Creek Tract. The lines run across Ford Road and the North Florida Ranch, which caters to horse riders and borders Thomas Creek Tract. The right of way south of Ford Road runs through private forest land, but if nothing can be worked out with them, there is a county maintained road (Carroll Road) that runs from Ford Road south to the edge of CSF. It seems like the opportunity is there to make some sort of connection between the two sections of CSF without using US 301.

Thanks for allowing me to voice my opinions on how to improve Cary State Forest. I can be reached at PO Box 1846, Callahan, FL, 32011, or at JHendricks459@aol.com
Admittedly a more daunting project, a level, well maintained path/trail that connects the planned bike lanes on US 301 to Garden Street and the Baldwin Rail Trail will allow visitors to visit CSF via biking, hiking or horseback riding without having to drive their vehicles into CSF. Again, this will allow more visitors to enjoy CSF via "green" transportation while cutting down on the number of vehicles that are driven into CSF. 90 percent would be constructed from existing forest roads. The remaining 10 percent would be a challenge to complete, but if properly designed, could become a must-do trail unique to CSF.
A level, well maintained path/trail that connects the planned bike lanes on US 301 to Thomas Creek/Acree Road and Plummer Road will allow visitors to visit CSF's Thomas Creek Tract via biking, hiking or horseback riding without having to drive their vehicles into CSF. This will allow more visitors to enjoy CSF via "green" transportation while cutting down on the number of vehicles that are driven into CSF, thus cutting down the environmental damage the vehicles cause. Although a paved surface is best, a hard-pan soil based surface or limerock surface will suffice.
Bruce Hill (chairperson) called the meeting to order at 9:30 am and thanked everyone for his or her attendance. He went around the room and asked for everyone to again introduce himself or herself. He then turned the meeting over to Bill Korn, who briefly explained the purpose of the meeting - which is to give the MPAG members an opportunity to review and discuss the public hearing testimony as well as any written comments that had been received regarding the Cary State Forest Draft 10-year Management Plan. Following this discussion, Mr. Korn said he would then go around the table to hear from each of the MPAG members on any particular comments or ideas they had to make it a better plan.

He explained that he would be working to build a consensus on any changes or additions to the plan draft, and avoid if possible, taking votes. He promised that any changes to the draft that the full MPAG agreed to would be submitted on up to the FFS Director, but he reminded everyone that any draft changes were only advisory, and it was the Director's prerogative to accept or
reject them. Mr. Korn emphasized however, that the FFS Director was very interested in hearing from the local citizens and closely reviewed all input.

Copy of the minutes from the two MPAG meetings held last night were handed out and Mr. Korn explained the importance of the minutes and asked the members take time to review both the minutes prior to their approval.

Copies of all written comments received at last night’s public hearing were handed out as well and members asked to read over prior to discussing. After team members had a chance to read all the handouts, Mr. Korn asked if anyone saw any changes necessary to both sets of meeting minutes. With only a minor change, team members accepted both sets of minutes.

Mr. Korn then discussed again a three-step process he’d like to use for the meeting. First to review and discuss the written comments received, then the oral testimony, and finally, the personal input and feedback from each team member.

Mr. Korn began by summarizing the nature of the written comments received both, prior to the public hearing (one letter), and those received (using the Speaker Forms provided) during the public hearing (eight written comments). The exact content of these eight written statements (including the person’s name, address, and any stated affiliation) received during the meeting are shown immediately below. The letter and attachments received prior to the hearing from John Hendricks, regarding recommendations on an annual forest day celebration and bike friendly trails/ greater connectivity, is attached to these minutes in their entirety.

1. Tracye Lingerfelt – Concerned Citizen
   “I live in the Cisco Gardens community which borders Cary State Forest. My interest in the forest is multi-faceted. I have for several years now been using the forest for trail riding, which is my main interest. I would like to see more equestrian trails and am impressed with what has been provided thus far. I am also interested in land conservation as well as other recreational activities offered. It is my hope and desire to keep the forest open to the public for years to come and to pass what the forest has to offer for generations beyond me. Also, my 15½ year-old son is interested in going on to college and majoring in agriculture and would like to volunteer with the forest. Thank you for your time and dedication to the forest and the public.”

2. Sheryl Rowe – Horseback rider
   “Baseball Practice during hunting season. Horseback riding trails – Please keep them for us. No increase in hunting – please.”

3. Jean Provost – Adjoining Land Owner
   “I own property along the east side of the Monticello side of the park. We need a buffer to keep hunting from the homes at this area. There are kids’ horses in this area. We have had to wear orange safety vests for safety. We would love to have trails for horses and to keep them off the limerock, as well as a horse watering station on the Monticello side.”
4. Jeannette Cox – Horseback rider
   "Would like an area for horseback riding where hunters can’t go in to hunt. Need a better
   way of keeping people from hunting close to Monticello eastside before someone or horse
   gets shot and makes the news."

5. Lawrence Philip Cox – No affiliation stated
   "Friend lives next to forest on east end. We ride horses in forest with him. We have spoke
   w/rangers and other about access and maintenance. We have some concerns w/hunting in
   the area where we ride in that season. On trail ride last year spotted a herd of deer (10-12)
   in forest grazing, and they did not pay any attention to us."

6. Cindy Vogel – Horseback rider
   "1) Riding on the limerock roads is hard on our horses’ hoofs so we need to do something to
   help that. The Garden St. entrance is all limerock so if maybe we could have a separate trail
   for entering not lime rock. 2) Garden St. area last block close to homes we would like no
   hunting there and park area shot guns only? 3) 15 families that ride often there."

7. Larry Motes – Adjoining Land Owner
   "Would like to see a no hunting buffer around my property."

8. Tim Ellis – Adjoining Land Owner
   "1 doe or buck at least 3 on one side HUNTING REGULATIONS
   Divide quota permits per section – Monticello, North Ford, Cary, Thomas Creek.
   How can you keep track on count of game taken without Check Station?
   Have special hog hunts to control population."

Mr. Korn observed and the team agreed that the letter submitted by Mr. Hendricks and the
written comments on the plan received during last night’s public hearing seemed to generally fall
into three or four topical areas – which would help organize their discussion of this input. These
areas included 1) trail connectivity, 2) hunting “buffers”, 3) hunting regulations and equestrian
conflicts, 4) equestrian trails.

With this in mind the team tackled first the comments from Mr. Hendricks regarding his
suggestions for improving trail connectivity and access - between the tracts, the Jacksonville-
Baldwin Rail Trail and other conservation areas, and the issue of construction/maintenance of
bicycle-friendly bike paths. Discussion focused on sufficiency of the general language found on
p. 33 and 34 regarding planned trails improvements. After much talk that in general the
language in the plan allowed for the types of proposed changes that Mr. Hendricks was asking
for. However, Brian Burk et and others suggested that a rewording of the last sentence in this
section “3. Trails” would be helpful. He agreed to work on language so that the MPAG could
move on to the next topic. Later in the meeting, he offered the following language, which would
replace the current wording of the final sentence in that section. **MPAG consensus was to
accept the change.** New wording will be:

   FFS is a partner in a long-range effort to connect CSF to Jennings State Forest through
   a multi-use trail that will cross several conservation lands owned by multiple agencies.
As part of this partnership, FFS will coordinate with the COJ on a possible trail connection to the Jacksonville-Baldwin Rail trail from CSF.

MPAG members then engaged in a discussion regarding concerns by adjacent landowners for their safety when CSF hunters were using the forest boundaries to hunt in close proximity to private residences. Several written comments received (see above) during the public hearing asked that FFS consider establishing a no-hunting buffer or set backs in these areas such as along Garden Street on the east side of the Monticello Tract and in the Dillon Road area on the south side of the Cary Tract. Several made clear that the issue here was not with adjacent woodland owners, but state forest boundaries that are shared with residential neighborhoods. Mr. Talley stated that past studies showed that there was no data or evidence that confirmed that anybody living adjacent to a hunt area had been injured from a hunting accident. Mr. Korn shared that at other state forests, the public and adjacent owners had also raised this issue of hunting safety and buffers. Generally he said the compromise was to look for improvements in boundary fencing & signage and improved law enforcement presence in these sensitive areas. Mr. Hill stated that he thought that there were opportunities for FFS to resolve the concerns through operational measures that could look at fencing, road closures, signage, etc. While some didn’t feel buffers or setbacks necessary, the consensus was that the MPAG come up with some language that reflected that there was a concern for hunting safety in these state forest areas that were adjacent to sensitive residential zones. After additional discussion on possible ways to mitigate safety concerns, MPAG members focused their efforts on reaching agreement on plan language, which would encourage FFS and FWC to take a closer look at the issue. Finally, MPAG reached consensus on adding the following statement to the Hunting and Fishing section (p. 32) of the plan:

“FFS will evaluate areas along the boundary to identify possible safety issues where actions need to be taken to mitigate these concerns to protect adjacent properties and neighbors. Possible solutions include increased signage, road closures, and setbacks.”

Next, Mr. Korn asked for MPAG feedback on the written statements received during the public hearing that raised several issues on hunting seasons, lack of check stations, and hunter conflicts with equestrian users. Mr. Moore commented on the benefit of check stations to monitor wildlife numbers and also offered, at one point, ideas about being able to issue quota permits on CSF by tracts to distribute hunter pressure (see Mr. Ellis’ written comment above). Mr. Talley shared information on severe budget cuts closing many of the traditional check station operations on “co-op” and “lead” WMAs. He also didn’t feel like there was anyway at this time that FWC could issue permits separately for each tract. Discussion ensued regarding hunt season length. Both he and Mr. Hill suggested too that on any of the hunting season or regulations that FWC took public input through their website, as well as, took input from FFS every two years as part of their cycle for reviewing and changing hunting regulations on each WMA. They encouraged anyone with ideas for changes to submit their comments during this process.

Next, the written comments regarding conflicts for equestrian use during hunts were discussed. Some felt that this resulted due the number of hunt days, however others pointed out that the number of hunt days when looked at in aggregate were not excessive. It was suggested one option might be to lengthen the archery season and shorten the general gun season. Mr. Hill and Mr. Talley shared that such user conflicts could be minimized with better communication to
equestrian users regarding the time of day the average hunter used the forest (usually early in the morning and then late afternoon) that equestrian and hikers could likely schedule their visits for midday and avoid contact with hunters. Mr. Korn pointed out that one item proposed in the new management plan was a CSF liaison group (Goal 2, Objective 9, p. 6) which it’d been his experience really provided FFS and its forest user groups a forum to learn about activities, share ideas and improve understanding among all users. He felt like some of the discussion being had as part of this MPAG meeting would be ideal topics for discussion and resolution at these liaison group meetings and he was glad to see it in the plan and he hoped that the local FFS would follow up soon and get them started. Mr. Hill thought many of these points of discussion were operational and he encouraged anyone with a concern or idea to bring it to him or the staff. As a result of the discussion, there were no changes to the plan recommended by the MPAG.

Next, the MPAG took up the comments made as part of several written comments received at the public hearing regarding the trails and trail surface material for equestrian users. There was concern reiterated by Mr. Silcox that hard-packed limestone was not an appropriate surface material for horse use and that other surfacing materials (e.g. sand roads) and alternative trail locations (e.g. old firelines) would be preferred. Mr. Hill said these were valid concerns and that FFS was working to try to be responsive to user needs. He felt that these were more operational concerns and that the place to address them was in FFS operational plans (e.g. Five-Year Recreation Plan) and perhaps too at the upcoming liaison group meetings. No specific plan changes therefore were suggested for the management plan by the MPAG.

At this point, Mr. Korn said that they were through the topics raised in the written comments received and that at this time he’d like to quickly review topics covered in the oral testimony received last night at the public hearing. Mr. Korn quickly reviewed the content of the three speakers as documented in the minutes of last night’s public hearing. The topics all related to those already covered earlier in this meeting (use of limerock on horse trails, equestrian facilities, hunting safety/buffers). As a result, the MPAG felt there weren’t any new topics to be discussed.

At this point, Mr. Korn went around the room asking each person if they had any thoughts and comments about the draft Plan. The individual MPAG member comments and group discussion was as follows:

**Scotland Talley, Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission**
Regarding Goal 4, Objective 4 on imperiled species monitoring, Mr. Talley asked that FFS include and coordinate with FWC in developing wildlife monitoring protocols, as they were already developing protocol/standards for monitoring for 60+ focal animal species here in Florida and there was no need to duplicate. **MPAG consensus was to add** to this objective (p. 7) that monitoring protocols to be established “in consultation with FWC”.

Mr. Talley asked why there was no reference basal area provided for the sandhill natural community. Mr. Hill stated that FFS didn’t want to be boxed in. Wished to be left flexibility. Mr. Talley then asked why are the silvicultural treatments basically all read the same in the plan for each pine community type. Also, he posed, how could FFS thin to a target basal area but none shown in the desired conditions section (sandhill). Mr. Hill and Mr. Korn said these were
good questions, but again, it was answered, it was to give FFS flexibility and to base thinning strategies on what was occurring on the ground.

Mr. Talley recommended after clearcutting off-site planted pine from sandhill areas, that FFS consider leaving the site unplanted after harvesting while working on groundcover. All agreed this made good sense. **MPAG consensus was to add** statement in the Silviculture discussion in the Sandhill- Management Actions section of the plan (p. 49) to read: “These areas will be evaluated prior to planting to determine if seeding/revegetation efforts will be needed or if their native groundcover will grow back on its own.”

Overall, Mr. Talley stated that he liked the plan, liked the new FFS plan format, better than the old.

**Connie Holt, Jacksonville Executive Council Assistant (Representing Council Member Ray Holt, District 11)**
Ms. Holt stated that her issues, related to hunt safety, had all been covered previously. She was pleased with the plan.

**Dana Bell, Nassau County Soil and Water Conservation District**
Mrs. Bell stated that all her issues had been covered.

**Sam Silcox, Equestrian Representative, private landowner, CSF volunteer**
Mr. Silcox stated that all his issues had been covered during earlier discussion.

**Matt Corby, Land Manager, St. Johns River Water Mgt District**
Mr. Corby asked if the additional park ranger mentioned in Goal 2 of the plan was necessary in order to accomplish the other stated goals for improving recreation. Mr. Hill stated no. Mr. Corby suggested in Goal 2, Objective 5 regarding a projected increase in carrying capacity to 535 daily visitors that it be made clear that such an increase would be pending the extensive list of recreation improvements identified in Exhibit L. Yes, Mr. McFall and Mr. Hill said that was the case. **MPAG consensus was to add** a statement to the objective that this new carrying capacity would be “pending all activities and plans listed in Exhibit L are completed”.

Mr. Corby then asked about Goal 3/Objective 5 (p. 6) as to the nature of the proposed 75-acres of “habitat/natural community improvement” and how exactly was it to be measured. Mr. McFall explained that this was degraded sandhill. Discussion continued with suggestions for more specific forms of performance measures. **MPAG consensus was to add** “degraded sandhill” to the text of the objective and to change performance measure to read: “1. Number of acres burned 2. Number of acres reforested”.

Mr. Corby commented on the Save Our Rivers-purchased (SJRWMD) property referred to (p. 11-Table 1) as the Redshirt parcel (325 acres). He explained that under an agreement between FFS and SJRWMD, that FFS would be managing it, and in exchange the SJRWMD would be given management responsibility for a 90-acre parcel in the Thomas Creek tract, east of the railroad. He suggested that some explanation be provided in the plan text. **MPAG consensus was for FFS to add some language** in the plan that would explain this transfer of responsibility
for these two parcels. FFS agreed to research details and add the appropriate language. Mr. Corby also asked FFS to clarify in the plan (p. 12, Table 2) that the Logan parcel in the Thomas Creek Conservation area is partially owned by the City of Jacksonville and ought to be noted here. **MPAG consensus that FFS add the notation.**

Mr. Corby asked what FFS meant by the statement on p. 25 in the Threatened and Endangered Species section “Specialized management techniques will be used...” FFS staff explained that actual management actions would be handled on a case-by-case basis as it pertained to the needs of the particular wildlife species. Mr. Corby then asked about the reference on p. 35 to the 8,848-acres of fire dependent communities and pointed out that each FNAI plant community may have a different fire return interval. Mr. Korn and Mr. McFall both agreed and pointed out that FFS had included in Table 6 on p. 41 a list of all the natural communities and the desired fire return interval. Mr. Corby looked it over and said, yes, he thought the burn intervals looked fine.

Finally, Mr. Corby asked if more information and a specific map could be included in the text to give more definition to the general discussion provided regarding the “No Catch Swamp Hydrological Enhancement Project” (p. 45). Mr. Hill stated that he didn’t think it was necessary to include a specific map with all the operational details in this management plan. After some discussion it was the **MPAG consensus for FFS to add** the “No Catch Swamp” name in text to the existing natural community map in the Exhibit O and P.

Mr. Corby summed up then to say that he liked the plan and found the natural community discussion (e.g. plant composition, prescribed burning goals) is well written.

**George Barbour, Florida Native Plant Society, Private Landowner, CSF volunteer**

Mr. Barbour asked about plans to address the litter situation that he observes when he is out on the forest. He didn’t see where litter cleanup was addressed in any specific manner in the plan. He stated that he and his wife spend a lot of time on Cary and spend a lot of time picking up litter – with volunteers trying to pick up litter twice a week. The problem is worse he said during hunting season when there are more people out on the forest. He shared a photograph taken of the trash they’d picked up during one of their clean-up visits. FFS staff shared their appreciation for their efforts. It was generally felt by MPAG members that such details of managing visitor impacts were more of an operational issue and didn’t need to be spelled out in the management plan.

Mr. Barbour encouraged FFS to increase educational opportunities and materials and their use of forest volunteers. It was felt by most that the general language on “volunteers” and “environmental education and public outreach” found on pages 20 and 32, respectively, were sufficient.

Mr. Barbour then asked if the plan provided for FFS to allow firewood harvests that could be utilized during sandhill restoration work. Mr. Hill responded that, yes, it was allowed and covered in the plan language (pp. 15, 36) that addresses timber harvests and silvicultural activities.
Brian Burket, *City of Jacksonville*
Mr. Burket questioned the nature and design of the planned campground (p 34 “Camping”). Was the focus for RV-type camping or was it to be more for tenting. FFS staff responded that the focus would be for tent camping. **MPAG consensus was that this sounded good.** FFS agreed to add the words “tent” camping for clarity.

Raymond Seth III, *Hiking Representative, Boy Scouts of America Volunteer*
Mr. Seth expressed concern that the law enforcement personnel needed more education as to forest rules and authority to handle problems. He relayed a story about a visit to the CSF campground near the firetower with his Boy Scout troop when they had to tolerate loud, inebriated group that had not reserved a campsite. When he called the FFS dispatch, he was told it would be quicker for him to call the sheriff’s department directly. When the officer responded he had no clue as to the camping rules and was not helpful in resolving the incident. Mr. Hill responded that he would take it up with the FFS dispatch – as they should not have put it back on him to call for help. They should have arranged for law enforcement and then followed up to be sure all was all right. Some discussion ensued regarding the law enforcement resources available for patrol and complaints. It was agreed that at the moment the most effective at this work now, were the FWC wildlife officers or the OALE (Florida Department of Agriculture) officers, as they were more familiar with forest rules. Discussion also suggested there may be opportunities to increase communication between agencies (i.e. sheriff’s office) so that they understand what rules/procedures to enforce. **The MPAG consensus was to add** the need for education to Goal 2, Objective 6 (p. 5) so that it reads: “Increase the presence and education of all cooperating law enforcement agencies…”

Mr. Seth next suggested that, as it related to Goal 2, Objective 10 (Use of Volunteers) on p. 6, it would be beneficial for CSF staff to maintain a list of potential volunteer tasks or projects and to use such a “needs list” to help recruit volunteers with specific interests. Mr. McFall agreed and stated that he keeps such a list. **The MPAG consensus was for the plan to add** to this objective, a performance measure for: “Number of volunteer projects/tasks identified”.

Next, Mr. Seth questioned the type of language and information that FFS intended to use on its interpretive signage discussed in Goal 8, Objective 8 (p. 10). Mr. McFall provided a general explanation that this would include ecological information, restoration program information, other FFS programs and brochures to use on self-guiding trails. Mr. Seth’s suggestion was that FFS to include signs/brochures that would allow visitors to understand better what they are looking at, without the help of CSF staff.

Doug Moore, *Hunting Representative, Private Landowner (M & M Dairy)*
Mr. Moore explained that the earlier discussion on hunt buffers adjacent to sensitive private homes, etc had all been covered previously and that he had nothing further.

Bruce Hill, *District Manager, Florida Forest Service*
During the meeting, Mr. Hill explained that the FFS would be adding to the Exhibit E Optimal Management Boundary map the Whitehouse Field property, should the Department of Defense ever be in a position to surplus all or part of it. **No MPAG members expressed any concern for making this change to the map.**
Mr. Hill thanked each of the MPAG members for their time and input during the meetings.

Mr. Korn reiterated the next step would be for FFS staff here to work through all the MPAG consensus changes from today’s discussion to incorporate all of them into the draft plan with the idea that this MPAG process makes it a better plan. Copies of the new draft would be forwarded then up to the Division Director for his review. If anyone wanted to see a digital copy of the MPAG-edited plan they should let Mr. McFall know. FFS would be sending out to each of them in the next week or two a copy of this MPAG meeting minutes for them to look over and a timeframe for contacting FFS should anyone see any corrections to be made. From there it would go to the Division of State Lands and the Acquisition and Restoration Council.

He again stated FFS’s appreciation for their time and participation in the process.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

NOTE: Following the meeting Mr. Barry Holloway, Nassau County Commissioner, contacted Mr. McFall and apologized for a conflict that arose that kept him from attending the MPAG meeting. He stated that "You all are doing a good job, keep up the good work."
EXHIBIT I

Management Procedures for Archaeological and Historical Sites and Properties on State-Owned or Controlled Lands
These procedures apply to state agencies, local governments, and non-profits that manage state-owned properties.

A. General Discussion

Historic resources are both archaeological sites and historic structures. Per Chapter 267, Florida Statutes, ‘Historic property’ or ‘historic resource’ means any prehistoric district, site, building, object, or other real or personal property of historical, architectural, or archaeological value, and folklife resources. These properties or resources may include, but are not limited to, monuments, memorials, Indian habitations, ceremonial sites, abandoned settlements, sunken or abandoned ships, engineering works, treasure trove, artifacts, or other objects with intrinsic historical or archaeological value, or any part thereof, relating to the history, government, and culture of the state.”

B. Agency Responsibilities

Per State Policy relative to historic properties, state agencies of the executive branch must allow the Division of Historical Resources (Division) the opportunity to comment on any undertakings, whether these undertakings directly involve the state agency, i.e., land management responsibilities, or the state agency has indirect jurisdiction, i.e. permitting authority, grants, etc. No state funds should be expended on the undertaking until the Division has the opportunity to review and comment on the project, permit, grant, etc.

State agencies shall preserve the historic resources which are owned or controlled by the agency.

Regarding proposed demolition or substantial alterations of historic properties, consultation with the Division must occur, and alternatives to demolition must be considered.

State agencies must consult with Division to establish a program to location, inventory and evaluate all historic properties under ownership or controlled by the agency.

C. Statutory Authority

Statutory Authority and more in depth information can be found in the following:

Chapter 253, F.S. – State Lands

Chapter 267, F.S. – Historical Resources

Chapter 872, F.S. – Offenses Concerning Dead Bodies and Graves
Other helpful citations and references:

Chapter 1A-32, F.A.C. – Archaeological Research

Chapter 1A-44, F.A.C. – Procedures for Reporting and Determining Jurisdiction Over Unmarked Human Burials

Chapter 1A-46, F.A.C. – Archaeological and Historical Report Standards and Guidelines

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings

D. Management Implementation

Even though the Division sits on the Acquisition and Restoration Council and approves land management plans, these plans are conceptual. Specific information regarding individual projects must be submitted to the Division for review and recommendations.

Managers of state lands must coordinate any land clearing or ground disturbing activities with the Division to allow for review and comment on the proposed project. Recommendations may include, but are not limited to: approval of the project as submitted, pre-testing of the project site by a certified archaeological monitor, cultural resource assessment survey by a qualified professional archaeologist, modifications to the proposed project to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects.

Projects such as additions, exterior alteration, or related new construction regarding historic structures must also be submitted to the Division of Historical Resources for review and comment by the Division’s architects. Projects involving structures fifty years of age or older, must be submitted to this agency for a significance determination. In rare cases, structures under fifty years of age may be deemed historically significant. These must be evaluated on a case by case basis.

Adverse impacts to significant sites, either archaeological sites or historic buildings, must be avoided. Furthermore, managers of state property should make preparations for locating and evaluating historic resources, both archaeological sites and historic structures.

E. Minimum Review Documentation Requirements

In order to have a proposed project reviewed by the Division, the following information, at a minimum, must be submitted for comments and recommendations.

Project Description – A detailed description of the proposed project including all related activities. For land clearing or ground disturbing activities, the depth and extent of the disturbance, use of heavy equipment, location of lay down yard, etc. For historic structures, specific details regarding rehabilitation, demolition, etc.
**Project Location** – The exact location of the project indicated on a USGS Quadrangle map, is preferable. A management base map may be acceptable. Aerial photos indicating the exact project area as supplemental information are helpful.

**Photographs** – Photographs of the project area are always useful. Photographs of structures are required.

**Description of Project Area** – Note the acreage of the project, describe the present condition of project area, and any past land uses or disturbances.

**Description of Structures** – Describe the condition and setting of each building within project area if approximately fifty years of age or older.

**Recorded Archaeological Sites or Historic Structures** – Provide Florida Master Site File numbers for all recorded historic resources within or adjacent to the project area. This information should be in the current management plan; however, it can be obtained by contacting the Florida Master Site File at (850) 245-6440.

*     *     *

Questions relating to the treatment of archaeological and historic resources on state lands should be directed to:

Susan M. Harp  
Historic Preservation Planner  
Division of Historical Resources  
Bureau of Historic Preservation  
Compliance and Review Section  
R. A. Gray Building  
500 South Bronough Street  
Tallahassee, FL  32399-0250

Email: susan.harp@dos.myflorida.com  
Phone: (850) 245-6367  
Fax: (850) 245-6437
EXHIBIT J

Soil Map
Cary State Forest Soils Descriptions

There are 27 different soil series found within CSF (USDA Soil Surveys of Nassau and Duval Counties, Florida). The dominant soil series of CSF are described below:

**Evergreen** series consists of nearly level, very poorly drained soils that formed in thin decomposed organic materials underlain by sandy marine sediments. They are found mainly in wetland communities.

**Boulogne** series consists of nearly level, poorly drained soils that formed by sandy marine sediments and are found within mostly mesic flatwoods.

**Leon** series consists of very deep, poorly and very poorly drained, moderately to moderately slowly permeable soils in flatwoods, wetlands, and stream terraces.

**Goldhead** series consists of poorly drained and very poorly drained soils on broad areas of the flatwoods.

**Pottsburg** series consists of very deep, somewhat poorly and poorly drained, moderately permeable soils in areas such as dryer mesic flatwoods.

**Lynn Haven** series consists of very deep, poorly and very poorly drained, moderate or moderately rapid permeable soils mainly in wet flatwoods and wetlands.

**Surrency** series consists of very deep, poorly and very poorly drained, moderately slow to moderate permeable soils within mainly wetlands.

**Hurricane** series consists of very deep, somewhat poorly drained, moderately rapid permeable soils on broad areas that are slightly higher than the adjacent flatwoods, such as dryer mesic flatwoods sites.

**Stockade** series consists of very poorly drained soils on low-lying drainages and wetlands.

**Penney** series consists of very deep, excessively drained, rapidly permeable soils on uplands, mainly on sandhills. The Penney series is one of few well drained soils on Cary, most of which are located on the Thomas Creek Tract.
EXHIBIT K

FNAI Managed Area
Element Summary
### Plants and Lichens
- **Balduina atropurpurea**
  - Common Name: Purple Honeycomb-head
  - Global Rank: G2
  - State Rank: S1
  - Federal Status: N
  - State Listing: LE

- **Ctenium floridanum**
  - Common Name: Florida Toothache Grass
  - Global Rank: G2
  - State Rank: S2
  - Federal Status: N
  - State Listing: LE

### Birds
- **Picoides borealis**
  - Common Name: Red-cockaded Woodpecker
  - Global Rank: G3
  - State Rank: S2
  - Federal Status: LE
  - State Listing: LS

### Mammals
- **Sciurus niger shermani**
  - Common Name: Sherman's Fox Squirrel
  - Global Rank: G5T3
  - State Rank: S3
  - Federal Status: N
  - State Listing: LS

---

**Note:** Summary includes all (and only) documented species occurrence records currently in the FNAI database.
Using a ranking system developed by The Nature Conservancy and the Natural Heritage Program Network, the Florida Natural Areas Inventory assigns two ranks for each element. The global element rank is based on an element's worldwide status; the state element rank is based on the status of the element in Florida. Element ranks are based on many factors, the most important ones being estimated number of Element Occurrences (EOs), estimated abundance (number of individuals for species; area for natural communities), geographic range, estimated number of adequately protected EOs, relative threat of destruction, and ecological fragility.

**FNAI GLOBAL ELEMENT RANK**

- **G1** = Critically imperiled globally because of extreme rarity (5 or fewer occurrences or less than 1000 individuals) or because of extreme vulnerability to extinction due to some natural or man-made factor.
- **G2** = Imperiled globally because of rarity (6 to 20 occurrences or less than 3000 individuals) or because of vulnerability to extinction due to some natural or man-made factor.
- **G3** = Either very rare and local throughout its range (21-100 occurrences or less than 10,000 individuals) or found locally in a restricted range or vulnerable to extinction from other factors.
- **G4** = Apparently secure globally (may be rare in parts of range).
- **G5** = Demonstrably secure globally.
- **G#T#** = Tentative rank (e.g., G2?)
- **G#G#** = Range of rank; insufficient data to assign specific global rank (e.g., G2G3)
- **G#T#Q** = Rank of questionable species - ranked as species but questionable whether it is species or subspecies; numbers have same definition as above (e.g., G3T1)
- **G#Q** = Rank of questionable species - ranked as species but questionable whether it is species or subspecies; numbers have same definition as above (e.g., G2Q)
- **GH** = Of historical occurrence throughout its range, may be rediscovered (e.g., ivory-billed woodpecker)
- **GNA** = Ranking is not applicable because element is not a suitable target for conservation (e.g. as for hybrid species)
- **GNR** = Not yet ranked (temporary)
- **GNRTNR** = Neither the full species nor the taxonomic subgroup has yet been ranked (temporary)
- **GX** = Believed to be extinct throughout range
- **GXC** = Extirpated from the wild but still known from captivity/cultivation
- **GU** = Unrankable. Due to lack of information, no rank or range can be assigned (e.g., GUT2).

**FNAI STATE ELEMENT RANK**

Definition parallels global element rank: substitute "S" for "G", and "in Florida" for "globally" in above global rank definitions.

**FEDERAL LEGAL STATUS (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service- USFWS)**

Provided by FNAI for information only. For official definitions and lists of protected species, consult the relevant federal agency. Definitions derived from U.S. Endangered Species Act of 1973, Sec. 3. Note that the federal status given by FNAI refers only to Florida populations and that federal status may differ elsewhere.

- **LE** = Listed as Endangered Species in the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants under the provisions of the Endangered Species Act. Defined as any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.
- **LE,XN** = A non-essential experimental population of a species otherwise Listed as an Endangered Species.
- **PE** = Proposed for addition to the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants as Endangered Species.
- **LT** = Listed as Threatened Species. Defined as any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.
- **LT,PDL** = Species currently listed Threatened but has been proposed for delisting.
- **LT,PE** = Species currently listed Threatened but has been proposed for a change to Endangered.

Note: Summary includes all (and only) documented species occurrence records currently in the FNAI database.
LE,PT = Species currently listed Endangered but has been proposed for a change to Threatened.
PT  = Proposed for listing as Threatened Species.
C   = Candidate Species for addition to the list of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants, Category 1. Federal agencies have sufficient information on biological vulnerability and threats to support proposing to list the species as Endangered or Threatened.
SAT = Threatened due to similarity of appearance to a threatened species.
SC  = Species of concern. Species is not currently listed but is of management concern to USFWS.
N   = Not currently listed, nor currently being considered for addition to the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants.

STATE LEGAL STATUS

Provided by FNAI for information only. For official definitions and lists of protected species, consult the relevant state agency.

ANIMALS: Definitions derived from "Florida's Endangered Species and Species of Special Concern, Official Lists" published by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC), 1 Aug 1997, and subsequent updates.

LE  = Listed as Endangered Species by the FFWCC. Defined as a species, subspecies, or isolated population which is so rare or depleted in number or so restricted in range of habitat due to any man-made or natural factors that it is in immediate danger of extinction or extirpation from the state, or which may attain such a status within the immediate future.
LT  = Listed as Threatened Species by the FFWCC. Defined as a species, subspecies, or isolated population which is acutely vulnerable to environmental alteration, declining in number at a rapid rate, or whose range or habitat is decreasing in area at a rapid rate and as a consequence is destined or very likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future. LT* for Ursus americanus floridanus (Florida black bear) indicates that this status does not apply in Baker and Columbia counties and in the Apalachicola National Forest. LT* for Neovison vison pop.1 (Southern mink, South Florida population) indicates that this status applies to the Everglades population only.
LS  = Listed as Species of Special Concern by the FFWCC. Defined as a population which warrants special protection, recognition, or consideration because it has an inherent significant vulnerability to habitat modification, environmental alteration, human disturbance, or substantial human exploitation which, in the foreseeable future, may result in its becoming a threatened species. LS* indicates that a species has LS status only in selected portions of its range in Florida. LS* for Pandion haliaetus (Osprey) indicates that this status applies in Monroe county only.
PE  = Proposed for listing as Endangered.
PT  = Proposed for listing as Threatened.
PS  = Proposed for listing as Species of Special Concern.
N   = Not currently listed, nor currently being considered for listing.

PLANTS (Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services- FDACS) Definitions derived from Sections 581.011 and 581.185(2), Florida Statutes, and the Preservation of Native Flora of Florida Act, 5B-40.001. FNAI does not track all state-regulated plant species; for a complete list of state-regulated plant species, call Florida Division of Plant Industry, 352-372-3505 or see: http://doacs.state.fl.us/pl/images/rules/05b.pdf

LE  = Listed as Endangered Plants in the Preservation of Native Flora of Florida Act. Defined as species of plants native to the state that are in imminent danger of extinction within the state, the survival of which is unlikely if the causes of a decline in the number of plants continue, and includes all species determined to be endangered or threatened pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended.
PE  = Proposed by the FDACS for listing as Endangered Plants.
LT  = Listed as Threatened Plants in the Preservation of Native Flora of Florida Act. Defined as species native to the state that are in rapid decline in the number of plants within the state, but which have not so decreased in such number as to cause them to be endangered. LT* indicates that a species has LT status only in selected portions of its range in Florida.
PT  = Proposed by the FDACS for listing as Threatened Plants.
N   = Not currently listed, nor currently being considered for listing.
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