Date: February 5, 1987

To: Charles Higgs - LMD

From: James R. Huntcon - ADM/5

Subject: Peshtigo Brook Wildlife Area

I am approving the attached Addendum to the Peshtigo Brook Wildlife Area Master Plan. Please attach the addendum with the revised ownership map to all file copies of the plan and proceed with the trade at your earliest opportunity.
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I am proposing to make the attached changes to the Peshtigo Brook Wildlife Area Master Plan (Approved December 16, 1981).

Recently we have been approached by a landowner who owns three 40's in the interior of the Peshtigo Brook Wildlife Area. The landowner would like to trade these three 40's for land on the edge of the wildlife area for better access. We have identified three 40's on the exterior that are somewhat isolated from the remainder of the property and could be offered for trade.

The 1981 Master Plan established the property boundary around only the land controlled by state ownership at that time. It was felt that because of the low priority of the property, no additional acquisitions should be made. Major management emphasis is on forest wildlife, with some minor management for wetland wildlife.

The presence of three isolated 40's in the interior of the wildlife area reduces management efficiency. State ownership of these tracts would improve blocking of state land, provide greater flexibility in management, and reduce potential problems with private landowners trying to gain access to their lands. Possibilities for conducting prescribed burns would be greatly enhanced with acquisition of these inholdings.

The three 40's recommended to be designated as excess property are located on the outer edge of the wildlife area, and have poor access for the general public.

Because of the greater advantage to the state of having the land in the interior of Peshtigo Brook Wildlife Area, I am making the following proposed changes to the property boundary. The 40's to be added to the acquisition boundary would be SE 1/4 NE 1/4, Sec. 8; NW 1/4 NW 1/4, Sec. 9; and NW 1/4
NE 1/4, Sec. 16, all in T30N-R18E. The 40's to be designated as excess property would be SW 1/4 SW 1/4, Sec. 4; NE 1/4 SW 1/4, Sec. 4; and NE 1/4 SW 1/4, Sec. 3, all in T30N-R18E. State ownership would be maintained on NW 1/4 SW 1/4, Sec. 4, T30N-R18E because this tract contains a state fire tower and is used by forestry personnel for equipment training.
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ADDENDUM

Peshtigo Wildlife Area

Approved December 16, 1981

Through the 1981 plan, the wildlife area property boundary was reduced from 3,200 acres to 2,160 acres (Figure 1). This conformed to the acreage in state ownership at that time.

The ownership as established by the 1981 plan left two private 40's in the interior totally surrounded by state land, and left one 40 three-quarters surrounded by state land. Blocking in these parcels would create better opportunities for conducting prescribed burns for maintaining marshland habitats. Few burns have been conducted on Peshtigo Brook, in part due to the difficulty of dealing with the private land in the interior.

Access through much of the western portion of the wildlife area is on Hawthorne Lane. Vehicle traffic is rutting up this road badly. The road should be closed to vehicle traffic and designated as a hunter walking trail. Controlling vehicle traffic will be difficult if private land exists in the interior.

It is recommended that these three interior parcels be re-added to the property boundary, and three parcels on the edge area recommended as designation as excess property (Fig. 2 and 3). These changes would improve state ownership on the Peshtigo Brook Wildlife Area, without changing the property acreage of 2,060 acres.

The three parcels proposed as excess land have more uplands (22 acres) compared to the three parcels proposed for addition (11 acres), but the aspen and oak types forming these uplands are abundant on adjacent county and state lands. Also, these exterior parcels have very poor access for the general public, and therefore receive very limited use.

Because there appears to be more uplands on the proposed excess lands, any acquisition or land trade would not be costly to the state, and in fact could provide revenue.

A single isolated 40 would be maintained by the state in the NW 1/4 SW 1/4, Sec. 4, T30N, R18E. This is the site of a state fire tower and the area is used for training personnel on fire control equipment. Also, the state would keep an easement through the 40 to the east (NE 1/4 SW 1/4, Sec. 4, T30N-R18E) for access to the tower site.