

Land Management Plan Compliance Checklist

Required for State-owned conservation lands over 160 acres (Updated July 2022)

Instructions for managers:

Complete each item and fill in the applicable correlating page numbers and/or appendix where the item can be found within the land management plan (LMP). If an item does not apply to the subject property, please describe that fact on a correlating page number of the LMP. Do not mark an "N/A" for any items below.

For more information, please visit the stewardship portion of the Division of State Lands' website at: <http://floridadep.gov/lands/environmental-services/content/land-stewardship>

Section A: Acquisition Information Items

Item #	Requirement	Statute/Rule	Page Numbers and/or Appendix
1	The common name of the property.	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Page 1 (Executive Summary); Page 8 (II.A.1)
2	The land acquisition program, if any, under which the property was acquired.	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Page 1 (Executive Summary); Page 9 (II.A.4)
3	Degree of title interest held by the Board, including reservations and encumbrances such as leases.	18-2.021	Page 10 (II.B.2)
4	The legal description and acreage of the property.	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Page 8 (II.A.2)
5	A map showing the approximate location and boundaries of the property, and the location of any structures or improvements to the property.	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Exhibits B & C
6	An assessment as to whether the property, or any portion, should be declared surplus. <i>Provide Information regarding assessment and analysis in the plan, and provide corresponding map.</i>	18-2.021	Page 13 (II.D.3)
7	Identification of other parcels of land within or immediately adjacent to the property that should be purchased because they are essential to management of the property. <i>Please clearly indicate parcels on a map.</i>	18-2.021	Page 13 (II.D.2)
8	Identification of adjacent land uses that conflict with the planned use of the property, if any.	18-2.021	Page 13 (II.D.4)
9	A statement of the purpose for which the lands were acquired, the projected use or uses as defined in 253.034 and the statutory authority for such use or uses.	259.032	Page 3 (I.A); Page 9 (II.B.1)
10	Proximity of property to other significant State, local or federal land or water resources.	18-2.021	Page 9 (II.A.3); Exhibit E

Section B: Use Items

Item #	Requirement	Statute/Rule	Page Numbers and/or Appendix
11	The designated single use or multiple use management for the property, including use by other managing entities.	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Page 1 (Executive Summary); Page 3 (I.A); Page 10 (II.B.3)
12	A description of past and existing uses, including any unauthorized uses of the property.	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Page 4 (I.B); Page 10 (II.B.4); Page 13 (II.D.6); Page 14 (II.E.); Page 15 (III); Page 16 (IV); Page 23 (V); Page 25 (VI); Page 32 (VII)
13	A description of alternative or multiple uses of the property considered by the lessee and a statement detailing why such uses were not adopted.	18-2.018	Page 12 (II.D)

14	A description of the management responsibilities of each entity involved in the property's management and how such responsibilities will be coordinated.	18-2.018	Page 1 (Executive Summary); Page 14 (II.E.1)
15	Include a provision that requires that the managing agency consult with the Division of Historical Resources, Department of State before taking actions that may adversely affect archeological or historical resources.	18-2.021	Page 15 (III.C-D); Exhibit G
16	Analysis/description of other managing agencies and private land managers, if any, which could facilitate the restoration or management of the land.	18-2.021	Page 15 (II.E.6); Page 15 (III.C); Page 19 (IV.C.2-3); Page 32 (VI.F)
17	A determination of the public uses and public access that would be consistent with the purposes for which the lands were acquired.	259.032	Page 3 (I.A)
18	A finding regarding whether each planned use complies with the 1981 State Lands Management Plan, particularly whether such uses represent "balanced public utilization," specific agency statutory authority and any other legislative or executive directives that constrain the use of such property.	18-2.021	Page 11 (II.B.5)
19	Letter of compliance from the local government stating that the LMP is in compliance with the Local Government Comprehensive Plan.	BOT requirement	Page 13 (II.D.5); Exhibit R
20	An assessment of the impact of planned uses on the renewable and non-renewable resources of the property, including soil and water resources, and a detailed description of the specific actions that will be taken to protect, enhance and conserve these resources and to compensate/mitigate damage caused by such uses, including a description of how the manager plans to control and prevent soil erosion and soil or water contamination.	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Page 7 (I.C Goal 7); Page 16 (IV); Exhibits J & K
21	*For managed areas larger than 1,000 acres, an analysis of the multiple-use potential of the property which shall include the potential of the property to generate revenues to enhance the management of the property provided that no lease, easement, or license for such revenue-generating use shall be entered into if the granting of such lease, easement or license would adversely affect the tax exemption of the interest on any revenue bonds issued to fund the acquisition of the affected lands from gross income for federal income tax purposes, pursuant to Internal Revenue Service regulations.	18-2.021 & 253.036	Page 3 (I.A); Page 10 (II.B.4)
22	If the lead managing agency determines that timber resource management is not in conflict with the primary management objectives of the managed area, a component or section, prepared by a qualified professional forester, that assesses the feasibility of managing timber resources pursuant to section 253.036, F.S.	18-021	Page 29 (VI.C)
23	A statement regarding incompatible use in reference to Ch. 253.034(10).	253.034(10)	Page 12 (II.D.1)

*The following taken from 253.034(10) is not a land management plan requirement; however, it should be considered when developing a land management plan: The following additional uses of conservation lands acquired pursuant to the Florida Forever program and other state-funded conservation land purchase programs shall be authorized, upon a finding by the Board of Trustees, if they meet the criteria specified in paragraphs (a)-(e): water resource development projects, water supply development projects, storm-water management projects, linear facilities and sustainable agriculture and forestry. Such additional uses are authorized where: (a) Not inconsistent with the management plan for such lands; (b) Compatible with the natural ecosystem and resource values of such lands; (c) The proposed use is appropriately located on such lands and where due consideration is given to the use of other available lands; (d) The using entity reasonably compensates the titleholder for such use based upon an appropriate measure of value; and (e) The use is consistent with the public interest.

Section C: Public Involvement Items

Item #	Requirement	Statute/Rule	Page Numbers and/or Appendix
--------	-------------	--------------	------------------------------

24	A statement concerning the extent of public involvement and local government participation in the development of the plan, if any.	18-2.021	Page 1 (Executive Summary); Page 15 (II.E.4); Exhibits D, Q, R, S
25	The management prospectus required pursuant to paragraph (9)(d) shall be available to the public for a period of 30 days prior to the public hearing.	259.032	✓
26	LMPs and LMP updates for parcels over 160 acres shall be developed with input from an advisory group who must conduct at least one public hearing within the county in which the parcel or project is located. <i>Include the advisory group members and their affiliations, as well as the date and location of the advisory group meeting.</i>	259.032	Page 15 (II.E.4); Exhibit S
27	Summary of comments and concerns expressed by the advisory group for parcels over 160 acres	18-2.021	Exhibit S
28	During plan development, at least one public hearing shall be held in each affected county. Notice of such public hearing shall be posted on the parcel or project designated for management, advertised in a paper of general circulation, and announced at a scheduled meeting of the local governing body before the actual public hearing. <i>Include a copy of each County's advertisements and announcements (meeting minutes will suffice to indicate an announcement) in the management plan.</i>	253.034 & 259.032	✓
29	The manager shall consider the findings and recommendations of the land management review team in finalizing the required 10-year update of its management plan. <i>Include manager's replies to the team's findings and recommendations.</i>	259.036	Page 15 (II.E.4); No land management reviews on property have been initiated or completed due to newly acquired property / establishing the first land management plan for property.
30	Summary of comments and concerns expressed by the management review team, if required by Section 259.036, F.S.	18-2.021	No land management reviews on property have been initiated or completed due to newly acquired property / establishing the first land management plan for property.
31	If manager is not in agreement with the management review team's findings and recommendations in finalizing the required 10-year update of its management plan, the managing agency should explain why they disagree with the findings or recommendations.	259.036	No land management reviews on property have been initiated or completed due to newly acquired property / establishing the first land management plan for property.

Section D: Natural Resources

Item #	Requirement	Statute/Rule	Page Numbers and/or Appendix
32	Location and description of known and reasonably identifiable renewable and non-renewable resources of the property regarding soil types. <i>Use brief descriptions and include USDA maps when available.</i>	18-2.021	Page 17 (IV.A); Exhibit H
33	Insert FNAI based natural community maps when available.	ARC consensus	Exhibits K, O, P

34	Location and description of known and reasonably identifiable renewable and non-renewable resources of the property regarding outstanding native landscapes containing relatively unaltered flora, fauna and geological conditions.	18-2.021	Page 19 (IV.C); Exhibits H, K, L
35	Location and description of known and reasonably identifiable renewable and non-renewable resources of the property regarding unique natural features and/or resources including but not limited to virgin timber stands, scenic vistas, natural rivers and streams, coral reefs, natural springs, caverns and large sinkholes.	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Page 23 (IV.G)
36	Location and description of known and reasonably identifiable renewable and non-renewable resources of the property regarding beaches and dunes.	18-2.021	Page 22 (IV.E)
37	Location and description of known and reasonably identifiable renewable and non-renewable resources of the property regarding mineral resources, such as oil, gas and phosphate, etc.	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Page 22 (IV.F)
38	Location and description of known and reasonably identifiable renewable and non-renewable resources of the property regarding fish and wildlife, both game and non-game, and their habitat.	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Page 21 (IV.C.4); Exhibits K, L
39	Location and description of known and reasonably identifiable renewable and non-renewable resources of the property regarding State and Federally listed endangered or threatened species and their habitat.	18-2.021	Page 19 (IV.C.1); Exhibits K, L
40	The identification or resources on the property that are listed in the Natural Areas Inventory. <i>Include letter from FNAI or consultant where appropriate.</i>	18-2.021	Page 19 (IV.C.2); Exhibits K, O, P
41	Specific description of how the managing agency plans to identify, locate, protect and preserve or otherwise use fragile, nonrenewable natural and cultural resources.	259.032	Page 4 (I.C); Page 15 (III.C.D); Page 16 (IV); Page 25 (VI.A-B); Page 32 (VII)
42	Habitat Restoration and Improvement	259.032 & 253.034 ↓	Page 16 (IV)
42-A.	Describe management needs, problems and a desired outcome and the key management activities necessary to achieve the enhancement, protection and preservation of restored habitats and enhance the natural, historical and archeological resources and their values for which the lands were acquired.		Page 4 (I.C); Page 32 (VII)
42-B.	Provide a detailed description of both short (2-year planning period) and long-term (10-year planning period) management goals, and a priority schedule based on the purposes for which the lands were acquired and include a timeline for completion.		Page 4 (I.C)
42-C.	The associated measurable objectives to achieve the goals.		Page 4 (I.C)
42-D.	The related activities that are to be performed to meet the land management objectives and their associated measures. <i>Include fire management plans - they can be in plan body or an appendix.</i>		Page 4 (I.C); Page 25 (VI); Page 32 (VII)
42-E.	A detailed expense and manpower budget in order to provide a management tool that facilitates development of performance measures, including recommendations for cost-effective methods of accomplishing those activities.		Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.
43	***Quantitative data description of the land regarding an inventory of forest and other natural resources and associated acreage. <i>See footnote.</i>	253.034	Page 8 (II.A.2); Page 9 (II.A.4); Page 11 (II.C); Page 32 (VII); Exhibits B, I, L, P, R

44	Sustainable Forest Management, including implementation of prescribed fire management		Page 25 (VI); Exhibit M
44-A.	Management needs, problems and a desired outcome (see requirement for # 42-A).		Page 4 (I.C. Goal 1); Page 25 (VI); Page 32 (VII)
44-B.	Detailed description of both short and long-term management goals (see requirement for # 42-B).		Page 4 (I.C. Goal 1)
44-C.	Measurable objectives (see requirement for #42-C).		Page 4 (I.C. Goal 1)
44-D.	Related activities (see requirement for #42-D).		Page 25 (VI); Page 32 (VII)
44-E.	Budgets (see requirement for #42-E).	18-2.021, 253.034 & 259.032 ↓	Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.
45	Imperiled species, habitat maintenance, enhancement, restoration or population restoration	259.032 & 253.034	Page 19 (IV.C)
45-A.	Management needs, problems and a desired outcome (see requirement for # 42-A).	↓	Page 6 (I.C Goal 4); Page 19 (IV.C.1); Page 32 (VII)
45-B.	Detailed description of both short and long-term management goals (see requirement for # 42-B).		Page 6 (I.C Goal 4); Page 19 (IV.C.1); Page 32 (VII)
45-C.	Measurable objectives (see requirement for #42-C).		Page 6 (I.C Goal 4)
45-D.	Related activities (see requirement for #42-D).		Page 19 (IV.C.1); Page 32 (VII)
45-E.	Budgets (see requirement for #42-E).		Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.
45-F	Assess the feasibility of managing the lands > 40 contiguous acres as a recipient site for gopher tortoises consistent with rules of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, as prepared by the agency or cooperatively with a Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission wildlife biologist.	259.105	Page 22 (IV.C.6)
45-G	Economic feasibility of establishing a gopher tortoise recipient site, including the initial cost, recurring management costs and the revenue projections.	259.105	Page 22 (IV.C.6)
46	***Quantitative data description of the land regarding an inventory of exotic and invasive plants and associated acreage. <i>See footnote.</i>	253.034	Page 30 (VI.D); Exhibit N
47	Place the Arthropod Control Plan in an appendix. If one does not exist, provide a statement as to what arrangement exists between the local mosquito control district and the management unit.	BOT requirement via lease language	Exhibit T
48	Exotic and invasive species maintenance and control	259.032 & 253.034	Page 30 (VI.D)
48-A.	Management needs, problems and a desired outcome (see requirement for # 42-A).	↓	Page 7 (I.C Goal 5); Exhibit N

48-B.	Detailed description of both short and long-term management goals (see requirement for # 42-B).		Page 7 (I.C Goal 5)
48-C.	Measurable objectives (see requirement for #42-C).		Page 7 (I.C Goal 5)
48-D.	Related activities (see requirement for #42-D).		Page 30 (VI.D,E); Page 32 (VII)
48-E.	Budgets (see requirement for #42-E).		Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.

Section E: Water Resources

Item #	Requirement	Statute/Rule	Page Numbers and/or Appendix
49	A statement as to whether the property is within and/or adjacent to an aquatic preserve or a designated area of critical state concern or an area under study for such designation. <i>If yes, provide a list of the appropriate managing agencies that have been notified of the proposed plan.</i>	18-2.018 & 18-2.021	Page 11 (II.B.7)
50	Location and description of known and reasonably identifiable renewable and non-renewable resources of the property regarding water resources, including water classification for each water body and the identification of any such water body that is designated as an Outstanding Florida Water under Rule 62-302.700, F.A.C.	18-2.021	Page 17 (IV.B); Exhibits I, J
51	Location and description of known and reasonably identifiable renewable and non-renewable resources of the property regarding swamps, marshes and other wetlands.	18-2.021	Page 18 (IV.B.4)
52	***Quantitative description of the land regarding an inventory of hydrological features and associated acreage. <i>See footnote.</i>	253.034	Page 17 (IV.B); Page 32 (VII)
53	Hydrological Preservation and Restoration	259.032 & 253.034	Page 17 (IV.B)
53-A.	Management needs, problems and a desired outcome (see requirement for # 42-A).	↓	Page 7 (I.C. Goal 7); Page 17 (IV.B)
53-B.	Detailed description of both short and long-term management goals (see requirement for # 42-B).		Page 7 (I.C. Goal 7)
53-C.	Measurable objectives (see requirement for #42-C).		Page 7 (I.C. Goal 7)
53-D.	Related activities (see requirement for #42-D).		Page 7 (I.C. Goal 7); Page 17 (IV.B)
53-E.	Budgets (see requirement for #42-E).		Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.

Section F: Historical, Archeological and Cultural Resources

Item #	Requirement	Statute/Rule	Page Numbers and/or Appendix
--------	-------------	--------------	------------------------------

54	**Location and description of known and reasonably identifiable renewable and non-renewable resources of the property regarding archeological and historical resources. <i>Include maps of all cultural resources except Native American sites, unless such sites are major points of interest that are open to public visitation.</i>	18-2.018, 18-2.021 & per DHR's request	Page 15 (III.B); Exhibit F
55	***Quantitative data description of the land regarding an inventory of significant land, cultural or historical features and associated acreage.	253.034	Page 15 (III.B); Exhibit F
56	A description of actions the agency plans to take to locate and identify unknown resources such as surveys of unknown archeological and historical resources.	18-2.021	Page 15 (III.C,D); Exhibit G
57	Cultural and Historical Resources	259.032 & 253.034 ↓	Page 15 (III)
57-A.	Management needs, problems and a desired outcome (see requirement for # 42-A).		Page 7 (I.C. Goal 6)
57-B.	Detailed description of both short and long-term management goals (see requirement for # 42-B).		Page 7 (I.C. Goal 6)
57-C.	Measurable objectives (see requirement for #42-C).		Page 7 (I.C. Goal 6)
57-D.	Related activities (see requirement for #42-D).		Page 15 (III.C,D)
57-E.	Budgets (see requirement for #42-E).		Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.

**While maps of Native American sites should not be included in the body of the management plan, the DSL urges each managing agency to provide such information to the Division of Historical Resources for inclusion in their proprietary database. This information should be available for access to new managers to assist them in developing, implementing and coordinating their management activities.

Section G: Facilities (Infrastructure, Access, Recreation)

Item #	Requirement	Statute/Rule	Page Numbers and/or Appendix
58	***Quantitative data description of the land regarding an inventory of infrastructure and associated acreage. <i>See footnote.</i>	253.034	Page 11 (II.C); Exhibit C
59	Capital Facilities and Infrastructure	259.032 & 253.034 ↓	Page 11 (II.C.)
59-A.	Management needs, problems and a desired outcome (see requirement for # 42-A).		Page 8 (I.C. Goal 8); Page 11 (II.C.)
59-B.	Detailed description of both short and long-term management goals (see requirement for # 42-B).		Page 8 (I.C. Goal 8); Page 11 (II.C.)
59-C.	Measurable objectives (see requirement for #42-C).		Page 8 (I.C. Goal 8); Page 11 (II.C.)
59-D.	Related activities (see requirement for #42-D).		Page 11 (II.C); Page 23 (V)
59-E.	Budgets (see requirement for #42-E).		Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.
60	*** Quantitative data description of the land regarding an inventory of recreational facilities and associated acreage.	253.034	Page 23 (V); Exhibit C

61	Public Access and Recreational Opportunities	259.032 & 253.034 ↓	Page 23 (V)
61-A.	Management needs, problems and a desired outcome (see requirement for # 42-A).		Page 5 (I.C. Goal 2)
61-B.	Detailed description of both short and long-term management goals (see requirement for # 42-B).		Page 5 (I.C. Goal 2)
61-C.	Measurable objectives (see requirement for #42-C).		Page 5 (I.C. Goal 2)
61-D.	Related activities (see requirement for #42-D).		Page 10 (II.B.4); Page 15 (II.E.5,6); Exhibits A, B, C
61-E.	Budgets (see requirement for #42-E).		Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.

Section H: Other/ Managing Agency Tools

Item #	Requirement	Statute/Rule	Page Numbers and/or Appendix
62	Place this LMP Compliance Checklist at the front of the plan.	ARC and managing agency consensus	✓
63	Place the Executive Summary at the front of the LMP. Include a physical description of the land.	ARC and 253.034	Page 1 (Executive Summary)
64	If this LMP is a 10-year update, note the accomplishments since the drafting of the last LMP set forth in an organized (categories or bullets) format.	ARC consensus	Page 4 (I.B); Exhibit A
65	Key management activities necessary to achieve the desired outcomes regarding other appropriate resource management.	259.032	Page 4 (I.C.); Page 32 (VII)
66	Summary budget for the scheduled land management activities of the LMP including any potential fees anticipated from public or private entities for projects to offset adverse impacts to imperiled species or such habitat, which fees shall be used to restore, manage, enhance, repopulate, or acquire imperiled species habitat for lands that have or are anticipated to have imperiled species or such habitat onsite. The summary budget shall be prepared in such a manner that it facilitates computing an aggregate of land management costs for all state-managed lands using the categories described in s. 259.037(3) which are resource management, administration, support, capital improvements, recreation visitor services, law enforcement activities.	253.034	Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.
67	Cost estimate for conducting other management activities which would enhance the natural resource value or public recreation value for which the lands were acquired, include recommendations for cost-effective methods in accomplishing those activities.	259.032	Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.

68	A statement of gross income generated, net income and expenses.	18-2.018	Page 12 (II.C.4); No budget exhibit exists because expenses are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with Forest Management support as warranted.
----	---	----------	--

*** = The referenced inventories shall be of such detail that objective measures and benchmarks can be established for each tract of land and monitored during the lifetime of the plan. All quantitative data collected shall be aggregated, standardized, collected, and presented in an electronic format to allow for uniform management reporting and analysis. The information collected by the DEP pursuant to s. 253.0325(2) shall be available to the land manager and his or her assignee.

TEN-YEAR LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN
FOR THE
KISSIMMEE BEND STATE FOREST
OKEECHOBEE COUNTY



Photo courtesy of Florida Natural Areas Inventory

PREPARED BY
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER SERVICES
FLORIDA FOREST SERVICE

APPROVED ON
TBD, 2025

TEN-YEAR LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN
FOR THE
KISSIMMEE BEND STATE FOREST



Approved by:

Richard Dolan, Director
Florida Forest Service

Date

James Roberts, Chief
Forest Management Bureau

Date

**TEN-YEAR LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN
KISSIMMEE BEND STATE FOREST
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Land Management Plan Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction.....	3
A. General Mission and Management Plan Direction	3
B. Past Accomplishments	4
C. Goals / Objectives for the Next Ten-Year Period.....	4
II. Administration Section	8
A. Descriptive Information.....	8
1. Common Name of Property	8
2. Legal Description and Acreage.....	8
3. Proximity to Other Public Resources.....	9
4. Property Acquisition and Land Use Considerations	9
B. Management Authority, Purpose, and Constraints	9
1. Purpose for Acquisition / Management Prospectus	9
2. Degree of Title Interest Held by the Board.....	10
3. Designated Single or Multiple-Use Management.....	10
4. Revenue Producing Activities.....	10
5. Conformation to State Lands Management Plan	11
6. Legislative or Executive Constraints	11
7. Aquatic Preserve / Area of Critical State Concern	11
C. Capital Facilities and Infrastructure.....	11
1. Property Boundaries Establishment and Preservation	11
2. Improvements	11
3. On-Site Housing.....	11
4. Operations Infrastructure	12
D. Additional Acquisitions and Land Use Considerations	12
1. Alternate Uses Considered.....	12
2. Additional Land Needs	13
3. Surplus Land Assessment	13
4. Adjacent Conflicting Uses	13
5. Compliance with Local Comprehensive Plan.....	13
6. Utility Corridors and Easements	13
E. Agency and Public Involvement.....	14
1. Responsibilities of Managing Agencies.....	14
2. Law Enforcement.....	14
3. Wildland Fire	14
4. Public and Local Government Involvement	15
5. Volunteers	15
6. Friends of Florida State Forests	15
III. Archaeological / Cultural Resources and Protection	15

A. Past Uses	15
B. Archaeological and Historical Resources	15
C. Ground Disturbing Activities.....	15
D. Survey and Monitoring	16
IV. Natural Resources and Protection	16
A. Soils and Geologic Resources.....	17
1. Resources	17
2. Soil Protection.....	17
B. Water Resources	17
1. Resources	17
2. Water Classification.....	17
3. Water Protection	17
4. Swamps, Marshes, and Other Wetlands	18
5. Wetlands Restoration.....	18
6. FDEP Basin Management Action Plan.....	18
C. Flora and Fauna Resources	19
1. Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species	19
2. Florida Natural Areas Inventory	19
3. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	20
4. Game Species and Other Wildlife.....	21
5. Survey and Monitoring	21
6. Gopher Tortoise Recipient Site Feasibility Assessment	22
D. Sustainable Forest Resources.....	22
E. Beaches and Dune Resources	22
F. Mineral Resources	22
G. Unique Natural Features and Outstanding Native Landscapes.....	23
H. Research Projects / Specimen Collection	23
I. Ground Disturbing Activities.....	23
V. Public Access and Recreation	23
A. Existing Recreation Opportunities	24
B. Planned Recreation Opportunities	24
C. Hunter Access	25
D. Education	25
VI. Forest Management Practices	25
A. Prescribed Fire	25
B. Wildfire Prevention and Mitigation Strategies	27
1. Suppression Strategies	27
2. Smoke Management.....	28
3. Firebreaks and Firelines.....	28
4. Sensitive Areas.....	28
5. Firewise Communities	28
6. Adjacent Neighbor Contacts	29
7. Post-Burn Evaluations	29

C. Sustainable Forestry & Silviculture	29
1. Strategies	29
2. Silvicultural Operations	29
3. Forest Inventory	30
4. Timber Sales	30
5. Cattle Grazing	30
D. Invasive Species Control.....	30
E. Insects, Disease, and Forest Health.....	31
F. Use of Private Land Contractors.....	32
VII. Proposed Management Activities for Natural Communities	32
A. Depression Marsh	33
B. Dry Prairie.....	34
C. Mesic Hammock	36
D. Slough Marsh.....	37
E. Wet Prairie	38
F. Altered Landcover Types.....	39
VIII. References.....	40
IX. Glossary of Abbreviations	41

TABLES

Table 1. KBSF Acreage by Funding Source.....	Page 8
Table 2. Nearby Public Conservation Land and Easements	Page 9
Table 3. Parcel Acquisition.....	Page 9
Table 4. Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species Documented on KBSF	Page 19
Table 5. Invasive Plant Species Occurring on KBSF	Page 31
Table 6. Natural Landcover Types.....	Page 32
Table 7. Altered Landcover Types	Page 32
Table 8. Prescribed Fire Interval Guide on KBSF	Page 33

**TEN-YEAR LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN
KISSIMMEE BEND STATE FOREST
EXHIBITS**

Four-Year Management Accomplishments Summary.....	Exhibit A
Boundary and Road Map	Exhibit B
Facilities, Recreation, and Improvements Map	Exhibit C
Florida Forever Acquisition Project.....	Exhibit D
Proximity to Significant Managed Lands Map.....	Exhibit E
DHR Report on Archaeological and Cultural Sites.....	Exhibit F
Management Procedures for Archaeological and Historical Sites and Properties on State Owned or Controlled Lands	Exhibit G
Soil Types Map and Descriptions	Exhibit H
FDEP Outstanding Florida Waters	Exhibit I
Water Resources Map	Exhibit J
FNAI Managed Area Data Report	Exhibit K
FWC Listed Species Occurrence Records	Exhibit L
KBSF Fire History	Exhibit M
Invasive Species Map	Exhibit N
Current FNAI Natural Communities and Cover Types Map.....	Exhibit O
Historic FNAI Natural Communities and Cover Types Map	Exhibit P
Management Prospectus	Exhibit Q
Compliance with Local Comprehensive Plan.....	Exhibit R
Management Plan Advisory Group Summary	Exhibit S
Arthropod Control Plan.....	Exhibit T

LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LEAD AGENCY: Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS), Florida Forest Service (FFS)
COMMON NAME: Kissimmee Bend State Forest
LOCATION: Okeechobee County
ACREAGE TOTAL: 1,992 acres

Historic Natural Communities	Approximate Acreage
Dry Prairie	756
Slough Marsh	581
Wet Prairie	364

Historic Natural Communities	Approximate Acreage
Depression Marsh	245
Mesic Hammock	46

TIITF LEASE AGREEMENT NUMBERS: 4836

USE: Single ☐ Multiple ☒

MANAGEMENT AGENCY

FDACS, Florida Forest Service
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
South Florida Water Management District
Department of State, Division of Historical Resources

RESPONSIBILITY

General Forest Resource Management
Wildlife Resources & Laws
Water Resource Protection & Restoration
Historical & Archaeological Resource Management

DESIGNATED LAND USE: Multiple-Use State Forest
SUBLEASES: None
ENCUMBRANCES: None
TYPE ACQUISITION: Florida Forever acquisition project
UNIQUE FEATURES: Globally imperiled dry prairie is the primary natural community
ARCHAEOLOGICAL / HISTORICAL: No (0) known sites
MANAGEMENT NEEDS: Continued restoration and maintenance of native ecosystems and protection of archaeological and historical sites if discovered
ACQUISITION NEEDS: None
SURPLUS ACREAGE: None
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: Management Review Team, Management Plan Advisory Group, Management Plan Review Public Hearing & Kissimmee Bend State Forest Liaison Committee -----

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE (FOR DIVISION OF STATE LANDS USE ONLY)

ARC Approval Date: _____ TIITF Approval Date: _____

Comments: _____

I. Introduction

Kissimmee Bend State Forest (KBSF) is located within the Everglades Headwaters and Kissimmee River Basin. The 1,992-acre property was purchased through the Florida Forever Acquisition Program in April 2020 with the primary objectives of protecting water quality and quantity in the Kissimmee River and Lake Okeechobee watersheds and implementing resource-based outdoor recreation opportunities. The name is derived from the distinct western bend in the Kissimmee River directly west of the property.

The dominant features of KBSF are the dry prairies and associated isolated wetland communities. The forest's biologically rich grasslands are a significant part of the Everglades Headwaters ecosystem. This unique ecosystem is known for its rare and diverse wildlife, including the Florida grasshopper sparrow, Florida scrub-jay and the crested caracara. The globally imperiled dry prairie is the primary natural community found at KBSF, though examples of depression marsh, mesic hammock, slough marsh and wet prairie can also be found.

A. General Mission and Management Plan Direction

The primary mission of the FFS is to “protect Florida and its people from the dangers of wildland fire and manage forest resources through a stewardship ethic to assure they are available for future generations.”

Management strategies for KBSF center on the multiple-use concept, as defined in sections 589.04(3) and 253.034(2)(a), Florida Statutes (F.S.). Implementation of this concept will utilize and conserve state forest resources in a harmonious and coordinated combination that will best serve the people of the State of Florida, and that is consistent with the purpose for which the forest was acquired. Multiple-use management for KBSF will be accomplished with the following strategies:

- Practice sustainable forest management for the efficient generation of revenue and in support of state forest management objectives;
- Provide for resource-based outdoor recreation opportunities for multiple interests;
- Restore and manage healthy forests and native ecosystems ensuring the long-term viability of populations and species listed as endangered, threatened, or rare, and other components of biological diversity, including game and non-game wildlife and plants;
- Protect known archaeological, historical, and cultural resources;
- Restore, maintain, and protect hydrological functions, related water resources, and the health of associated wetland and aquatic communities; and
- Provide research and educational opportunities related to natural resource management.

This management plan is provided according to requirements of Sections 253.034, 259.032, and 373, Florida Statutes (F.S.) and was prepared utilizing guidelines outlined in Section 18-2.021 of the Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.). It is not an annual work plan or detailed operational plan but provides general guidance for the management of KBSF for the next ten-year period and outlines the major concepts that will guide management activities on the forest.

B. Past Accomplishments

Insofar as the property was recently acquired in April 2020, the management activities and goals continue to be developed for KBSF. Data regarding past management activities and public use on KBSF have been compiled monthly and are available from the forest manager. A table has been prepared for this plan that summarizes the accomplishments for each of the past four years. See Exhibit A. The table does not attempt to account for all activities on the forest, but summarizes major activities, nor does it list the multitude of daily activities and public interactions involved in managing KBSF. Among the most notable accomplishments have been the following:

- Conducted prescribed burns on 2,887 acres
- Marked 3.5 miles of boundary; equating to one half (1/2) of the forest perimeter
- Treated one acre of cogongrass
- Improved 0.1 miles of road
- Liaison Committee of private citizens and interested parties assembled in February 2022.

C. Goals / Objectives for the Next Ten-Year Period

The following goals and objectives provide direction and focus of management resources for the next ten-year planning period. Funding, agency program priorities, and the potential for wildfire during the planning period will determine the degree to which these objectives can be met. Management activities on KBSF during this period must conserve, protect, utilize, and enhance the natural and historical resources and manage resource-based outdoor recreation, which is compatible with the conservation and protection of this forest. Most of the management operations will be conducted by the FFS, although some activities will be contracted to private sector vendors or completed with the cooperation of other agencies. All activities will enhance the property's natural resource or public recreation value.

The management activities listed below will be addressed within the ten-year management period and are defined as short-term goals, long-term goals, or ongoing goals. Short-term goals are goals that are achievable within a two-year planning period, and long-term goals are achievable within a ten-year planning period. Objectives are listed in priority order for each goal. Other activities will be completed with minimal overhead expense and existing staff.

➤ GOAL 1: Sustainable Forest Management

Objective 1: Develop and implement the Five-Year Silviculture Action Plan including prescribed burning and understory restoration. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measures:

- Annual updates of the Five-Year Silviculture Action Plan completed
- Continued implementation of the Five-Year Silviculture Action Plan (acres treated)

Objective 2: Continue to implement the FFS process for developing stand descriptions and conducting forest inventory, including maintaining a GIS database containing forest stands, roads, and other attributes (including but not limited to: rare, threatened, and endangered species, archaeological and historical resources, invasive species locations). (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measures:

- Updated GIS database and re-inventory of all attributes as required by FFS procedures

- Number of acres inventoried

➤ **GOAL 2: Public Access and Recreation Opportunities**

Objective 1: Maintain public access and recreation opportunities that are compatible with multiple-use management. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measure: Number of visitor opportunities per day

Objective 2: Evaluate the potential for additional public access and recreation opportunities on KBSF that are compatible with multiple-use management. Recreation opportunities will fall under the scope of multiple-use management in accordance with watershed protection, conservation, ecosystem restoration, and as detailed in the purpose for acquisition. (Short-term objective)

Performance Measure: List of viable access points and visitor opportunities for consideration

Objective 3: Continue to safely integrate visitor use into KBSF, develop the Five-Year Outdoor Recreation Plan, and update annually. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measures:

- Continued implementation of the Five-Year Outdoor Recreation Plan
- Annual updates of the Five-Year Outdoor Recreation Plan completed

Objective 4: Continue to involve and meet with the Liaison Committee. The purpose of Liaison Committee meetings is to facilitate communication between the FFS and committee members (and the groups they represent) about state forest management and to obtain feedback from these entities. The Liaison Committee consists of local residents, community leaders, special interest group representatives (vendors, hunters, and other recreation users, etc.), environmental group representatives, and other public / private entities. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measures:

- Liaison Committee remains organized
- Annual meetings continue

Objective 5: Maintain cooperation with Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) to develop specific hunting season quotas and bag limits, and to address hunting issues which are to be agreed upon at an annual cooperator meeting between FFS and FWC. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measures:

- Annual letter on agreed-upon hunting issues
- Updated rules posted and WMA brochures available online at MyFWC.com

Objective 6: Recruit volunteers and volunteer organizations to assist with recreation and / or resource management. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measures:

- Number of volunteers and organizations that assist with projects
- Number of hours provided by volunteers

➤ **GOAL 3: Habitat Restoration, Improvement, and Fire Management**

Objective 1: The KBSF currently contains approximately 1,992 acres of fire-dependent communities. To achieve an average a fire-return interval of 1 to 4 years for most communities in the forest, FFS will attempt to conduct prescribed burns on an average of approximately 500 – 1000 acres per year. Currently FFS staff estimates 1,992 acres at KBSF are within the desired fire-return interval. (Ongoing Objective)

Performance Measures:

- Number of acres burned during the dormant and growing seasons
- Number of acres burned within target fire-return interval

Objective 2: Continue to annually update and implement the Five-Year Prescribed Burning Management Plan and the prescribed burning goals. (Ongoing Objective)

Performance Measures:

- Annual updates of the Five-Year Prescribed Burning Management Plan completed
- Continued implementation of the Five-Year Prescribed Burning Management Plan (acres treated)

Objective 3: Reduce the threat of wildfire within the wildland urban interface on KBSF and the surrounding community through a comprehensive mitigation strategy that includes evaluating vegetative fuels near residential areas and identifying potential fuel reduction projects. (Ongoing Objective)

Performance Measures:

- Evaluation complete
- Should fuel reduction be necessary, the number of acres treated for fuel reduction

Objective 4: Utilize prescribed fire to enhance restoration of native groundcover. Evaluate areas where native groundcover has been eliminated or heavily impacted from historical land use on a case-by-case basis for alternative methods to address reestablishment of native groundcover plants. Restore native groundcover where practical or heavily impacted from historical land use. (Long-term objective)

Performance Measure: Number of acres restored

➤ **GOAL 4: Listed and Rare Species Habitat Maintenance, Enhancement, Restoration, or Population Restoration**

Objective 1: In cooperation with FWC, develop a Wildlife Management Strategy addressing the wildlife species for KBSF, with emphasis on imperiled species and associated management prescriptions for their habitats. (Long-term objective)

Performance Measures:

- Imperiled species management strategy completed
- Baseline-listed and rare species list completed for KBSF

Objective 2: In consultation with FWC, implement survey and monitoring protocols, where feasible, for listed and rare species. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measure: Number of species for which monitoring is ongoing

➤ **GOAL 5: Invasive Species Maintenance and Control**

Objective 1: Continue to follow and annually update the Five-Year Ecological Plan for KBSF, to locate, identify, and control invasive species. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measures:

- Total number of acres identified and successfully treated
- Annual updates of the Five-Year Ecological Plan completed
- Continue to maintain KBSF invasive database information annually

➤ **GOAL 6: Cultural and Historical Resource Management**

Objective 1: Ensure all Ground Disturbing Activities are managed in compliance with the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources (DHR) Florida Master Site File. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measure: Number of Ground Disturbing Activities handled per DHR guidelines

Objective 2: Request an archeological survey of KBSF to determine if any archeological resources exist on site. (Long-term objective)

Performance Measure: Completed archeological survey through the Public Lands Archaeology program.

Objective 3: Ensure that any sites discovered during Ground Disturbing Activities are recorded in the DHR Master Site file. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measure: Send any newly recorded site(s) to DHR Master Site file as needed and monitor the recorded site(s)

Objective 4: Maintain at least one (1) qualified staff member as an Archaeological Resource Management (ARM) monitor. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measure: Number of local staff trained as ARM monitors

➤ **GOAL 7: Hydrological Preservation and Restoration**

Objective 1: Protect water resources during management activities through the implementation of Silviculture Best Management Practices (BMP) that are applicable to forest road maintenance and construction, construction of pre-suppression firelines, timber stand improvement activities, sinkholes, etc. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measure: Percent compliance with Silviculture BMP

Objective 2: Close, rehabilitate, or restore those roads, firelines, and trails that have evidence of erosion into surrounding water bodies causing alterations to the hydrology and / or water quality. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measures:

- Number of roads, firelines, and trails closed, rehabilitated, and / or restored
- Number of culverts installed or maintained

Objective 3: Conduct or obtain a site assessment / study to identify potential hydrology restoration needs. (Short-term objective)

Performance Measure: Assessment conducted

➤ **GOAL 8: Capital Facilities and Infrastructure**

Objective 1: KBSF staff, along with help from volunteers and / or user groups, will construct and maintain three (3) primitive campgrounds, and will maintain 1.3 miles of road existing on the forest. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measure: Number of existing facilities constructed and maintained and number of miles of roads maintained.

Objective 2: Continue to follow the Five-Year Roads and Bridges Management Plan and update annually. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measures:

- Continued implementation of the Five-Year Roads and Bridges Management Plan
- Annual updates of the Five-Year Roads and Bridges Management Plan completed

Objective 3: Continue to implement the Five-Year Boundary Survey and Maintenance Management Plan and update annually. Approximately 20 percent of the forest boundary will be remarked annually as necessary which includes harrowing, reposting signage, and repainting boundary trees. (Ongoing objective)

Performance Measures:

- Continued implementation of the Five-Year Boundary Survey and Maintenance Management Plan
- Percentage of forest boundary maintained each year
- Annual updates of the Five-Year Boundary Survey and Maintenance Management Plan completed

II. Administration Section

A. Descriptive Information

1. Common Name of Property

The common name of the property is the Kissimmee Bend State Forest.

2. Legal Description and Acreage

The KBSF is comprised of 1,992.12 acres.

The forest is located in Sections 11, 12, 13, and 14 in Township 34 South, Range 32 East; and Sections 7 and 18, Township 34 South, Range 33 East, Okeechobee County. The boundaries are identified in Exhibit B and Table 1.

Table 1. KBSF Acreage by Funding Source

Funding Source	Acres
Triple Diamond Florida Forever Project	1,992.12

A complete legal description of lands owned by the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund (TIITF) is on record at the Okeechobee District Office, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), and the FFS State Office in Tallahassee.

3. Proximity to Other Public Resources

Lands managed by state, federal, or local government for conservation of natural or cultural resources that are located within approximately 25 miles of the KBSF are included in Exhibit E and Table 2.

Table 2. Nearby Public Conservation Land and Easements

Tract	Managing Agency	Distance
Kissimmee Prairie Preserve State Park	DRP	Adjacent N
USFWS Refuge Kissimmee Bend Unit	USFWS	Adjacent E
USFWS Okeechobee Unit	USFWS	Adjacent SE
Wetlands Reserve Program Easement	NRCS	Adjacent W
Corona Ranch Conservation Easement	FDACS	2 miles S
Kissimmee River PUA	SFWMD	3 miles WSW
Avon Park Bombing Range	DOD	6 miles NW
DeLuca Preserve	UF	12 miles NE
Lake Wales Ridge NWR	USFWS	13 miles W
Lake Wales Ridge WMA	FWC	17 miles W
Lake Wales Ridge State Forest	FFS	18 miles NW
Fort Drum WMA	SJRWMD	22 miles NE
Highlands Hammock State Park	DEP	23 miles W

DEP – Department of Environmental Protection

DOD – Department of Defense

DRP – FDEP Division of Environment Protection

FDACS – Florida Department of Agriculture and
Consumer Services

FFS – Florida Forest Service

FWC – Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service

SFWMD – South Florida Water Management District

SJRWMD – Saint Johns River Water Management District

USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services

4. Property Acquisition and Land Use Considerations

In April 2020, FFS acquired the 1,992-acre property located within the Everglades Headwaters National Wildlife Refuge. The acquisition is part of the Triple Diamond Florida Forever project and conserves significant dry prairie habitat, as well as other high-quality habitats in an area of Florida known for its rare vertebrate wildlife, endangered natural communities, and significant hydrological initiatives. See Table 3 and Exhibit D.

Table 3. Parcel Acquisition

Parcel Name	Lease Date	Lease No.	Acres
Kissimmee Bend	4/13/2020	4836	1,992

B. Management Authority, Purpose, and Constraints

1. Purpose for Acquisition / Management Prospectus

The primary purpose of acquisition by the State of Florida was to preserve significant dry prairie, important in the long-term protection of this native natural community and the rare species that it supports, as well as provide recreation and research opportunities. KBSF is a part of the Triple Diamond Florida Forever project. Triple Diamond, along with existing conservation lands, contributes to a large, contiguous protection area of more than 200,000 acres. See Exhibit Q.

The permanent protection of the property was made possible through the acquisition work of the Open Space Institute (OSI) with the support of the Wyss Foundation. OSI purchased the land from the Wold Family, who actively managed the tract as a native range since 1976.

Management is provided by FFS with assistance, as warranted, from other agencies. FFS manages forest resources, recreation, water resource protection, watershed protection, and land use planning on KBSF.

Revenue derived from recreation is planned to offset incurred expenses, capital improvements, and Other Personal Services (OPS).

2. Degree of Title Interest Held by the Board

The TIITF holds fee simple title to all 1,992.12 acres of KBSF, with no reservations or encumbrances.

3. Designated Single or Multiple-Use Management

KBSF is managed under a multiple-use concept by the FFS, under the authority of Chapters 253 and 589, F.S. The FFS is the lead managing agency as stated in TIITF Management Lease number 4836.

Multiple-use management is the harmonious and coordinated management of timber, recreation, conservation of fish and wildlife, forage, archaeological and historic sites, habitat and other biological resources, or water resources so they are utilized in the combination that will best serve the people of the state, making the most judicious use of the land for some or all these resources and considering the relative values of the various resources. Local demands, acquisition objectives, and other factors influence the array of uses that are compatible with and allowed on any specific area of KBSF. This management approach is believed to provide for the greatest public benefit, by allowing compatible uses while protecting overall forest health, native ecosystems, and the functions and values associated with them.

4. Revenue Producing Activities

No significant revenue is expected to be initially generated. The future revenue will depend on the nature and extent of public use and the use of the facilities already on the property. Additional revenue producing activities will be considered when they have been determined to be financially feasible and will not adversely impact management of the forest. Current and potential revenue producing activities for the KBSF include, but are not limited to:

- *Recreation Fees* – Fees may be collected for day use activities, annual passes, and vendor / special use permits.
- *Privately Sponsored Recreation Events* – Currently no events have taken place.
- *Apiary Leases* – There are currently no apiary leases on KBSF. The feasibility of pursuing and establishing apiary leases on KBSF in areas where appropriate will be evaluated in accordance with guidelines stated in the State Forest Handbook.
- *Grazing Leases* – There are currently no grazing leases on KBSF.

5. Conformation to State Lands Management Plan

Management of the forest under the multiple-use concept complies with the State Lands Management Plan and provides optimum balanced public utilization of the property. Specific authority for the FFS's management of public land is derived from Chapters 253, 259 and 589 F.S.

6. Legislative or Executive Constraints

There are no known legislative or executive constraints specifically directed toward KBSF.

FFS makes every effort to comply with applicable statutes, rules, and ordinances when managing the forest. For example, when public facilities are developed on state forests, every effort is made to comply with Public Law 101-336, the Americans with Disabilities Act. As new facilities are developed, the universal access requirements of this law are followed in all cases except where the law allows reasonable exceptions (e.g., where handicap access is structurally impractical or where providing such access would change the fundamental character of the facility being provided).

7. Aquatic Preserve / Area of Critical State Concern

This area is not within an aquatic preserve or an area of critical state concern, nor is it in an area under study for such designation.

C. Capital Facilities and Infrastructure

1. Property Boundaries Establishment and Preservation

KBSF boundary lines, seven (7) miles in total, are managed by state forest personnel in accordance with the guidelines of the State Forest Handbook. There are four (4) gates throughout KBSF that require periodic maintenance. Twenty percent (20%) of the state forest boundary lines are to be maintained annually, or once every five years, by clearing, repainting, and reposting, and placement of state forest boundary signs by FFS personnel.

2. Improvements

Infrastructure present on the KBSF include two (2) wells. See Exhibit C.

3. On-Site Housing

There are no residences located on KBSF. Housing is prioritized based on FFS policy.

FFS may establish on-site housing (mobile / manufactured home) on KBSF if deemed necessary to alleviate security and management issues. The need and feasibility for the state forest will be evaluated and established if considered appropriate by the District Manager and approved by the FFS Director. Prior to the occurrence of any ground disturbing activity for establishing on-site housing, a notification will be sent to the Florida Division of Historical Resources (DHR) and Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) for review and recommendations. The need and feasibility specific for the forest will be evaluated and established if considered appropriate by the Okeechobee District Manager and approved by the FFS Director.

4. Operations Infrastructure

a. Operations Budget

There is no operations budget for KBSF. Personnel, budget, and equipment resources are derived from the expense budget for the Okeechobee District with support from Forest Management as warranted. Implementation of any of the activities within this management plan is contingent on annual district budget, availability of funding, other resources, and other statewide priorities.

b. Equipment

To carry out the resource management work on KBSF, as well as to maintain forest improvements such as trails, roads, and facilities, the following equipment is available for work on KBSF:

- 2017 Kubota UTV 4x4, with trailer
- Swamp Buggy
- Farm Tractor with tiller, mower, and grapple

c. Staffing

KBSF is managed under the direction of a Forest Area Supervisor. Additional staff are assigned to the forest as needed and include a Senior Forester as well as other district personnel.

The Forest Area Supervisor (FAS) will work to achieve the goals outlined in this management plan. Recreation planning and management activities as well as resource management and planning activities, such as trail flagging/identification, recreation facility placement, timber cruising, and sale administration, etc., are the responsibility of the FAS under the direction of the District Manager. Forest operations, such as road maintenance, operations/recreation facility maintenance, prescribed burning, etc., are the responsibility of the Forest Area Supervisor under the direction of the District Manager.

To augment the staff working on KBSF, the FAS is responsible for recruiting interested volunteers who can bring needed experience and skills to assist with the management of the forest recreation program as well as the resource management activities.

D. Additional Acquisitions and Land Use Considerations

1. Alternate Uses Considered

No alternate uses are being considered at this time. Alternate uses will be considered as requests are made and will be accommodated as appropriate if they are determined to be compatible with existing uses and with the management goals and objectives of KBSF. Uses determined as incompatible include but are not limited to water resource development projects, water supply projects, storm-water management projects, sewage treatment facilities, linear facilities, off highway vehicle use, dumping, mining, and oil well stimulation (e.g., hydraulic fracturing/fracking), or as determined by law, regulation, or other incompatible uses as described elsewhere in the management plan. Deadhead logging is not compatible with nor considered appropriate use within or adjacent to state forest boundaries. No water resource projects are being considered at this time on KBSF.

2. Additional Land Needs

There are no additional land needs for KBSF. KBSF is completely bounded by conservation land to the north, east and west. Lands to the south are in conservation easements.

3. Surplus Land Assessment

On conservation lands where FFS is the lead manager, FFS assesses and identifies areas for potential surplus land. This consists of an examination of resource and operational management needs, public access and recreation use, and GIS modeling and analysis.

The evaluation of KBSF by FFS has determined that all portions of the area are being managed and operated for the original purposes of acquisition, as well as center on the multiple-use concept, as defined in sections 589.04(3) and 253.034(2)(a), F.S. Implementation of this concept will utilize and conserve state forest resources in a harmonious and coordinated combination that will best serve the people of the State of Florida. Therefore, no portion of the KBSF is recommended for potential surplus.

4. Adjacent Conflicting Uses

FFS will cooperate with adjacent property owners, prospective owners, or prospective developers to discuss methods to minimize negative impacts on management, resources, facilities, roads, recreation, etc., and discuss ways to minimize encroachment onto the forest.

5. Compliance with Local Comprehensive Plan

This plan was submitted to the Board of County Commissioners in Okeechobee County for review and compliance with their local comprehensive plans. See Exhibit R.

6. Utility Corridors and Easements

FFS does not favor the fragmentation of natural communities with linear facilities. Consequently, easements for such uses will be discouraged to the greatest extent practical. The FFS does not consider KBSF suitable for any new linear facilities.

When such encroachments are unavoidable, previously disturbed sites will be the preferred location. The objectives, when identifying possible locations for new linear facilities, will be to minimize damage to sensitive resources (e.g., listed species and archaeological sites), minimize habitat fragmentation, limit disruption of management activities, including prescribed burns, and limit disruption of resource-based multiple use activities such as recreation.

Collocation of new linear facilities with existing corridors will be considered but will be used only where expansion of existing corridors does not increase the level of habitat fragmentation and disruption of management and multiple-use activities. FFS will further encourage the use of underground cable where scenic considerations are desirable as well as encourage the development and use of wildlife crossings for unavoidable roadway development projects. Easements for such utilities are subject to the review and approval of FDACS and the TIITF. Requests for linear facility uses will be handled according to the Governor and the Cabinet's linear facilities policy.

E. Agency & Public Involvement

1. Responsibilities of Managing Agencies

FFS is the lead managing agency, responsible for overall forest management and public recreation activities, as stated in TIITF Management Lease number 4836. Pursuant to the management lease, the lead managing agency may enter into further agreements or to subleases on any part of KBSF.

FFS will cooperate with the DHR regarding appropriate management practices on historical or archaeological sites on the property as stated in Section 267.061, F.S. FFS will consult DHR prior to the initiation of ground disturbing activities as required per DHR guidelines.

FWC assumes law enforcement responsibilities and conducts other wildlife management activities with input from FFS.

The SFWMD will be consulted and involved in matters relating to water resources and hydrological restoration as appropriate.

Additionally, a State Forest Liaison Committee of private citizens and representatives of forest user groups meet annually to provide input on forest management activities and share their ideas with FFS staff to improve the forest.

2. Law Enforcement

Primary law enforcement responsibilities will be handled by FWC law enforcement officers. Rules governing the use of KBSF are stated in Chapter 5I-4, F.A.C. FWC will enforce fish and wildlife regulations and aid in enforcing state forest rules. FWC does not currently have an officer dedicated to patrolling and enforcement on KBSF. This task is shared among multiple FWC officers who also patrol and enforce laws on properties and waterways outside of KBSF.

The FDACS Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement (OALE) will assist with open burning and wildfire investigations as needed. The Okeechobee County Sheriff's Office provides additional assistance as needed.

Special rules under Chapter 5I-4, F.A.C. were promulgated for FDAC, FFS, to manage the use of state lands and better control traffic and oversee camping and other uses on KBSF.

3. Wildland Fire

The FFS has the primary responsibility for prevention, detection, and suppression of wildfires wherever they may occur. The FFS shall provide leadership and direction in the evaluation, coordination, allocation of resources, and monitoring of wildfire management and protection (F.S. 590.01). The FFS also has the responsibility of authorizing prescribed burns (F.S. 590.02 [1][i]).

4. Public and Local Government Involvement

This plan has been prepared by FFS and will be carried out primarily by the FFS. FFS responds to public involvement through liaison committees, management plan advisory groups, public hearings, and through ongoing direct contact with user groups.

The plan was developed with input from the KBSF Management Plan Advisory Group and was reviewed at a public hearing on January 29, 2025. A summary of the advisory group's meetings and discussions, as well as written comments received on the plan, are included in Exhibit S. The Acquisition and Restoration Council (ARC) public hearing and meeting serve as an additional forum for public input and review of the plan.

5. Volunteers

Volunteer recruitment will be an important asset to KBSF in support of the FFS mission. Volunteer activities may occur as one-time events or in association with recurring projects and routine maintenance. Additional volunteer recruitment will continue to assist furthering the FFS mission.

6. Friends of Florida State Forests

Friends of Florida State Forests, Inc. (FFSF) is a Direct Support Organization (DSO) of the Florida Forest Service. FFSF supports management activities and projects on Florida's state forests. FFSF is established by Florida statute, supports programs within Florida's state forests, and is governed by a board of directors representing all areas of the state. Through community support, FFSF assists the FFS to expand opportunities for recreation, environmental education, fire prevention, and forest management within Florida's state forests.

The FFSF program is referenced in Chapter 589.012, F.S. For more information visit: www.floridastateforests.org.

III. Archaeological / Cultural Resources and Protection

A. Past Uses

Dry prairie once covered a considerable area in southern Florida, but much less remains today. Lightning fires have naturally maintained the grass communities and provided forage for numerous generations of cattle. Early settlers to the area gathered cattle left behind by the first Spanish explorers. Prior to the State of Florida's acquisition, the property was managed for cattle grazing with a mixture of improved and native range since 1976.

B. Archaeological and Historical Resources

A review of information contained in the Florida Department of State, DHR, Florida Master Site File has determined there are no (0) recorded archeological sites and no (0) historical structures found within the designated area for KBSF. See Exhibit F.

C. Ground Disturbing Activities

Representatives of DHR and FNAI will be consulted prior to the initiation of proposed ground disturbing activity as required per DHR guidelines. FFS will make every effort to protect known archaeological and historical resources. FFS will follow the "Management Procedures for Archaeological and Historical Sites and Properties on State Owned or Controlled Lands" and

will comply with all appropriate provisions of Section 267.061(2)(a,b) F.S. See Exhibit G. Any significant ground disturbing activity proposal will be submitted to DHR's Compliance and Review office for review prior to undertakings and allow the Division a reasonable opportunity to comment. Ground disturbing activities not specifically covered by this plan will be conducted under the parameters of the Interim Management Guidelines.

D. Survey and Monitoring

Currently, no local district FFS staff is trained by DHR as an Archaeological Resource Management (ARM) monitor. FFS will pursue opportunities for additional personnel to receive ARM Monitor training. FFS will consult with public lands archaeologists at DHR, as necessary, to determine an appropriate priority and frequency of monitoring at each of the listed sites, and any protection measures that might be required. Unless required on a more frequent basis, all archaeological and historical sites within the forest will be monitored at least annually. FFS field staff will monitor the listed sites to note condition and any existing or potential threats.

Any known archaeological and historical sites will be identified on maps to aid state forest personnel and if necessary, law enforcement personnel in patrolling and protecting sites. Applicable surveys will be conducted by trained FFS staff or contracted archaeologists during the process of planning and implementing multiple-use management activities. FFS personnel will remain alert for any environmentally significant resource discoveries and protective actions will be taken as necessary. In addition, FFS will seek the advice and recommendations of DHR regarding any additional archaeological survey needs. Trained monitors will oversee limited types of ground disturbing activities in which DHR recommends monitoring. FFS will utilize the services of DHR Public Lands archaeologists, when available, to locate and evaluate unknown resources, and to make recommendations in the management of known resources.

IV. Natural Resources and Protection

The primary purpose for FFS management of KBSF is to preserve the water quality of the region and provide additional resource-based recreational opportunities. The forest will be managed so as to restore, protect, and manage ecosystem functions while allowing compatible public uses. Management activities will be executed in a manner to minimize soil erosion and maintain and protect/enhance the hydrological resources on KBSF. If problems arise, corrective action will be implemented by FFS staff under the direction of the FFS Forest Hydrology Section. Efforts will be made to monitor and protect KBSF's waterbodies and their associated water quality and native plants and animals.

KBSF falls within the jurisdiction of the SFWMD. FFS will coordinate with SFWMD and / or FDEP, as necessary, on activities pertaining to water resource protection and management. Any activities requiring water management district permits will be handled accordingly. FFS will work with SFWMD to ensure that levels and quality of ground and surface water resources are appropriately monitored.

A. Soils and Geologic Resources

1. Resources

Soil information for KBSF was obtained from the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). KBSF contains four (4) major soils. Of the major soils, predominant soils listed by the NRCS include Floridana / Riviera / Placid soils, Myakka fine sand, Valkaria fine sand, and Immokalee fine sand. Detailed information on all soils present on the forest may be found in Exhibit H.

2. Soil Protection

Management activities will be executed in a manner to minimize soil erosion. As problems arise, corrective action will be implemented by FFS staff under the direction of the FFS Forest Hydrology section in conjunction with recommendations as contained in the most current version of the Florida Silviculture BMP Manual.

Currently there are no major or significant soil erosion problems on KBSF.

B. Water Resources

The water resources on KBSF perform essential roles in the protection of water quality, groundwater recharge, flood control, and aquatic habitat preservation. In the interest of maintaining these valuable resource functions, state forest management personnel will work with the FFS Hydrology Section to incorporate wetlands restoration into the overall resource management program as opportunities arise, particularly where wetland systems have been impaired or negatively impacted by previous management activities or natural disasters. See Exhibit J for map of the water resources on KBSF.

1. Resources

Water resources on KBSF consist of seasonal ponds. There are no perennial ponds or streams.

2. Water Classification

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Standards Development Section reports there are no waters on or near the forest listed as exceptions to Class III according to subparagraph 62-302.400, F.A.C.; therefore, all of the surface waters on or adjacent to the site are classified III waters (Fish Consumption; Recreation, Propagation and Maintenance of a Healthy, Well-Balanced Population of Fish and Wildlife), which is the statewide default classification under subsection 62-302.400, F.A.C.

According to subsection 62-302.700(9), F.A.C., there are no Outstanding Florida Waters (OFWs) on, adjacent to, or near the forest. See Exhibit I.

3. Water Protection

The acquisition and management of this public land had among its objectives to optimize ecological restoration, protect, and manage existing natural resources, and facilitate sensible public use. Concern over a continuous usable source of fresh water requires emphasis on protecting this vital resource. Water resource protection measures, at a minimum, will be accomplished using BMPs as described in the most current version of the Silviculture BMP

Manual.

4. Swamps, Marshes, and Other Wetlands

KBSF contains approximately 1,144 acres in three (3) hydric communities: slough marsh, wet prairie, and depression marsh. Maintenance of naturally occurring wetland communities is a high priority and will be accomplished through appropriate management activities, including prescribed fire, invasive species management, and adherence to Silviculture BMPs.

5. Wetlands Restoration

Wetland restoration objectives on the state forest include erosion control, restoration of water levels and / or hydroperiod, and restoration of wetland plant and animal communities. To achieve these objectives, restoration activities may involve road and soil stabilization, water level control structure removal or installation, invasive species control, site preparation and re-vegetation with native wetland species, and project monitoring. These activities may be conducted individually or concurrently; implemented by FFS personnel or by non-FFS personnel under mitigation or grant contractual agreements. Wetland restoration projects should be conducted in conjunction with other restoration activities indicated elsewhere in this plan.

Where applicable, and with the assistance from the FFS Forest Management Bureau, KBSF personnel may pursue funding to develop and implement wetland restoration projects. Additionally, cooperative research among FFS, other state agencies, and the federal government will provide valuable information in determining future management objectives of wetlands restoration.

Wetland restoration will be coordinated with SFWMD and applicable partners. Any activities requiring permits from the water management district will be handled accordingly and will comply with the latest edition of the FFS Silviculture BMP Manual.

6. Florida Department of Environmental Protection Basin Management Action Plan

A Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP) is a "blueprint" for restoring impaired waters by reducing pollutant loadings to meet the allowable loadings established in a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). It represents a comprehensive set of strategies, including, but not limited to permit limits on wastewater facilities, urban and agricultural best management practices, conservation programs, financial assistance, and revenue generating activities, all designed to implement the pollutant reductions established by the TMDL. These broad-based plans are developed with local stakeholders, as they rely on local input and local commitment, and are adopted by Secretarial Order to be enforceable.

The BMAP provides for phased implementation under Subparagraph 403.067(7)(a)1, F.S. The phased BMAP approach allows for the implementation of projects designed to achieve incremental reductions, while simultaneously monitoring and conducting studies to better understand the water quality dynamics (sources and response variables) in the watershed.

The KBSF is currently not within a BMAP project area.

C. Flora and Fauna Resources

1. Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species

The intent of FFS is to manage KBSF in a manner that will minimize the potential for wildlife species to become imperiled. FFS employees continually monitor the forest for threatened or endangered species while conducting management activities. Specialized management techniques will be used, as necessary, to protect or increase protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species and species of special concern, as applicable for both plants and animals. See Table 4.

Table 4. Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species Documented on KBSF

Common Name	Scientific Name	FNAI Global Rank	FNAI State Rank	Federal Status	State Status
Florida grasshopper sparrow	<i>Ammodramus savannarum floridanus</i>	G5T1	S1	E	FE
Gopher tortoise	<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	G3	S3	N	ST
Crested caracara	<i>Caracara plancus</i>	G5	S2	T	FT

*** STATUS/RANK KEY**

Federal Status (USFWS): LE= Listed Endangered, LT= Listed Threatened, N= Not currently listed, C = Candidate species for which federal listing agencies have sufficient information on biological vulnerability and threats to support proposing to list the species as Endangered or Threatened. SAT, T(S/A) = threatened due to similarity of appearance. A species that is threatened due to similarity of appearance with another listed species and is listed for its protection. Species listed as T(S/A) are not biologically endangered or threatened and are not subject to Section 7 consultation.

State Status (FWC): Animals: FE = Listed as Endangered Species at the Federal level by the USFWS, FT = Listed as Threatened Species at the Federal level by the USFWS, F(XN) = Federal listed as an experimental population in Florida, FT(S/A) = Federal Threatened due to similarity of appearance, ST = State population listed as Threatened by the FWC, SSC = Listed as Species of Special Concern by the FWC, N = Not currently listed, nor currently being considered for listing.

Plants: LE = Endangered: species of plants native to Florida 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; includes all species determined to be endangered or threatened pursuant to the U.S. Endangered Species Act; LT = Threatened: 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 number as to cause them to be Endangered; CE = Commercially Exploited; N = Not currently listed, nor currently being considered for listing.

FNAI Global Rank: G1= Critically Imperiled, G2 = Imperiled, G3= Very Rare, G4= Apparently Secure, G5= Demonstrably Secure, GNR = Element not yet ranked (temporary), G#? = Tentative rank, T# = Taxonomic Subgroup; numbers have same definition as G#'s.

FNAI State Rank: S1= Critically Imperiled, S2= Imperiled, S3= Very Rare, S4= Apparently Secure, S5 = Demonstrably secure in Florida, S#?= Tentative Rank.

2. Florida Natural Areas Inventory

The Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) is the single most comprehensive source of information available on the locations of rare species and significant ecological resources throughout Florida. FNAI has reported the following regarding KBSF. Also see Exhibit K.

a. Element Occurrences

FNAI element occurrences data layer includes occurrences of rare species and natural communities. For animals and plants, element occurrences usually indicate a viable population of the species. Based on the information available, this site appears to be located on or very near a significant region of scrub habitat, a natural community in decline that provides important habitat for several rare species within a small area.

Documented habitat includes depression marsh, dry prairie, mesic hammock, slough marsh, and wet prairie.

b. Likely and Potential Habitat for Rare Species

In addition to documented occurrences, other rare species and natural communities may be identified on or near KBSF. Rare species and communities have been documented on the site, in addition to other likely or potential species as listed in Exhibit K.

c. Land Acquisition Projects

The site is within the Triple Diamond Florida Forever Project. This is part of the State of Florida's Conservation and Recreation Lands Acquisition Program. See Exhibit D.

FNAI recommends that professionals familiar with Florida's flora and fauna conduct a site-specific survey to determine the current presence or absence of rare, threatened, or endangered species before expansions or alterations are made to any facilities.

3. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Fish and Wildlife Research Institute (FWRI) reports numerous records of listed species occurrences or critical habitats within the confines of the property. This includes state and federally listed endangered or threatened species.

Other findings by the FWC include:

- a. The property is located within high priority Strategic Habitat Conservation Areas for multiple species: short-tailed hawk (*Buteo brachyurus*), Florida burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia floridana*), and Florida grasshopper sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum floridanus*).
- b. KBSF is located within an area of high Species Richness which indicates the total number of species within potential habitat identified in a specific location.
- c. KBSF is located in and adjacent to Priority Wetlands which are wetlands significant to listed wetland-dependent vertebrates.
- d. FWC's response includes a map indicating multiple species locations.

These data represent only those occurrences recorded by FWC staff and other affiliated researchers. The database does not necessarily contain records of all listed species that may occur in a given area. Also, data on certain species are not entered into the database on a site-specific basis. Therefore, one should not assume that an absence of occurrences in their database indicates that species of significance do not occur in the area. See Exhibit L.

The FWC recommends the review of management guidelines in the published FWC Gopher Tortoise Management Plan to guide management actions for the gopher tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*) on the forest. The FWC Gopher Tortoise Management Plan provides beneficial resource guidelines for habitat management and monitoring of the gopher tortoise. For

reference, the FWC Gopher Tortoise Species Management Plan can be accessed at MyFWC.com.

The FWC recommends the review of management guidelines in FWC's published Species Action Plans for the management of imperiled, rare, and focal bird species. The FWC Species Action Plans provide beneficial resource guidelines for habitat management and monitoring of the respective species. For reference, the FWC Species Action Plans can be accessed at MyFWC.com.

4. Game Species and Other Wildlife

Wildlife management plays an important role in the management of resources on KBSF. FWC provides cooperative technical assistance in managing the wildlife and fish populations, setting hunting seasons, establishing bag and season limits, and overall wildlife and fish law enforcement on KBSF.

KBSF is managed for hunting and fishing as the Kissimmee Bend Unit of the Everglades Headwaters Wildlife Management Area and is regulated by FWC. Management of this area will be directed to the production of biological diversity and species composition consistent with existing natural community types. Such communities will be restored and/or maintained through habitat management. All biological resources will be managed to maintain diversity.

Notable wildlife species inhabiting the forest include American alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*), white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), wild turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*), wood stork (*Mycteria americana*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), crested caracara (*Caracara plancus*), American white pelican (*Pelecanus erythrorhynchos*), and swallow-tailed kite (*Elanoides forficatus*).

All wildlife species will be managed and protected through the restoration and maintenance of native ecosystems found on the forest. The State Forest Handbook provides additional details for such things as prescribed burning and ecological restoration.

5. Survey and Monitoring

FFS will implement species-specific management plans developed by FWC and other agencies as applicable. FFS will cooperate with FWC and other agencies in the development of new wildlife management plans and monitoring protocols, as necessary. Such plans will be consistent with rule and statute promulgated for the management of such species.

a. Gopher Tortoises

Belt transect surveys for gopher tortoise burrows have been conducted by FFS and FWC staff opportunistically, as needed, but generally in advance of land management activities that may impact tortoises (e.g., timber harvest). All surveys are done in cooperation with FWC.

No formal survey has been conducted. All future, formal surveys will be completed in cooperation with FWC.

b. Florida Black Bear

FFS will continue to cooperate with FWC to implement FWC's state-wide Florida Black Bear Management Plan, with an emphasis on maintaining sustainable black bear populations in suitable habitats throughout Florida for the benefit of the species and people.

c. Listed Plant Species

All known locations of listed or rare flora are GIS mapped and location data are shared with FNAI.

d. Other Rare Biota Surveys

Surveys are done as time and staffing allow. High quality plant communities continue to incur ad hoc surveys for both invasive plants and animals.

Most of the isolated wetlands on KBSF have received a cursory biological survey from FNAI (2021), with rare and significant plant and animal species observed and documented. Assistance will be offered to FWC for gopher tortoise burrow commensals monitoring, as well as monitoring for other rare species as appropriate.

During routine management activities, incidental sightings of rare animals and plants are GIS mapped by FFS staff. All rare species data is collected and sent to FNAI annually.

6. Gopher Tortoise Recipient Site Feasibility Assessment

The FFS has assessed the feasibility of establishing a gopher tortoise recipient site on KBSF. Soil drainage classes present across the forest range from poorly drained to very poorly drained; often either frequently flooded or with a degree of surficial saturation during the wetter months of the year (see Exhibit H). Further, given the degree of prairie, there is insufficient tree cover to consider the establishment of a gopher tortoise recipient site. Therefore, the FFS has determined there are no suitable locations for gopher tortoise recipient site establishment on KBSF.

D. Sustainable Forest Resources

FFS practices sustainable multiple-use management to meet the forest resource needs and values of the present without compromising the similar capability of the future. Sustainable management involves practicing a land stewardship ethic that integrates the reforestation, managing, growing, nurturing, and harvesting of trees for useful products with the conservation of soil, air and water quality, wildlife and fish habitat, and aesthetics. This is accomplished by maintaining and updating accurate estimates of standing timber in order to assure that the timber resources retain their sustainability. Forest inventories will be updated on a continual basis according to guidelines established by the FFS Forest Management Bureau.

E. Beaches and Dune Resources

No beaches or dunes occur on the KBSF.

F. Mineral Resources

No mineral deposits of commercial value are known to exist on KBSF.

G. Unique Natural Features and Outstanding Native Landscapes

The forest's biologically rich grasslands are a significant part of the Everglades Headwaters ecosystem. This unique ecosystem is known for its rare and diverse wildlife, including the Florida grasshopper sparrow and the crested caracara.

H. Research Projects / Specimen Collection

Research projects may be performed on the forest on a temporary or permanent basis for the purpose of obtaining information that furthers the knowledge of forestry and related fields. FFS cooperates with other governmental agencies, non-profit organizations, and educational institutions, whenever feasible, on this type of research. FFS will consider assisting with research projects when funds and manpower are available.

All research to be considered on KBSF must be considered in accordance with the guidelines stated in the State Forest Handbook. Any requests for research should be submitted in writing to the appropriate field staff to be forwarded to the Forest Management Bureau for approval. Requests must include: a letter outlining the purpose, scope, methodology, and location of the proposed research. Requests are subject to review by FFS Foresters, Biologists, the Forest Health Section, and the Forest Hydrology Section, as appropriate. Authorization to conduct research will require that the investigator provide copies of any reports or studies generated from any research to the FFS and the KBSF staff. Other special conditions may be applicable, and the authorization may be terminated at any point if the study is not in compliance.

No research projects have been conducted on KBSF.

I. Ground Disturbing Activities

Although the FFS's approach to handling ground disturbing activities is identified in other sections of this plan, the FFS's overall approach to this issue is summarized here. FFS recognizes the importance of managing and protecting sensitive resources and will take steps to ensure that such resources are not adversely impacted by ground disturbing activities. Sensitive resources include areas such as known sensitive species locations; archaeological, fossil, and historical sites; ecotones, wetlands, and water resources. The process for evaluating and obtaining approval for ground disturbing activities is outlined in Appendix 2.A.6. of the State Forest Handbook.

When new pre-suppression firelines, recreation trails, or other low-impact recreation site enhancements are necessary, their placement will be reviewed by state forest field staff to avoid sensitive areas. For ground disturbing activities such as construction of buildings, parking lots, and new roads, the FFS will consult with FNAI, DHR, SFWMD, and ARC, as appropriate.

V. Public Access and Recreation

The primary recreation objective is to provide the public with passive outdoor recreation activities that are dependent on the natural environment and to provide outdoor recreation opportunities to wounded veterans through Operation Outdoor Freedom (OOF). FFS will continue to promote and encourage public access and recreation use by the public while protecting resources and practicing multiple-use management.

Periodic evaluations will be conducted by FFS staff to monitor recreation impacts on resources. Modifications to recreation uses will be implemented should significant negative impacts be identified. New recreation opportunities and facilities, which are compatible with the primary goals and responsibilities of the FFS, will be considered only after FFS determines their compatibility with other forest uses and forest resources. Assessment of visitor impacts, outdoor recreation opportunities and facilities, and proposed changes will all be addressed in the Five-Year Outdoor Recreation Plan updates.

A. Existing Recreation Opportunities

A variety of recreation opportunities are available on the forest. Visitors can enjoy hiking (service roads only), hunting, wildlife viewing, night sky viewing, and photography. See Exhibit C for a map of the Recreation, Facilities, and Improvements.

The main trailhead and parking area for the forest are on the adjoining NWR off NW 256th Street.

B. Planned Recreation Activities

FFS will continue to assess plans for additional recreation opportunities based on demand, carrying capacity, demographics, and impact to the resources on the Forest. All planned improvements may be completed as staff and funding permits. Both terrestrial and aquatic resources and relative activities will be evaluated. Any plans will be incorporated into the Five-Year Outdoor Recreation Plan on file at KBSF.

1. Public Access and Parking

Within the ten-year planning cycle, the potential for new parking and forest access points will be evaluated and considered for use. Existing parking and forest access points will continually be evaluated for updates and improvements.

2. Recreation Trails

Currently, there is no immediate plan for establishing hiking trails within this ten-year planning cycle for KBSF. However, the potential for new hiking trails (separate from service roads) will be evaluated should the demand arise.

Within this ten-year planning cycle, consideration will be made for producing a birding brochure.

3. Environmental Education

Currently only self-guided tours are available. If a need is determined in the future, KBSF may implement an environmental education program which may include guided tours, additional self-guided tours, and hands-on events.

4. Camping

Potential dispersed primitive campsites will be hike-in or drive-in, tent-only sites. At a minimum, each site will consist of a tent pad, fire ring, lantern pole, and a picnic table. Potential camp site locations are shown on the Facilities, Recreation, and Improvement Map. See Exhibit C.

5. Hunter and Hiker Education

FFS will continue communicating our needs and concerns with our user groups, cooperators, and our visitors. FFS is considering installing interpretive signs and / or kiosks detailing KBSF's unique ecosystem and FFS's sustainable management practices.

The Florida Forest Service will handle permitting requests for all recreation activities.

C. Hunter Access

Regulated hunting and fishing on Florida's state forests are managed cooperatively with the FWC. Hunting season dates, limits, and methods are established annually by FWC, in cooperation with FFS. Wildlife Management Area (WMA) regulations are updated annually and are identified in the current WMA brochures provided by FWC at www.MyFWC.com. Non-hunting recreation users are encouraged to check the WMA regulations and season dates before visiting KBSF.

OOF may host multiple events on KBSF. These events will involve outdoor recreation activities including, but not limited to, hunting, fishing, hiking, camping, clay shooting, and any other activity that is developed as an outdoor activity for wounded veterans. The supporting personnel will include state and private volunteers and any support personnel necessary for the operation, support, or funding of such events. Events can be recreation, fundraising, or planning in nature. The OOF program needs may include the upgrading of existing or construction of new facilities for lodging and recreation of participants, as well as logistical and operational needs of the program. On-site and offsite fundraising for the benefit of OOF may occur to assist in these efforts and will be performed under the coordination of and be consistent with the guidelines of the Friends of Florida State Forests.

D. Education

FFS may create partnerships with local K-12 schools and / or universities for the development and implementation of educational opportunities on KBSF. The Five-Year Outdoor Recreation Plan lends more insight to management activities as they pertain to future educational opportunities KBSF provides to the public.

VI. Forest Management Practices

A. Prescribed Fire

Forest management practices on KBSF are important in the restoration and maintenance of forest ecosystems and provide a variety of socio-economic benefits to Floridians. Management practices on KBSF include a prescribed fire program which is an effective tool in controlling the growth of hardwood trees, stimulating the recovery of native herbaceous groundcover, and promoting the regeneration of native pines.

FFS utilizes a fire management program on state forests that includes wildfire prevention, detection and suppression, and prescribed burning. This program is the responsibility of FFS's Okeechobee District and is detailed in the Five-Year Prescribed Burning Management Plan. Emphasis will be placed on prescribed burning, wildfire prevention, and education to help reduce wildfire occurrence on the Forest.

A Fire History graph detailing the recent history of prescribed burns and wildfires at KBSF is available in Exhibit M.

FFS has one (1) fire tower, one (1) engine type 6, and two (2) tractor-plow units located in Okeechobee County. Additional support is available from neighboring counties. Personnel and equipment stationed in Okeechobee County will be used for pre-suppression practices, establishment of firebreaks, rehabilitation of existing firelines, construction of new firelines, maintenance of perimeter firebreaks, and prescribed burning.

The annual forest prescribed burning program produces multiple benefits. The purposes of prescribed burning on KBSF are to facilitate forest management operations; enhance wildlife and listed species habitat; decrease fuel loading; enhance public safety; and restore, maintain, and protect all native ecosystems, ecotones, and their ecological processes. FFS personnel are responsible for planning and implementing the annual prescribed burn program for KBSF, which will consist of dormant and growing season burns. An update to the Five-Year Prescribed Burning Management Plan is developed each year by FFS staff. All burns conducted on KBSF are executed by Florida Certified Prescribed Burn Managers in accordance with Chapter 590.125, F.S. and Rule Chapter 5I-2, F.A.C.

According to FNAI, historic, fire-dependent natural communities on KBSF are estimated to have occupied approximately 1,120 acres and to have burned at approximately 1 to 8-year intervals. Current fire-dependent communities encompass 1,050 acres. Some historically fire-dependent communities have been altered through past land use practices, which inhibits the ability to meet objectives with prescribed fire alone. Based on current conditions and management objectives, KBSF will plan for 350 to 1,050 acres to be prescribed burned annually. Priority ranking of burn units is used to keep fire return intervals maintained while slowly adding additional acreage. Meeting prescribed fire goals will be largely dependent on weather conditions, available personnel, and statewide emergency situations such as wildfires, hurricanes, and other natural disaster response and relief. Currently it is estimated that approximately 1,050 acres of KBSF are within the desired fire return interval.

1. Fire Management

The fire management plan will serve as a working tool and an informational document for KBSF. The plan will provide guidelines regarding wildfire suppression and prescribed fire management. It will specify burn units, burn unit prescriptions, appropriate fire return intervals, and fire suppression planning. The plan may be reviewed and amended as necessary.

The use of prescribed fire in the management of timber, wildlife, and ecological resources on KBSF is necessary if the FFS is to fulfill the goals and objectives stated in this plan including enhancing and restoring native plant communities, managing protected species, managing timber, recreation, historical, and other resource values. The fire management plan and its objectives shall reflect and incorporate these multiple-resource objectives.

a. Prescribed Fire:

Prescribed fire is the most important land management tool, both ecologically and economically, for managing vegetation and natural communities and perpetuating

existing wildlife populations in Florida. Forest operation records and staff experience should be combined with the FNAI inventory and assessment (2021) to identify areas that may require mechanical or chemical treatments in conjunction with prescribed fire to restore a more natural vegetative structure.

- b. Burn Unit Plans:** Each prescribed fire will be conducted in accordance with FFS regulations and state law (Rule Chapter 5I-2 F.A.C.; Chapter 590 F.S.) and have a burn unit plan (or prescription). Each prescription will contain, at a minimum, the information, as required by Section 590.125(3), F.S., needed to complete the FFS Prescribed Burn Plan Form FDACS 11461.

Aerial ignition may be considered for large burn units where this tactic can be cost effective for larger acreages. Consideration should be given to rotating burn units between dormant and growing season burns over time. Fire return intervals for a burn unit are recommended to fall within the natural, historic range for the dominant natural community or communities within a given burn unit.

Based upon available species survey data, burn units within a prescription that have listed wildlife species shall explicitly state their presence and any restrictions or requirements relative to prescribed burning in proximity to these species or habitats. These may include time of year, pre-burn preparation, fire return intervals, and other burn parameters.

B. Wildfire Prevention and Mitigation Strategies

FFS utilizes a comprehensive wildfire management approach on state forests that includes an ongoing program of wildfire prevention, detection and suppression, and prescribed burning. Implementation of this program is the responsibility of FFS's Okeechobee District. Emphasis will be placed on consistent accomplishment of prescribed burning goals and community outreach to increase public understanding of wildfire prevention and the benefits of prescribed fire.

FFS has three paramount considerations regarding wildfires and are established in priority order:

- 1) Protection of human lives
- 2) Protection of improvements
- 3) Protection of natural resources

All procedures regarding wildfire will follow the State Forest Handbook and the KBSF Fire Management Plan.

1. Suppression Strategies

If a wildfire occurs on KBSF there are two (2) alternative suppression strategies as defined below:

- a. Contain and Control** is defined as a suppression strategy where a fire is restricted to a certain area by using existing natural or constructed barriers that stop the fires spread under the prevailing and forecasted weather until it is out. This strategy allows the use of environmentally sensitive tactics based on fuels, fire behavior, and weather conditions that keep a wildfire from burning a large area or for a long duration.

- b. Direct Suppression** is defined as a suppression strategy where aggressive suppression tactics are used to establish firelines around a fire to halt its spread and to extinguish all hotspots. This alternative is used whenever there is a threat to human life, property, private lands, and / or critical natural or cultural resources. This strategy should also be used when the total district fire load dictates that crews not be involved with individual fires for any longer than absolutely necessary.

Appropriate suppression action will be that which provides for the most reasonable probability of minimizing fire suppression cost and critical resource damage, consistent with probable fire behavior, total fire load, potential resource and environmental impacts, safety, and smoke management considerations. The Incident Command System (ICS) will be used for all suppression actions.

2. Smoke Management

Caution will be exercised to prevent a public safety or health hazard from the smoke of any prescribed burn or wildfire. Prescribed burns must pass the smoke screening procedure and be conducted by a certified burner. If smoke threatens to cause a safety hazard, then direct, immediate suppression action will be taken.

3. Firebreaks and Firelines

A system of permanent firebreaks is maintained around and within the boundaries of KBSF to guard against fires escaping from and entering the forest. Such firebreaks will consist of natural barriers, roads, trails, permanent grass strips and where appropriate, well maintained harrowed lines. All pre-suppression firebreaks will meet the established Silvicultural BMP criteria.

During wildfire suppression, the use of water and foam, permanent firebreaks, natural barriers, and existing roads and trails for firelines can be used when human life, safety, property, and resource considerations allow. Plowed and / or bladed lines will be used for initial installation of firelines in heavy fuels and in cases where it's considered necessary to protect life, property, or resources and / or to minimize threats to firefighters. Plowed and bladed lines will be rehabilitated and BMPs implemented as soon as practical after the fire is suppressed.

4. Sensitive Areas

KBSF has on file at the state forest headquarters an Environmentally Sensitive Area Map that identifies protected sites such as critical wetlands and archaeological and historical sites known to occur on the forest. FFS personnel are aware of these areas in the event of a wildfire. Special precautions will be followed when prescribed burning in sensitive areas on KBSF. When possible, fire staff will avoid line construction in wetland ecotones and other areas throughout the Forest.

5. Firewise Communities

FFS has implemented a Firewise community approach for prevention statewide. Specifically, in the area adjacent to or nearby KBSF, efforts in this regard will continue to identify communities at risk and to make contact with their representatives.

6. Adjacent Neighbor Contacts

The staff at KBSF maintains a list of neighbors who have requested they be notified in advance of prescribed burns. These neighbors are contacted by telephone or email with potential sites and dates of anticipated prescribed burns.

7. Post-Burn Evaluations

A post-burn evaluation is required for each prescribed burn on the state forest to assess impacts on timber and habitat. Based on the evaluations after prescribed fires in particular, decisions will be made on the effectiveness of the prescribed burn and improvements that can be made in the future. A historical fire record for all significant fires and prescribed burns will be maintained. This will be accomplished using completed burn plans and the maintenance of GIS data. These records are intended to provide data for future management decisions.

C. Sustainable Forestry & Silviculture

Timber is a valuable economic and ecological resource, and timber harvesting for the purposes of generating revenue, improving stand viability, forest health, wildlife, and ecological restoration and maintenance is critical to the silvicultural objectives on many forests. However, at this time, KBSF does not have any significant timber resources and any reference to timber management pertains to potential timber stands should any be acquired as part of this State Forest.

1. Strategies

The following silvicultural strategies will apply to silvicultural practices on KBSF, where applicable:

- a. To restore and maintain forest health and vigor through timber harvesting, prescribed burning, and reforestation, both naturally and artificially, with species native to the site.
- b. To create, through natural or artificial regeneration, uneven-aged, and even-aged management, a forest with both young and old growth components that yields sustainable economic, ecological, and social benefits.

2. Silvicultural Operations

Any future silvicultural operations on KBSF will be directed toward improving forest health, wildlife habitat, ecological and economical sustainability, as well as toward recovery from past management practices that are not in accordance with the objectives of this plan. Stands of off-site species with merchantable volume will be scheduled for harvest, followed by reforestation with the appropriate tree species. Herbicide applications may be necessary to control woody competition and to re-establish desired native species of both overstory and groundcover. Site preparation methods may include prescribed fire, mechanical vegetation control, and / or herbicide applications. Herbicides used will be registered for forestry use by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and will not adversely affect water resources. The FFS has no plans to establish pine species within prairie community types, as these communities naturally do not support pine production.

Prescribed fire is the most desirable method of vegetation control in fire-dependent ecosystems. However, due to the existence of areas where fuel loads have reached dangerous levels or urban interface dictates prescribed fire is not suitable, mechanical, or chemical vegetation control may be used. Mechanical and / or chemical vegetation control will be utilized where appropriate as determined by FFS staff for wildlife enhancement, fuel mitigation, and reforestation.

On any applicable parcels that may be acquired as part of KBSF in the future, maintenance and restoration of timber stands and natural communities through timber harvesting will include thinning for maintenance, regeneration harvests applicable to the species present and clear-cutting to remove off-site species.

All silvicultural activities, including timber harvesting and reforestation, will meet or exceed the standards in FFS's Silviculture BMPs and the State Forest Handbook, and will follow the Five-Year Silviculture Action Plan.

3. Forest Inventory

The purpose of a forest inventory is to provide FFS resource managers with information and tools for short and long-range resource management and planning. Ten percent of the forest area will be re-inventoried annually to provide an accurate estimation of the standing timber and to ensure that stands will be managed sustainably, as appropriate.

Timber / forestry resources available on the property include pockets of mixed hardwood tree species and scattered hardwoods throughout the prairie communities.

4. Timber Sales

Timber sales are generally advertised for competitive bids and sold on a per unit or lump sum basis. All timber sales are conducted according to guidelines specified in the State Forest Handbook.

5. Cattle Grazing

Cattle grazing activities assist in maintaining pastures and controlling invasive plants, support the maintenance of fences and gates, and provide a source of income to the forest.

Currently there are no (0) cattle leases on KBSF.

D. Invasive Species Control

FFS employees continually monitor the forest for invasive species while conducting management activities. FFS will locate, identify, and apply control measures with the intent to eradicate or control invasive species. Table 5 lists the general treatment strategy, acres impacted, and population stability trend for invasive plant species occurring on KBSF. Also see Exhibit N.

On-going maintenance and monitoring strategies are outlined in the Five-Year Ecological Management Plan which is developed to locate, identify, and control invasive plant species. Occurrences of invasive species are recorded in the KBSF GIS database and are monitored and

treated annually as funding permits. The GIS database is updated as new infestations are discovered.

Adjacent landowners who are known to have these species on their property will be approached to cooperate on control measures. FFS works to control the spread of invasive species by decontaminating agency equipment and equipment used by private contractors according to the State Forest Handbook.

FFS will enlist support from FWC in the effort to control invasive animals. Feral hogs (*Sus scrofa*) are present on KBSF but are not believed to occur in significant numbers at this time. FWC has issued a feral hog control permit to FFS for all WMA state forests and FFS will allow for feral hog removal on KBSF through trapping and regulated hunting as necessary.

Training in the identification and control of invasive species will be scheduled for personnel as time and resources permit. Training concerning invasive plants will be coordinated with the Forest Management Bureau's Forest Health Section. Control of invasive species will be target specific and use a variety of methods including appropriately labeled and efficacious herbicide treatments.

Table 5. Invasive Plant Species Occurring on KBSF

Scientific Name	Common Name	Treatment Strategy	Acres Impacted	Treatment Status
<i>Hymenachne amplexicaulis</i>	West Indian marsh grass	herbicide	1.0	Increasing
<i>Imperata cylindrica</i>	Cogon grass	herbicide	2.0	Increasing
<i>Lygodium microphyllum</i>	Old world climbing fern	herbicide	1.0	Increasing
<i>Senna alata</i>	Candlestick plant	herbicide	0.25	Increasing
<i>Urena lobata</i>	Caesar's weed	herbicide	0.25	Increasing

E. Insects, Disease, and Forest Health

Currently there are no significant insect or disease problems on KBSF. In the event of a forest pest outbreak, KBSF resource managers will consult with the Forest Management Bureau's Forest Health Section to formulate an appropriate and effective response.

In compliance with Section 388.4111, F.S. and in Section 5E-13.042, F.A.C., all lands have been evaluated and subsequently designated as environmentally sensitive and biologically highly productive. Such designation is appropriate and consistent with the previously documented natural resources and ecosystem values and affords the appropriate protection for these resources from arthropod control practices that would impose a potential hazard to fish, wildlife, and other natural resources existing on this property. The local arthropod control agency in Okeechobee County will be notified of the approval of this plan documenting this designation.

As a result, prior to conducting any arthropod control activities on KBSF, the local agency must prepare a public lands control plan that addresses all concerns that FFS may have for protecting the natural resources and ecosystem values on the state forest. In this regard, FFS will provide

the local agency details on the management objectives for KBSF. This public lands control plan must be in compliance with FDACS guidelines and use the appropriate FDACS form. The plan must then be approved and mutually adopted by the county, FFS, and FDACS, prior to initiation of any mosquito control work. Should the local mosquito control district not propose any mosquito control operations on the property, no arthropod control plan is required. See Exhibit T.

F. Use of Private Land Contractors

The forest manager makes ongoing evaluations of the use of private contractors and consultants to facilitate the total resource management activities of this state forest. The opportunities for outsourcing land management work include:

1. Herbicide applications
2. Restoration activities
3. Site preparation activities
4. Reforestation
5. Timber harvesting
6. Biological assessments and mapping
7. Fixed capital and infrastructure improvements

VII. Proposed Management Activities for Natural Communities

In 2021, FNAI completed an inventory and natural community mapping project on KBSF. Current and historic natural community cover types can be found in Exhibits O and P, and Table 6. This inventory included altered community types which are habitats that have been impacted by humans and do not fit into FNAI's Natural Community Classification. See Table 7.

Table 6. Natural Landcover Types

Community Type	Historic Acres*	Current Acres*
Depression Marsh	245	243
Dry Prairie	756	708
Mesic Hammock	46	46
Slough Marsh	581	559
Wet Prairie	364	342
Altered Landcover Types**	0	94
TOTAL	1,992	1,992

* Rounding errors exist

** See Table 7

Table 7. Altered Landcover Types

Landcover Type	Current Acres*
Abandoned Field/Pasture	7
Artificial Pond	0.5
Canal/Ditch	16
Clearing	24.5
Road	8
Successional Hardwood Forest	38
TOTAL	94

* Protocol as described in Appendix 2 of FNAI's "Guide to the Natural Communities of Florida", 2010 Edition.

For the purposes of this management plan, restoration is defined as the process of returning ecosystems to the appropriate structure and species composition, based on soil type, representative species present, and hydrology. Management during this ten-year period will begin with a forest-wide assessment of the fuel loading, timber densities, reforestation needs, and groundcover in order to develop a five-year comprehensive operational plan for prescribed burning and other management activities across KBSF. Strategies may include thinning pine plantations, mowing or chopping in areas of heavy fuel buildup, application of both dormant and growing season fires, and / or the use of herbicides to control hardwoods and / or hardwood regeneration, where appropriate. Site preparation and reforestation may be required to increase pine stocking in stands with very poor stocking or in restoration efforts on any future pine-dominant parcels. Fire return intervals are included as a guide and may vary depending upon specific conditions and are intended to attain desired forest and resource management goals. See Table 8.

Table 8. Prescribed Fire Interval Guide on KBSF

Habitat Type	Historic Fire Return Intervals*	KBSF Fire Frequency Goal (Local)	Comments
Depression marsh	1-8	1-8	Burn edges with surrounding uplands
Dry Prairie	1-3	1-3	
Mesic Hammock	N/A	N/A	
Slough Marsh	N/A	1-3	Burn edges with surrounding uplands
Wet Prairie	1-3	1-3	

* As determined by FNAI

The following community descriptions, existing condition descriptions, and management recommendations are taken from a 2021 FNAI mapping project report and the Guide to the Natural Communities of Florida (FNAI 2010), as well as from the knowledge and experience gained by FFS during forest inventory efforts and routine field work on KBSF.

To achieve the objectives outlined in this plan, the following management activities will be performed in the natural and managed communities at KBSF during the next ten-year planning period. Goals, desired conditions, standards, and guidelines provide management area direction. These goals and desired conditions may take many planning cycles to attain.

A. Depression Marsh

Description:

Depression marshes are isolated, non-forested wetland basins embedded in a pyrogenic matrix community such as pine flatwoods, prairie, or sandhill. These marshes typically have concentric zones of vegetation related to the length of hydroperiod and depth of flooding. Depression marshes are distinguished from basin marshes principally by their landscape position which subjects them to more frequent fires. The desired future condition for a depression marsh is a diverse herb dominated community where grasses, sedges, and emergent broadleaf herbs such as maidencane (*Panicum hemitomon*), narrowfruit horned beaksedge (*Rhynchospora inundata*),

and pickerelweed (*Pontederia cordata*) dominate. Shrub cover is typically very low, restricted mainly to St. John's wort (*Hypericum* sp.), and palm or oak trees are found only on the edges. Depression marshes at KBSF are common, occupying the lowest elevations in the flat, prairie landscape. On 1940s aerial photographs, depression marshes appear as darker smooth circular patches set into the dry prairie landscape, usually with a border of wet prairie vegetation. The boundary between depression marshes and the shorter hydroperiod wet prairies is difficult to determine in most cases. Marshes and prairies at KBSF are on a firm, sandy substrate, with peat accumulation only at the deepest centers.

Current Conditions:

Most depression marshes at KBSF are relatively undisturbed. Off-road vehicle trails cross the marshes along the property boundary, but these are mostly restricted to the shallow marsh edge or fringing wet prairie. Hydrology alteration by ditching and road construction also affects a few marshes in the central part of the property. Species composition varies from the outer, shallow portions typically on sand to the inner, deep centers with peat accumulation. The outer zones are mostly dominated by blue maidencane (*Amphicarpum muehlenbergianum*), longleaf threeawn (*Aristida palustris*), southern umbrellasedge (*Fuirena scirpoidea*), and Tracy's beaksedge (*Rhynchospora tracyi*), with an open shrub layer of peelbark St. John's wort (*Hypericum fasciculatum*). This zone is also characterized by a high diversity of wetland herbs, grasses, and sedges. The transition to the center often has dense narrowfruit, horned beaksedge and/or maidencane, while flag species such as pickerelweed and bulltongue arrowhead (*Sagittaria lancifolia*) dominate the central areas.

Conversion to roads, ditches, or cleared fence lines has slightly reduced the acreage of depression marshes on the property. Hog digging is a minor problem in the shallower areas.

Fire Regimes:

Depression marshes likely burned irregularly every 1 to 8 years depending on water levels at the time of fires on the landscape. Fires generally occurred early (April-June) in the lightning season when water was low and surrounding communities were dry.

Management Needs:

Marshes should generally be allowed to burn with the surrounding prairie communities. Ideally, fire should be prescribed at a time when water is low or absent in the marshes. Ditches or elevated roads through marshes can be at greater risk of invasion by invasive plants and destructive hogs. Continued monitoring for new populations of nuisance species can identify problem areas early.

B. Dry Prairie

Description:

Dry prairie is a community of low shrubs and grasses occupying vast, level expanses in south-central Florida. The community is entirely or nearly treeless, with stunted shrubs no more than knee-high. Common shrubs are saw palmetto (*Serenoa repens*), which is often stunted, dwarf live oak (*Quercus minima*), gallberry (*Ilex glabra*), shiny blueberry (*Vaccinium myrsinites*), netted pawpaw (*Asimina reticulata*), Atlantic St. John's wort (*Hypericum tenuifolium*), wax myrtle (*Myrica cerifera*), and dwarf huckleberry (*Gaylussacia dumosa*). The groundcover

includes about an equal proportion of herbs that form a dense, diverse layer of predominantly wiregrass (*Aristida stricta*), along with bottlebrush threeawn (*Aristida spiciformis*), hemlock witchgrass (*Dichanthelium portoricense*), broomsedge bluestem (*Andropogon virginicus*), lopsided indiagrass (*Sorghastrum secundum*), and cypress witchgrass (*Dichanthelium ensifolium*), plus numerous forbs.

Almost all uplands on KBSF were historically dry prairie. These appear on 1940s aerial photographs as a smooth, medium grey signature, occasionally with darker circular areas with larger saw palmetto clones. The dry prairies form a mosaic with wet prairies throughout, with a few small areas of hammock in natural fire shadows along wetland edges.

Current Conditions:

Dry prairie at KBSF is generally in good condition. Although there was a lack of fire in the years immediately preceding acquisition by the state, the landscape was burned as part of rangeland management prior to that. Prairies on the northern portion of the property are in the best condition. These are similar to desired future conditions and only require continued fire to maintain quality. In addition to a variety of dwarf shrubs, these prairies have a good diversity of herbs including bluestem (*Andropogon* sp.), wiregrass, pineland chaffhead (*Carphephorus carnosus*), coastalplain chaffhead (*Carphephorus corymbosus*), spadeleaf (*Centella asiatica*), cypress witchgrass, Baldwin's spikerush (*Eleocharis baldwinii*), early whitetop fleabane (*Erigeron vernus*), Mohr's thoroughwort (*Eupatorium mohrii*), roundleaf thoroughwort (*Eupatorium rotundifolium*), slender flattop goldenrod (*Euthamia caroliniana*), fimbry (*Fimbristylis* sp.), narrowleaf sunflower (*Helianthus angustifolius*), fringed yellow stargrass (*Hypoxis juncea*), blazing star (*Liatris* sp.), savannah false pimpernel (*Lindernia grandiflora*), rose rush (*Lygodesmia aphylla*), whitetop aster (*Oclemena reticulata*), thin paspalum (*Paspalum setaceum*), Florida false sunflower (*Phoebanthus grandiflorus*), yellow milkwort (*Polygala rugelii*), coastalplain milkwort (*Polygala setacea*), bracken fern (*Pteridium aquilinum*), blackroot (*Pterocaulon pycnostachyum*), Nuttall's meadowbeauty (*Rhexia nuttallii*), whitetop aster (*Sericocarpus tortifolius*), sweet goldenrod (*Solidago odora*), rough hedgehyssop (*Sophronanthe hispida*), and yellow hatpins (*Syngonanthus flavidulus*).

Prairies on the southern portion of the property have not burned recently and have an overgrowth of gallberry, coastalplain staggerbush (*Lyonia fruticosa*), and southern bayberry (*Morella cerifera*) that are attaining heights over 2 meters in some places.

Mesic hammock vegetation has expanded into a few former prairies due to a lack of fire, and these successional hardwood forests now occupy some ecotones between dry and wet prairies. Although some dry prairie elements remain, these forests have an open to closed canopy of live oak (*Quercus virginiana*) and cabbage palm (*Sabal palmetto*). The groundcover is often weedy with big carpetgrass (*Axonopus furcatus*), flatsedge (*Cyperus* sp.), fireweed (*Erechtites hieraciifolius*), and common wireweed (*Sida ulmifolia*), possibly as a result of past cattle grazing and clearing. Vines are fairly common and include peppervine (*Ampelopsis arborea*), saw greenbrier (*Smilax bona-nox*), eastern poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans*), and muscadine (*Vitis rotundifolia*).

There has been some limited conversion of dry prairie to cleared fencelines and roads with associated ditches, and there is one approximately 7-acre abandoned pasture located in the southern half of the property. This pasture was planted in bahiagrass (*Paspalum notatum*), but now has a variety of mostly native plants re-colonizing it. However, the invasive cogon grass (*Imperata cylindrica*) is also exploiting this disturbed area.

Fire Regimes:

Frequent fire is critical for maintaining the dry prairie landscape. A fire return interval of 1 to 3 years will limit the growth of woody plants and promote a diverse herbaceous groundcover.

Management Needs:

Management in dry prairie should focus on frequent prescribed burns to maintain the unique stature and diversity of this community. Fires should be allowed to enter hammock edges to limit the spread of hammock vegetation into adjacent prairies. Ground disturbances from firebreaks and roller chopping should be kept to a minimum to discourage the spread of native and non-native weedy and invasive species that can be costly to remove. Existing populations of cogon grass and other invasive species need to be treated and surveyed regularly to prevent further spread. Mesic hammocks should be focused on removal of invasive species.

C. Mesic Hammock**Description:**

Mesic hammocks are evergreen, closed-canopy forests of primarily live oak and cabbage palm. These hammocks usually occur along wetlands or as islands within wetlands where they are sheltered from fire. The shrubby understory may be dense or open, tall or short, and is typically composed of a mix of saw palmetto, American beautyberry (*Callicarpa americana*), gallberry, common persimmon (*Diospyros virginiana*), wild olive (*Osmanthus americanus*), and / or wax myrtle. Tropical shrubs such as myrsine (*Myrsine cubana*) and wild coffee (*Psychotria nervosa*) are common. The herb layer is often sparse or patchy and consists of various graminoids. Abundant epiphytes on live oaks and cabbage palms are a characteristic feature of mesic hammocks. These include Spanish moss (*Tillandsia usneoides*) and other air-plants (*Tillandsia* sp.), epiphytic ferns such as resurrection fern (*Pleopeltis polypodioides* var. *michauxiana*), golden polypody (*Phlebodium aureum*), and shoestring fern (*Vittaria lineata*).

KBSF has several small mesic hammocks fringing the large marshes on the property. These range from less than an acre to almost 8 acres in size. On 1940s aerial photographs, these hammocks have a darker, textured signature.

Current Conditions:

Mesic hammocks on KBSF are generally in good condition. The canopy is dominated by either sabal palm or live oak, occasionally with swamp laurel oak (*Quercus laurifolia*). The open shrub layers contain mostly sabal palm, but also American beautyberry, coralbean (*Erythrina herbacea*), St. Andrew's cross (*Hypericum hypericoides*), and saw palmetto. There is a diversity of herbs, including blue mistflower (*Conoclinium coelestinum*), witchgrass (*Dichanthelium* sp.), fireweed, toothpetal false rein orchid (*Habenaria floribunda*), creeping cucumber (*Melothria pendula*), sword fern (*Nephrolepis* sp.), monk orchid (*Oeceoclades maculata*), woodsgrass (*Oplismenus hirtellus*), sweetscent (*Pluchea odorata*), rougeplant (*Rivina humilis*), common

wireweed, toothed midsorus fern (*Telmatoblechnum serrulatum*), and white crownbeard (*Verbesina virginica*). Airplants and epiphytic ferns are abundant.

Fire Regimes:

Fire is generally infrequent in mesic hammock, but mature live oaks and cabbage palms are tolerant of low intensity burns.

Management Needs:

Management in mesic hammocks should be focused on removal of invasive species. Typical prescribed burns in the adjacent ecosystem should naturally extinguish along the hammock edge. Firebreaks should be discouraged to allow a development of a natural ecotone and to help minimize invasion by weedy or invasive species.

D. Slough Marsh

Description:

Slough marsh is a primarily herbaceous community growing in a narrow to broad shallow channel with intermittently flowing water in flat sandy landscapes. These marshes are frequently flooded with slow moving water from upstream sources and local rainfall and are mostly found in the dry prairie regions of south-central Florida, where freshwater marshes may form linear drainageways that provide a conduit for moving water. Grasses, sedges, and emergent herbs dominate the mainly treeless landscape. Vegetation is found in zones based on length of hydroperiod and depth of flooding. Frequently flooded areas of slough marsh are often dominated by species such as bulltongue arrowhead, pickerelweed, alligatorflag (*Thalia geniculata*), maidencane, sawgrass (*Cladium jamaicense*), and cattails (*Typha* sp.). Drier marsh zones with less peat accumulation often are dominated by sand cordgrass (*Spartina bakeri*), longleaf threeawn, beaksedges (*Rhynchospora* spp.), Elliott's yellow-eyed grass (*Xyris elliotii*), narrowfruit horned beaksedge, and blue maidencane (*Amphicarpum muhlenbergianum*). Woody species are generally low in cover and include peelbark St. John's wort and water toothleaf (*Stillingia aquatica*).

KBSF has a large slough marsh that runs through the eastern and southern portions of the property. This marsh appears as a medium gray, smooth signature on the 1940s aerial photographs, with lighter colored areas of wet prairie forming broad ecotones to dry prairies.

Current Conditions:

The slough marsh on KBSF is generally in good condition but impacted by a central ditch running most of the length of the slough. As a result, water level fluctuations are likely not as large as the historic condition. The slough marsh occupies a fairly solid sand substrate and is shallow throughout most of the marsh. The distinction with the wet prairie ecotone is difficult to determine.

There is a uniform, open cover of short peelbark St. John's wort and water toothleaf, with occasional southern bayberry. Grasses dominate the vegetation with longleaf threeawn, blue maidencane, spadeleaf, pink sundew (*Drosera capillaris*), pipewort (*Eriocaulon* sp.), pineland heliotrope (*Euploca polyphylla*), rosy camphorweed (*Pluchea baccharis*), Baldwin's milkwort (*Polygala baldwinii*), tall pinebarren milkwort (*Polygala cymosa*), threadleaf beaksedge

(*Rhynchospora filifolia*), largeflower rosegentian (*Sabatia grandiflora*), nutrush (*Scleria* sp.), water toothleaf, coastalplain yellow-eyed grass (*Xyris ambigua*), and Elliott's yellow-eyed grass. An elevated road and associated ditches bisect the slough marsh in three areas, and a cleared fenceline also impacts some portions of the marsh. The invasive West Indian marsh grass (*Hymenachne amplexicaule*) is exploiting this disturbance and could potentially expand into the surrounding marsh.

Fire Regimes:

As in other wetland communities, the frequency of fire in slough marshes is a function of the fire frequency in the surrounding matrix community, as well as the fire-carrying characteristics of the marsh vegetation itself. Fire is usually beneficial, limiting the growth of woody species. Several dominant herbaceous plants, particularly maidencane and bulltongue arrowhead, grow vigorously following fire under normal conditions, i.e., when water levels are still near the soil surface.

Management Needs:

Management efforts should focus on invasive plant removal to reduce the threat of West Indian marsh grass expansion. Where practical, hydrological restoration activities which create a more natural hydroperiod should be considered on a case-by-case basis. Prescribed fire from the surrounding prairie landscape should be allowed to burn across the marsh.

E. Wet Prairie

Description:

Wet prairies are herbaceous, short hydroperiod, wetland communities that occur on topographically flat areas. These situations may occur in low areas in pine flatwoods or dry prairies, or in ecotones between marshes and the surrounding uplands. There is typically no canopy or shrub layer. The herbaceous layer is often dominated by wiregrass or hairawn muhly (*Muhlenbergia capillaris*), and a diversity of other grasses, sedges, and forbs.

At KBSF, wet prairies occupy large areas, usually adjacent to depression or slough marshes, although many small prairies are interspersed throughout the dry prairie. These wet prairies are a light grey, smooth signature on the 1940s aerial photography. The very flat topography on the property makes the exact boundary between marsh and prairie very difficult to determine.

Current Conditions:

The wet prairies at KBSF are generally in good condition. They range from wetter prairies grading into high marsh dominated by blue maidencane, big carpetgrass, hairawn muhly, or sand cordgrass, to more typical wiregrass-dominated prairies with a diversity of species including pineland chaffhead, pineland daisy (*Chaptalia tomentosa*), toothache grass (*Ctenium aromaticum*), pipewort, Mohr's thoroughwort, narrowleaf sunflower, clustered bushmint (*Hyptis alata*), grassleaf Barbara's buttons (*Marshallia graminifolia*), drumheads (*Polygala cruciata*), beaksedges, largeflower rosegentian, and yellow hatpins.

Many of the smaller prairies embedded in the dry prairie matrix are quite dry and seem more like an intermediate community between the two. These have a substantial cover of dwarf live oak but lack most of the other dwarf shrub species typical of dry prairie.

There has been some conversion of wet prairie to roads and ditches, and fire exclusion, particularly in the southern portion of the property, has led to an increase in tall shrubs. Wet prairies that fringe the large slough marsh on the property have also been impacted by lower water levels from ditching that has allowed the expansion of hammock trees into formerly open areas.

Fire Regimes:

Wet prairie naturally burns on a frequency similar to that of dry prairie. The fine fuels that dominate this community are highly flammable and carry fire quickly across the landscape.

Management Needs:

Management goals for the wet prairies of KBSF should focus on maintaining the existing high-quality areas through frequent prescribed fires. Any hydrological restoration determined to be practical and implemented within the slough marsh community would benefit wet prairie. Feral hog removal is also needed to reduce soil disturbance.

F. Altered Landcover Types

Description:

Altered landcover types are areas where the natural community has been overwhelmingly altered as a result of human activity.

The altered landcover types described in this section are often not appropriate areas for restoration. If restoration is desired, the target future condition of the altered community is dependent on the historic community. Please refer to the appropriate community type for a more specific explanation of the desired future condition.

Current Conditions:

KBSF is in mostly natural condition with a few exceptions. Cleared fencelines (classified as “clearing” in this map) and elevated roads with associated ditches run through the site. The ditches and clearings are generally populated with native, weedy species, but also harbor non-native invasive plants that can be transported on vehicles and machinery. West Indian marsh grass, an aggressive invasive grass in wetlands, was observed in two roadside ditch locations. And along the southern fenceline, cogon grass, candlestick plant (*Senna alata*), and Caesar’s weed (*Urena lobata*) were found.

A wide, shallow ditch runs the length of the slough marsh and creates excessive drainage in the system. This ditch does not currently appear to have extensive invasive species infestations but should be observed for West Indian marsh grass.

There are several small clearings on the site, often with a weedy understory and young hammock species forming a broken canopy. The largest cleared area is just off the main road running south. This is an old, approximately 7-acre pasture, abandoned since cattle operations ceased. Historically, this was a dry prairie adjacent to the slough marsh. This pasture is planted in bahiagrass, but now has a variety of mostly native plants re-colonizing it. However, the invasive cogon grass is also exploiting the edges of this disturbed area.

Hydrology alterations and a lack of fire in the landscape has driven the expansion of hardwood hammock species into areas of former dry and wet prairie, particularly on the southern portion of the property. These successional hardwood forests now occupy about 38 acres of ecotones, often as an extension of the smaller areas of natural hammock. Although some dry prairie elements remain, these forests have an open to closed canopy of live oak and cabbage palm. The groundcover is often weedy with big carpetgrass, flatsedge, fireweed, and common wireweed, possibly as a result of past cattle grazing and clearing. Vines are fairly common and include peppervine, saw greenbrier, eastern poison ivy, and muscadine.

Fire Regimes:

Please refer to the appropriate historical community type.

Management Needs:

It may not be practical or desirable to restore some of the altered landcover types (e.g., roads) to the historic natural community. However, long term hydrology restoration that includes the removal or plugging of ditches through the slough marsh would be highly beneficial to the natural communities on the site if determined to be feasible and practical.

An increase in fire frequency will help to limit further spread of hammock vegetation. Restoration of the abandoned pasture to dry prairie would require frequent burns, and possibly planting native groundcover species if determined to be practical.

VIII. References

Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Revised 2008. Silviculture Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Florida. Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Florida Forest Service, Tallahassee, Florida.

Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. 2016. State Forest Handbook. Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Florida Forest Service. Tallahassee, Florida.

Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources. Revised 2013. Management Procedures for Archaeological and Historical Sites and Properties on State-Owned or Controlled Lands. Department of the State, Division of Historical Resources, Tallahassee, Florida.

Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources. 2021. Florida Master Site File Cultural Resource Roster. Tallahassee, Florida.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Center for Spatial Analysis. 2021. Listed Species Occurrence Records. St. Petersburg, Florida.

Florida Natural Areas Inventory. Guide to the Natural Communities of Florida (FNAI) – 2010 Edition. Florida Natural Areas Inventory, Institute of Science and Public Affairs at The Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.

Florida Natural Areas Inventory. 2022. FNAI Inventory and Assessment, “Current and Historic Natural Communities at Kissimmee Bend State Forest.”

United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey. Soil Survey Area: Okeechobee County; Survey Area Data: Version 18, June 9, 2020. Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), Washington D.C.

IX. Glossary of Abbreviations

ARC.....	Acquisition and Restoration Council
BMAP.....	Basin Management Action Plan
BMP.....	Best Management Practices
F.A.C.	Florida Administrative Code
FDACS	Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
DHR.....	Florida Division of Historical Resources
FFS	Florida Forest Service
FNAI.....	Florida Natural Areas Inventory
F.S.....	Florida Statutes
FWC	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
KBSF	Kissimmee Bend State Forest
NRCS.....	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NWR.....	National Wildlife Refuge
SFWMD	South Florida Water Management District
OALE	FDACS Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement
OFW	Outstanding Florida Waters
OPS.....	Other Personal Services Employment
TIITF	Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund

KISSIMMEE BEND STATE FOREST
2025 LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A

Four-Year Management Accomplishment Summary

**Kissimmee Bend State Forest
Four-Year Accomplishments**

Invasive Control	Cogon Grass	Acres	1
Fire	Prescribed Burning	No.	3
		Acres	2,887
Boundary Maintenance	Maintenance/Marking	Miles	4
Other Activities	OOF Event	No.	1

Exhibit B

Boundary and Road Map

Kissimmee Bend State Forest

Boundary & Road Map

Coordinate System: Florida Albers
High Accuracy Reference Network (HARN) Datum

[illegible]

Managued Area boundaries courtesy of the Florida Natural Areas Inventory formerly Used Defense Sites (UDS) from the US Army Corps of Engineers



A scale bar with three segments. The first segment is labeled '0.25', the second '0.125', and the third '0'. The word 'Miles' is at the right end of the bar.



Map Month/Year: June 2023

Exhibit C

Facilities, Recreation, and Improvements Map

Kissimmee Bend State Forest

Facilities, Recreation and Improvements Map

Coordinate System: Florida Albers
High Accuracy Reference Network (HARN) Datum

[illegible]

Exhibit D

Florida Forever Acquisition Project

Triple Diamond

Critical Natural Lands

Okeechobee

<i>Year Added to Priority List</i>	2009
<i>Project Acres</i>	7,998
<i>Acquired Acres</i>	5,308
<i>Cost of Acquired Acres</i>	\$4,200,000
<i>Remaining Project Acres</i>	2,690
<i>2021 Assessed Value of Remaining Acres</i>	\$11,374,666

Purpose for State Acquisition

The Triple Diamond project will preserve significant areas of endemic dry prairie and potential habitat for the endangered Florida grasshopper sparrow. Preserving this intact landscape would protect and maintain thousands of acres of high-quality habitat and provide recreational and research opportunities in an area of Florida known for its rare wildlife, imperiled natural communities, and significant hydrological values.

General Description

Triple Diamond is a working ranch and is exemplary in its retention of Florida's native prairie. Natural communities comprise 80 percent of the property and include basin marsh, depression marsh, dome swamp, dry and wet prairie, mesic hammock, and swales or sloughs. Dry prairie, endemic to this region of the state, is the most prevalent natural community within the project. A smaller acreage of wet prairie occurs as open, herbaceous areas occupying lower spots in the dry prairie and in ecotones between wetlands and the dry prairie. The dry prairie provides habitat for state and federally listed species such as gopher tortoise, Florida grasshopper sparrow and crested caracara. Dry and wet prairies make up approximately 42 percent of the property's acreage and comprise one of the largest blocks of native prairie remaining on private lands. Much of the Triple Diamond prairie has been burned frequently and is in excellent condition. Interconnected swale/slough and depression marsh wetlands form a branching network that spreads over the length and breadth of the property. There are also isolated depression/basin marshes scattered over the property. One small dome swamp is in the northeastern portion of the project. The canopy is dominated by mature pond cypress surrounding a small, disturbed pond. A two-story home is in the southwestern part of the site as part of a complex of management facilities that also includes an equipment barn and horse stables.

This project is bordered on the north by the Kissimmee River Prairie Preserve State Park. Other public lands nearby include Avon Park Air Force Range, Bombing Range Ridge, and the Kissimmee River to the west and Fort Drum Marsh Conservation Area and Blue Cypress Conservation Area to the east. The



Kissimmee-St. Johns River Connector Florida Forever Project is also located within seven miles to the east of the property. Triple Diamond would contribute to a large, contiguous landscape-sized protection area of more than 200,000 acres.

FNAI Element Occurrence Summary

<u>FNAI Elements</u>	<u>Score</u>
Gopher tortoise	G3/S3
Swallow-tailed kite	G5/S2
Florida sandhill crane	G5T2/S2
Crested caracara	G5/S2

Public Use

The Triple Diamond project has the potential of providing a diverse recreational experience. There is already a well-maintained road system occurring throughout the property and all the existing facilities can greatly enhance the recreational and research potential of the property. There is a potential for a full range of trail activities including nature trails, long distance hiking trails, bicycle trails and equestrian trails. Nature appreciation and wildlife observation and both primitive and facility camping could be supported. The infrastructure already on the property is in excellent shape and the existing residence could be converted to a spacious visitor/educational center. The barn and corrals could be used as part of an equestrian center for trail rides.

Acquisition Planning

2009

On June 12, 2009, ARC recommended that the Triple Diamond Ranch be added to the Florida Forever list as an A list project. In 2009, the project had an estimated tax assessed value of \$23,007,107.

2010

On June 11, 2010, ARC placed this project into the Critical Natural Lands category.

2019

In 2019, DEP purchased 1,992 acres fee simple from the Open Space Institute Land Trust, Inc. The property is now managed as Kissimmee Bend State Forest.

In 2019, the USFWS acquired 2,003 acres to be managed as part of the Everglades Headwaters National Wildlife Refuge and Conservation Area.

2021

In 2021, the USFWS acquired 1,315 acres to be managed as part of the Everglades Headwaters National Wildlife Refuge and Conservation Area.

Coordination

TNC is considered an acquisition partner on this project.





Management Policy Statement

The primary goals of managing the Triple Diamond property are to protect and manage thousands of acres of high-quality habitats.

Manager(s)

DRP is the recommended manager of this site; it would be managed as a part of the Kissimmee Prairie Preserve State Park.

Management Prospectus

Qualifications for state designation

This intact and well-managed landscape would allow protection and management of thousands of acres of high-quality habitats in an area of Florida known for its rare and imperiled wildlife, natural communities, and significant hydrological value. This project also has the potential for providing a diverse resource-based recreation experience.

Conditions affecting intensity of management

The property should not require intense management in the short term; however, the buildings on the property will need to be maintained. Over the long term, the intensity of management and related costs will increase as management emphasis shifts to a broader public use area with more use of the substantial infrastructure already on the property.

Management implementation, Public access, Site security and Protection of infrastructure

Once the property is acquired and assigned to DRP, short term management efforts will concentrate on site security, control of vehicle access and management planning. Kissimmee Prairie Preserve State Park will serve initially as a point of access for low intensity resource-based recreation (such as hiking). Consideration will be given in the management planning process for the provision of access from other locations to accommodate recreation development. The magnitude and diversity of future resource-based recreation opportunities offered will in great part depend on establishment of a management plan for the property, funding for positions and using established infrastructure.

Revenue-generating potential

The future revenue will depend on the nature and extent of public use and the use of the facilities already on the property. Vendors for future operation of the equestrian facility and two-story house will be considered.

Cooperators in management activities

DRP will cooperate with and seek the advice of other state agencies, local government entities and interested parties as appropriate.






Management Cost Summary

<u>DRP</u>	<u>Startup</u>
Salary (1 FTE, 1 OPS)	\$52,000
Expense	\$50,000
OCO	\$150,000
Outsourcing	\$20,000
TOTAL	\$272,000

Source: Management Prospectus as originally submitted





TRIPLE DIAMOND

OKEECHOBEE COUNTY



Exhibit E

Proximity
to
Significant Managed Lands Map



Florida Forest Service

Kissimmee Bend State Forest

Proximity to Significant Managed Lands

Coordinate System: Florida Albers
High Accuracy Reference Network (HARN) Datum

DISCLAIMER:
This map was prepared by the Florida Forest Service, Department of Natural Resources, for informational purposes only. It is not intended to be used for legal or financial purposes. The Florida Forest Service, Department of Natural Resources, is not responsible for any errors or omissions on this map. The Florida Forest Service, Department of Natural Resources, is not responsible for any damages or losses resulting from the use of this map. The Florida Forest Service, Department of Natural Resources, is not responsible for any damages or losses resulting from the use of this map.




Exhibit F

Department of State

Report on Archaeological
and
Cultural Sites

From: [Vovsi, Eman M.](#)
To: [Anderson, Patti](#)
Subject: [External] RE: Archaeological Information for Kissimmee Bend State Forest
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 4:14:19 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Template 102.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Completed; no cultural resources detected

From: Anderson, Patti <Patricia.Anderson@fdacs.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 4:11 PM
To: Vovsi, Eman M. <Eman.Vovsi@DOS.MyFlorida.com>
Subject: Archaeological Information for Kissimmee Bend State Forest

EMAIL RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL SOURCE

The attachments/links in this message have been scanned by Proofpoint.

Good afternoon Eman,
I hope all is well.

I am contacting you to request a Florida Master Site File review of archaeological sites and structures found on Kissimmee Bend State Forest located in Okeechobee County. Only pertinent information from your results will be included in the 2022 10-Year Land Management Plan. I'm attaching the shapefile since it's a new acquisition.

Thank you kindly,
Patti

Patti Anderson
Land Management Planner
Florida Forest Service
Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
(850) 681-5889
Patricia.Anderson@FDACS.gov
3125 Conner Boulevard
Suite I-258, Mail Stop C-25
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1650



www.FDACS.gov

Please note that Florida has a broad public records law ([Chapter 119, Florida Statutes](#)). Most written communications to or from state employees are public records obtainable by the public upon request. Emails sent to me at this email address may be considered public and will only be withheld from disclosure if deemed confidential pursuant to the laws of the State of Florida.



Exhibit G

Management Procedures for Archaeological and Historical Sites and Properties on State Owned or Controlled Lands

Management Procedures for Archaeological and Historical Sites and Properties on State-Owned or Controlled Properties
(revised June 2021)

These procedures apply to state agencies, local governments, and non-profits that manage state-owned properties.

A. Historic Property Definition

Historic properties include archaeological sites and historic structures as well as other types of resources. Chapter 267, Florida Statutes states: “*‘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 Chapter 267, F.S. and state policy related to historic properties, state agencies of the executive branch must provide the Division of Historical Resources (Division) the opportunity to comment on any undertakings with the potential to affect historic properties that are listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places, 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 undertaking. (267.061(2)(a))

State agencies must consult with the Division when, as a result of state action or assistance, a historic property will be demolished or substantially altered in a way that will adversely affect the property. State agencies must take timely steps to consider feasible and prudent alternatives to the adverse effect. If no feasible or prudent alternatives exist, the state agency must take timely steps to avoid or mitigate the adverse effect. (267.061(2)(b))

State agencies must consult with Division to establish a program to locate, inventory and evaluate all historic properties under ownership or controlled by the agency. (267.061(2)(c))

State agencies are responsible for preserving historic properties under their control. State agencies are directed to use historic properties available to the agency when that use is consistent with the historic property and the agency’s mission. State agencies are also directed to pursue preservation of historic properties to support their continued use. (267.061(2)(d))

C. Statutory Authority

The full text of Chapter 267, F.S. and additional information related to the treatment of historic properties is available at:

<https://dos.myflorida.com/historical/preservation/compliance-and-review/regulations-guidelines/>

D. Management Implementation

Although the Division sits on the Acquisition and Restoration Council and approves land management plans, these plans are conceptual and do not include detailed project information. Specific information for individual projects must be submitted to the Division for review and comment.

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. The Division's recommendations may include, but are not limited to: approval of the project as submitted, recommendation for a cultural resource assessment survey by a qualified professional archaeologist, and modifications to the proposed project to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects.

Projects such as additions or alterations to historic structures as well as new construction must also be submitted to the Division for review. Projects involving structures fifty years of age or older must be submitted to the Division for a significance determination. In rare cases, structures under fifty years of age may be deemed historically significant.

Adverse effects to historic properties must be avoided when possible, and if avoidance is not possible, additional consultation with the Division is necessary to develop a mitigation plan. Furthermore, managers of state property should make preparations for locating and evaluating historic properties, both archaeological sites and historic structures.

E. Archaeological Resource Management (ARM) Training

The ARM Training Course introduces state land managers to the nature of archaeological resources, Florida archaeology, and the role of the Division in managing state-owned archaeological resources. Participants gain a better understanding of the requirements of state and federal laws with regard to protecting and managing archaeological sites on state managed lands. Participants also receive a certificate recognizing their ability to conduct limited monitoring activities in accordance with the Division's Review Procedure, thereby reducing the time and money spent to comply with state regulations. Additional information regarding the ARM Training Course is available at:

<https://dos.myflorida.com/historical/archaeology/education/arm-training-courses/>

F. Matrix for Ground Disturbance on State Lands

The matrix is a tool designed to help streamline the Division's Review Procedure. The matrix allows state land managers to make decisions about balancing ground disturbance and stewardship of historic resources. The matrix establishes types of undertakings that are either minor or major disturbances and then guides the land manager to consult the Division, conduct ARM-trained project monitoring, or proceed with the project. Additional information regarding the matrix is available at:

<https://dos.myflorida.com/historical/archaeology/education/dhr-matrix-for-ground-disturbance-on-state-lands/>

G. Human Remains Treatment

Chapter 872, *Florida Statutes* makes it illegal to willfully and knowingly disturb human remains. In the event human remains are discovered, cease all activity in the area that may disturb the remains. Leave the bones and nearby items in place. Immediately notify law enforcement or the local district medical examiner of the discovery and follow the provisions of Chapter 872, FS. Additional information regarding the treatment of human remains and cemeteries is available at:

<https://dos.myflorida.com/historical/archaeology/human-remains/>
<https://dos.myflorida.com/historical/archaeology/human-remains/abandoned-cemeteries/what-are-the-applicable-laws-and-regulations/>

H. Division of Historical Resources Review Procedure

Projects on state owned or controlled properties may submit projects to the Division for review using the streamlined State Lands Consultation Form. The form provides instructions to submit projects for review and outlines the necessary information for the Division to complete the review process. The State Lands Consultation Form and additional information about the Division's review process is available at:

<https://dos.myflorida.com/historical/preservation/compliance-and-review/state-lands-review/>

* * *

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

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

StateLandsCompliance@dos.myflorida.com

Phone: (850) 245-6333
Toll Free: (800) 847-7278
Fax: (850) 245-6435

Exhibit H

Soil Types Map and Descriptions



Florida Forest Service


Kissimmee Bend State Forest

Soils Map

Coordinate System: Florida Albers
High Accuracy Reference Network (HARN) Datum

DISCLAIMER:
This map was prepared by the Florida Forest Service
and is not intended to be used for any purpose other than
general information. It is not a legal document and should
not be used for any legal purpose. The Florida Forest Service
does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of the
information contained herein. The Florida Forest Service
accepts no liability for any errors or omissions in this
map. The Florida Forest Service is not responsible for
any damages or losses resulting from the use of this
map.

Revised: June 2008
The Florida Forest Service
10000 Highway 19, Suite 100
Orlando, FL 32817
Phone: 407/838-1234
Fax: 407/838-1235
Email: info@floridastatesoil.com



Component Legend

This report presents general information about the map units and map unit components in the selected area. It shows map unit symbols and names and the components in each map unit. It also shows the percent of the components in the map units, the kind of component, and the slope range of each component.

Report--Component Legend

Component Legend--Okeechobee County, Florida							
Map unit symbol and name	Map unit acres	Pct. of map unit	Component name	Component kind	Pct. slope		
					Low	RV	High
2--Basinger fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	33,510						
		80	Basinger	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0
3--Basinger and Placid soils, depressional	26,010						
		50	Basinger, depressional	Series	0.0	0.5	1.0
		40	Placid, depressional	Series	0.0	0.5	1.0
5--Valkaria fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	36,860						
		85	Valkaria	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0
7--Floridana, Riviera, and Placid soils, depressional	41,460						
		40	Floridana, depressional	Series	0.0	0.5	1.0
		30	Riviera, depressional	Series	0.0	0.5	1.0
		20	Placid, depressional	Series	0.0	0.5	1.0
8--Pineda-Pineda, wet, fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	4,140						
		45	Pineda	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0
		40	Pineda, wet	Series	0.0	0.5	1.0
9--Riviera fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	10,970						
		80	Riviera	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0
10--Ft. Drum fine sand	1,420						
		80	Ft. drum	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0
11--Immokalee fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	109,950						
		90	Immokalee	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0
14--Myakka fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	155,120						
		85	Myakka	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0

Component Legend--Okeechobee County, Florida							
Map unit symbol and name	Map unit acres	Pct. of map unit	Component name	Component kind	Pct. slope		
					Low	RV	High
15—Okeelanta muck, frequently ponded, 0 to 1 percent slopes	5,880						
		85	Okeelanta	Series	0.0	0.5	1.0
18—Parkwood fine sand	4,080						
		90	Parkwood	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0
25—Wabasso fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	5,340						
		85	Wabasso	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Okeechobee County, Florida
 Survey Area Data: Version 18, Jun 9, 2020

Map Unit Description (Brief, Generated)

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions in this report, along with the maps, provide information on the composition of map units and properties of their components.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

The Map Unit Description (Brief, Generated) report displays a generated description of the major soils that occur in a map unit. Descriptions of non-soil (miscellaneous areas) and minor map unit components are not included. This description is generated from the underlying soil attribute data.

Additional information about the map units described in this report is available in other Soil Data Mart reports, which give properties of the soils and the limitations, capabilities, and potentials for many uses. Also, the narratives that accompany the Soil Data Mart reports define some of the properties included in the map unit descriptions.

Report—Map Unit Description (Brief, Generated)

Okeechobee County, Florida

Map Unit: 2—Basinger fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Component: Basinger (80%)

The Basinger component makes up 80 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 2 percent. This component is on flats on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is low. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is frequently ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 6 inches during July, August, September, October. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 2 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 4w. This soil meets hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Myakka (6%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Myakka soil is a minor component.

Component: Immokalee (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Immokalee soil is a minor component.

Component: Placid (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Placid soil is a minor component.

Component: Pompano (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Pompano soil is a minor component.

Component: Anclote (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Anclote soil is a minor component.

Component: Felda (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Felda soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 3—Basinger and Placid soils, depressional**Component: Basinger, depressional (50%)**

The Basinger, depressional component makes up 50 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 1 percent. This component is on depressions on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is very poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is low. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is frequently ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 0 inches during June, July, August, September, October, November, December. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 5 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 7w. This soil meets hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Placid, depressional (40%)

The Placid, depressional component makes up 40 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 1 percent. This component is on depressions on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is very poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is moderate. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is frequently ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 0 inches during June, July, August, September, October, November, December. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 6 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 7w. This soil meets hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: St. Johns (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The St. Johns soil is a minor component.

Component: Myakka (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Myakka soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 5—Valkaria fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Component: Valkaria (85%)

The Valkaria component makes up 85 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 2 percent. This component is on flats on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is low. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is not ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 6 inches during July, August, September, October. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 3 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 4w. This soil meets hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Myakka (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Myakka soil is a minor component.

Component: Malabar (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Malabar soil is a minor component.

Component: Pineda (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Pineda soil is a minor component.

Component: Satellite (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Satellite soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 7—Floridana, Riviera, and Placid soils, depressional**Component: Floridana, depressional (40%)**

The Floridana, depressional component makes up 40 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 1 percent. This component is on depressions on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy and loamy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is very poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is moderate. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is frequently ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 0 inches during June, July, August, September, October, November, December. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 11 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 7w. This soil meets hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Riviera, depressional (30%)

The Riviera, depressional component makes up 30 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 1 percent. This component is on depressions on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy and loamy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is very poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is moderate. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is frequently ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 0 inches during June, July, August, September, October, November, December. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 1 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 7w. This soil meets hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Placid, depressional (20%)

The Placid, depressional component makes up 20 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 1 percent. This component is on depressions on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is very poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is moderate. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is frequently ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 0 inches during June, July, August, September, October, November, December. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 6 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 7w. This soil meets hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Okeelanta, depressional (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Okeelanta, depressional soil is a minor component.

Component: Manatee, depressional (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Manatee, depressional soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 8—Pineda-Pineda, wet, fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Component: Pineda (45%)

The Pineda component makes up 45 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 2 percent. This component is on flatwoods on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy and loamy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is low. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is not ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 12 inches during June, July, August, September, October, November. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 3 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 3w. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Pineda, wet (40%)

The Pineda, wet component makes up 40 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 1 percent. This component is on flats on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy and loamy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is low. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is frequently ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 0 inches during July, August, September, October. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 3 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 3w. This soil meets hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Felda (6%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Felda soil is a minor component.

Component: Wabasso (3%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Wabasso soil is a minor component.

Component: Hallandale (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Hallandale soil is a minor component.

Component: Boca (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Boca soil is a minor component.

Component: Valkaria (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Valkaria soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 9—Riviera fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Component: Riviera (80%)

The Riviera component makes up 80 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 2 percent. This component is on flats on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy and loamy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is moderate. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is not ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 6 inches during July, August, September, October. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 1 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 3w. This soil meets hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Wabasso (8%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Wabasso soil is a minor component.

Component: Pinellas (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Pinellas soil is a minor component.

Component: Hallandale (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Hallandale soil is a minor component.

Component: Oldsmar (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Oldsmar soil is a minor component.

Component: Floridana (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Floridana soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 10—Ft. Drum fine sand

Component: Ft. Drum (80%)

The Ft. Drum component makes up 80 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 2 percent. This component is on flats on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is low. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is not ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 12 inches during June, July, August, September. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 2 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 4w. This soil meets hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 15 percent. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 20 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Wabasso (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Wabasso soil is a minor component.

Component: Parkwood (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Parkwood soil is a minor component.

Component: Bradenton (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Bradenton soil is a minor component.

Component: Pineda (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Pineda soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 11—Immokalee fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Component: Immokalee (90%)

The Immokalee component makes up 90 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 2 percent. This component is on flatwoods on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is moderate. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is not ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 12 inches during June, July, August, September, October, November. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 2 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 4w. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Basinger (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Basinger soil is a minor component.

Component: Basinger (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Basinger soil is a minor component.

Component: Wabasso (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Wabasso soil is a minor component.

Component: Pomello (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Pomello soil is a minor component.

Component: Margate (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Margate soil is a minor component.

Component: Placid (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Placid soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 14—Myakka fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes**Component: Myakka (85%)**

The Myakka component makes up 85 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 2 percent. This component is on flatwoods on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is low. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is not ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 12 inches during June, July, August, September, October, November. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 2 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 4w. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Basinger (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Basinger soil is a minor component.

Component: Wabasso (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Wabasso soil is a minor component.

Component: Cassia (3%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Cassia soil is a minor component.

Component: Immokalee (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Immokalee soil is a minor component.

Component: Satellite (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Satellite soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 15—Okeelanta muck, frequently ponded, 0 to 1 percent slopes**Component: Okeelanta (85%)**

The Okeelanta component makes up 85 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 1 percent. This component is on depressions on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of herbaceous organic material over sandy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is very poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is very high. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is frequently ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 0 inches during January, June, July, August, September, October, November, December. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 75 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 7w. This soil meets hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Terra Ceia (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Terra Ceia soil is a minor component.

Component: Lauderhill (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Lauderhill soil is a minor component.

Component: Placid (3%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Placid soil is a minor component.

Component: Floridana (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Floridana soil is a minor component.

Component: Tequesta (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Tequesta soil is a minor component.

Component: Pompano (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Pompano soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 18—Parkwood fine sand

Component: Parkwood (90%)

The Parkwood component makes up 90 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 2 percent. This component is on flats on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy and loamy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is moderate. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is not ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 6 inches during June, July, August, September. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 4 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 3w. This soil meets hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 15 percent. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Ft. Drum (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Ft. Drum soil is a minor component.

Component: Bradenton (5%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Bradenton soil is a minor component.

Map Unit: 25—Wabasso fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Component: Wabasso (85%)

The Wabasso component makes up 85 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 0 to 2 percent. This component is on flatwoods on marine terraces on coastal plains. The parent material consists of sandy and loamy marine deposits. Depth to a root restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is poorly drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is high. Available water to a depth of 60 inches (or restricted depth) is moderate. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded. It is not ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 12 inches during June, July, August, September, October, November. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 2 percent. Nonirrigated land capability classification is 3w. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. There are no saline horizons within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a maximum sodium adsorption ratio of 1 within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Riviera (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Riviera soil is a minor component.

Component: Myakka (4%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Myakka soil is a minor component.

Component: Basinger (3%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Basinger soil is a minor component.

Component: Malabar (2%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Malabar soil is a minor component.

Component: Felda (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Felda soil is a minor component.

Component: Pinellas (1%)

Generated brief soil descriptions are created for major soil components. The Pinellas soil is a minor component.

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Okeechobee County, Florida
Survey Area Data: Version 18, Jun 9, 2020

Exhibit I

Department of Environmental Protection Outstanding Florida Waters



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF Environmental Protection

Bob Martinez Center
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2400

Ron DeSantis
Governor

Jeanette Nuñez
Lt. Governor

Shawn Hamilton
Secretary

July 17th, 2024

Ms. Emily Marsh
Land Management Planner, Florida Forest Service
Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
3125 Conner Boulevard, Suite I-258, Mail Stop C-25
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1650

RE: Kissimmee Bend State Forest

Dear Ms. Marsh:

Thank you for your inquiry regarding the surface water quality classifications and Outstanding Florida Waters (OFW) for Kissimmee Bend State Forest in Okeechobee County. All of the surface waters within, adjacent to, or within 5 miles of Kissimmee Bend State Forest are classified as Class III waters pursuant to Rule 62-302.400, Florida Administrative Code (FAC). According to subsection 62-302.700(9), (FAC), there are no OFWs within, adjacent, and within several miles of the state forest.

You may also be interested in knowing that, according to the Florida Natural Areas Inventory Managed Areas data layer, there are other parcels adjacent to or near the State Forest that are considered conservation lands at a Federal or State level (see attached map). However, these have not been designated as OFWs.

If you have any questions or need additional information about this response, please feel free to contact me via e-mail at Talia.E.Smith-Sickler@FloridaDEP.gov or by phone at 850-245-8068.

Sincerely,

Talia Elisa Smith-Sickler
Standards Development Section
Water Quality Standards Program
Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Kissimmee Bend State Forest Map:




Exhibit J

Water Resources Map



Florida Forest Service

Kissimmee Bend State Forest

Water Resources Map

Coordinate System: Florida Albers
High Accuracy Reference Network (HARN) Datum

DISCLAIMER:
This map was prepared by the Florida Forest Service (FFS) for informational purposes only. It is not intended to be used for legal or regulatory purposes. The FFS does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of the information presented on this map. The FFS is not responsible for any errors or omissions. This map is provided as a service to the public and should not be used for any purpose other than informational.

Revised Area Inventory as required by the Florida National Forest Inventory
Final Map Date: 01/2021
From the US Army Corps of Engineers




LEGEND



Kissimmee
Bend State
Forest



Water
Resources



0.25 0.125 0
Miles



Map Month/Year: January 2021

1,000 500 0
Yards

Exhibit K

Florida Natural Areas Inventory

Managed Area Data Report



1018 Thomasville Road
Suite 200-C
Tallahassee, FL 32303
850-224-8207
fax 850-681-9364
www.fnai.org

January 12, 2022

Patti Anderson
Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
Forest Service
3125 Conner Boulevard, Suite I-258, Mail Stop C-25
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1650q

Dear Ms. Anderson,

Thank you for requesting information from the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI). At your request we have produced the following report for your project area.

The purpose of this Standard Data Report is to provide objective scientific information on natural resources located in the vicinity of a site of interest, in order to inform those involved in project planning and evaluation. This Report makes no determination of the suitability of a proposed project for this location, or the potential impacts of the project on natural resources in the area.

Project: Kissimmee Bend State Forest
Date Received: 12/7/2021
Location: Okeechobee County

Based on the information available, this site appears to be located in a significant region of natural areas and habitat for several rare species.

Element Occurrences

A search of our maps and database indicates that we currently have one element occurrence mapped in the vicinity of the study area (see enclosed map and element occurrence table). Please be advised that a lack of element occurrences in the FNAI database is not a sufficient indication of the absence of rare or endangered species on a site.

The element occurrences data layer includes occurrences of rare species and natural communities. The map legend indicates that some element occurrences occur in the general vicinity of the label point. This may be due to lack of precision of the source data, or an element that occurs over an extended area (such as a wide ranging species or large natural community). For animals and plants, element occurrences generally refer to more than a casual sighting; they usually indicate a viable population of the species. Note that some element occurrences represent historically documented observations which may no longer be extant. Extirpated element occurrences will be marked with an 'X' following the occurrence label on the enclosed map.



Florida Resources
and Environmental
Analysis Center

Institute of Science
and Public Affairs

The Florida State University

Likely and Potential Rare Species

In addition to documented occurrences, other rare species and natural communities may be identified on or near the site based on habitat models and species range models (see enclosed Biodiversity Matrix Report). These species should be taken into consideration in field surveys, land management, and impact avoidance and mitigation.

Tracking Florida's Biodiversity

FNAI habitat models indicate areas, which based on land cover type, offer suitable habitat for one or more rare species that is known to occur in the vicinity. Habitat models have been developed for approximately 300 of the rarest species tracked by the Inventory, including all federally listed species.

FNAI species range models indicate areas that are within the known or predicted range of a species, based on climate variables, soils, vegetation, and/or slope. Species range models have been developed for approximately 340 species, including all federally listed species. The FNAI Biodiversity Matrix Geodatabase compiles Documented, Likely, and Potential species and natural communities for each square mile Matrix Unit statewide.

CLIP

The enclosed map shows natural resource conservation priorities based on the Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project. CLIP is based on many of the same natural resource data developed for the Florida Forever Conservation Needs Assessment, but provides an overall picture of conservation priorities across different resource categories, including biodiversity, landscapes, surface waters, and aggregated CLIP priorities (that combine the individual resource categories). CLIP is also based primarily on remote sensed data and is not intended to be the definitive authority on natural resources on a site.

For more information on CLIP, visit <https://www.fnai.org/services/clip>.

Managed Areas

Portions of the site appear to be located within the Kissimmee Bend State Forest, managed by the FL Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Florida Forest Service.

The Managed Areas data layer shows public and privately managed conservation lands throughout the state. Federal, state, local, and privately managed conservation lands are included.

Land Acquisition Projects

This site appears to be located within the Triple Diamond Florida Forever BOT Project, which is part of the State of Florida's Conservation and Recreation Lands land acquisition program. A description of this project is enclosed. For more information on this Florida Forever Project, contact the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of State Lands.

Florida Forever Board of Trustees (BOT) projects are proposed and acquired through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of State Lands. The state has no specific land management authority over these lands until they are purchased.

The Inventory always recommends that professionals familiar with Florida's flora and fauna conduct a site-specific survey to determine the current presence or absence of rare, threatened, or endangered species.

Please visit www.fnai.org/species-communities/tracking-main for county or statewide element occurrence distributions and links to more element information.

The database maintained by the Florida Natural Areas Inventory is the single most comprehensive source of information available on the locations of rare species and other significant ecological resources. However, the data are not always based on comprehensive or site-specific field surveys. Therefore this information should not be regarded as a final statement on the biological resources of the site being considered, nor should it be substituted for on-site surveys. Inventory data are designed for the purposes of conservation planning and scientific research, and are not intended for use as the primary criteria for regulatory decisions.

Information provided by this database may not be published without prior written notification to the Florida Natural Areas Inventory, and the Inventory must be credited as an information source in these

publications. **The maps contain sensitive environmental information, please do not distribute or publish without prior consent from FNAI.** FNAI data may not be resold for profit.

Thank you for your use of FNAI services. If I can be of further assistance, please contact me at (850) 224-8207 or at kbrinegar@fnai.fsu.edu.

Sincerely,

Kerri Brinegar

Kerri Brinegar
GIS / Data Services

Encl

1018 Thomasville Road
 Suite 200-C
 Tallahassee, FL 32303
 (850) 224-8207
 (850) 681-9364 Fax
www.fnai.org

FLORIDA
Natural Areas
 INVENTORY

CLIP v4.0 Resource Priorities

Biodiversity Resource Category

- Priority 1 - highest
- Priority 2
- Priority 3
- Priority 4
- Priority 5

Landscape Resource Category

- Priority 1 - highest
- Priority 2
- Priority 3
- Priority 4
- Priority 5

Surface Water Resource Category

- Priority 1 - highest
- Priority 2
- Priority 3
- Priority 4
- Priority 5

Aggregated CLIP Priorities


- Priority 1 - highest
- Priority 2
- Priority 3
- Priority 4
- Priority 5

Site Boundary

Map should not be interpreted without accompanying documents.

Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project (CLIP) is a cooperative effort between the FSU Florida Natural Areas Inventory, UF Center for Landscape Conservation Planning, and FL Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission, with additional funding from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and US Fish & Wildlife Service.


Kissimmee Bend State Forest




Site boundaries are approximate.

Okeechobee County

CLIP Biodiversity Resource Priorities



CLIP Surface Water Resource Priorities



CLIP Aggregated Resource Priorities

Map produced by KAB
12/13/2021



1018 Thomasville Road
Suite 200-C
Tallahassee, FL 32303
(850) 224-8207
(850) 681-9364 Fax
www.fnai.org

Florida Natural Areas Inventory

Managed Area Element Summary

Kissimmee Bend State Forest



SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	Global rank	State rank	Federal status	State status
REPTILES					
<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	Gopher Tortoise	G3	S3	C	ST
NATURAL COMMUNITIES					
Dry Prairie		G2	S2	N	N

Note: Summary includes all documented and likely species occurrence records currently in the FNAI database.



1018 Thomasville Road
Suite 200-C
Tallahassee, FL 32303
(850) 224-8207
(850) 681-9364 Fax
www.fnai.org

FNAI ELEMENT OCCURRENCE REPORT on or near Kissimmee Bend State Forest



Map Label	Scientific Name	Common Name	Global State Federal State Observation			EO Comments			
			Rank	Status	Description				
GOPHPOLY*1052	Gopherus polyphemus	Gopher Tortoise	G3	S3	C	ST	2021-07-27	Dry prairie with patches of scrub. Several sloughs, depression marshes, and basin marshes occur throughout the prairie.	2017-04: LTDS survey: 332 burrows scoped; 69 occupied; 260 unoccupied; 3 undetermined. Estimated 4,778 gopher tortoises, with an estimated density of 0.64 gopher tortoises per ha. (F17FNA06FLUS). One tortoise and two burrows, 1 active, were documented during natural community mapping at the proposed Kissimmee Bend State Forest in July 2021 (F21FNA19FLUS).

Florida Natural Areas Inventory

Biodiversity Matrix Report



Scientific Name	Common Name	Global Rank	State Rank	Federal Status	State Listing
Matrix Unit ID: 53371					
Likely					
<i>Ammodramus savannarum floridanus</i>	Florida Grasshopper Sparrow	G5T1	S1	E	FE
<i>Caracara cheriway</i>	Crested Caracara	G5	S2	T	FT
Dry prairie		G2	S2	N	N
<i>Drymarchon couperi</i>	Eastern Indigo Snake	G3	S2?	T	FT
Potential					
<i>Antigone canadensis pratensis</i>	Florida Sandhill Crane	G5T2	S2	N	ST
<i>Athene cunicularia floridana</i>	Florida Burrowing Owl	G4T3	S3	N	ST
<i>Bonamia grandiflora</i>	Florida bonamia	G3	S3	T	E
<i>Calamintha ashei</i>	Ashe's savory	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Calopogon multiflorus</i>	many-flowered grass-pink	G2G3	S2S3	N	T
<i>Centrosema arenicola</i>	sand butterfly pea	G2Q	S2	N	E
<i>Chionanthus pygmaeus</i>	pygmy fringe tree	G2	S2S3	E	E
<i>Coelorachis tuberculosa</i>	Piedmont jointgrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Coleataenia abscissa</i>	cutthroatgrass	G3	S3	N	E
<i>Conradina brevifolia</i>	short-leaved rosemary	G2Q	S2	E	E
<i>Dryobates borealis</i>	Red-cockaded Woodpecker	G3	S2	E, PT	FE
<i>Eriogonum longifolium</i> var. <i>gnaphalifolium</i>	scrub buckwheat	G4T3	S3	T	E
<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	Gopher Tortoise	G3	S3	C	ST
<i>Gymnopogon chapmanianus</i>	Chapman's skeletongrass	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Lechea cernua</i>	nodding pinweed	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Liatris ohlingerae</i>	Florida blazing star	G2	S2	E	E
<i>Lithobates capito</i>	Gopher Frog	G2G3	S3	N	N
<i>Matelea floridana</i>	Florida spiny-pod	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Mustela frenata peninsulae</i>	Florida Long-tailed Weasel	G5T3?	S3?	N	N
<i>Nemastylis floridana</i>	celestial lily	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Neofiber alleni</i>	Round-tailed Muskrat	G2	S2	N	N
<i>Nolina atopocarpa</i>	Florida beargrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Nolina brittoniana</i>	Britton's beargrass	G3	S3	E	E
<i>Paronychia chartacea</i> var. <i>chartacea</i>	paper-like nailwort	G3T3	S3	T	E
<i>Peucaea aestivalis</i>	Bachman's Sparrow	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Platanthera integra</i>	yellow fringeless orchid	G3G4	S3	N	E
<i>Plestiodon egregius lividus</i>	Blue-tailed Mole Skink	G5T2	S2	T	FT
<i>Podomys floridanus</i>	Florida Mouse	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Polygonella basiramia</i>	Florida jointweed	G3	S3	E	E
<i>Pteroglossaspis ecrinata</i>	giant orchid	G2G3	S2	N	T
<i>Rostrhamus sociabilis</i>	Snail Kite	G4G5	S2	E	FE
<i>Sciurus niger niger</i>	Southeastern Fox Squirrel	G5T5	S3	N	N
<i>Ursus americanus floridanus</i>	Florida Black Bear	G5T4	S4	N	N
<i>Warea carteri</i>	Carter's warea	G1	S1	E	E

Matrix Unit ID: 53372

Likely

<i>Ammodramus savannarum floridanus</i>	Florida Grasshopper Sparrow	G5T1	S1	E	FE
Dry prairie		G2	S2	N	N
<i>Drymarchon couperi</i>	Eastern Indigo Snake	G3	S2?	T	FT

Definitions: Documented - Rare species and natural communities documented on or near this site.
 Documented-Historic - Rare species and natural communities documented, but not observed/reported within the last twenty years.
 Likely - Rare species and natural communities likely to occur on this site based on suitable habitat and/or known occurrences in the vicinity.
 Potential - This site lies within the known or predicted range of the species listed.

Florida Natural Areas Inventory

Biodiversity Matrix Report



Scientific Name	Common Name	Global Rank	State Rank	Federal Status	State Listing
Potential					
<i>Antigone canadensis pratensis</i>	Florida Sandhill Crane	G5T2	S2	N	ST
<i>Athene cucularia floridana</i>	Florida Burrowing Owl	G4T3	S3	N	ST
<i>Bonamia grandiflora</i>	Florida bonamia	G3	S3	T	E
<i>Calamintha ashei</i>	Ashe's savory	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Calopogon multiflorus</i>	many-flowered grass-pink	G2G3	S2S3	N	T
<i>Centrosema arenicola</i>	sand butterfly pea	G2Q	S2	N	E
<i>Chionanthus pygmaeus</i>	pygmy fringe tree	G2	S2S3	E	E
<i>Coelorachis tuberculosa</i>	Piedmont jointgrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Coleataenia abscissa</i>	cutthroatgrass	G3	S3	N	E
<i>Conradina brevifolia</i>	short-leaved rosemary	G2Q	S2	E	E
<i>Dryobates borealis</i>	Red-cockaded Woodpecker	G3	S2	E, PT	FE
<i>Eriogonum longifolium</i> var. <i>gnaphalifolium</i>	scrub buckwheat	G4T3	S3	T	E
<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	Gopher Tortoise	G3	S3	C	ST
<i>Gymnopogon chapmanianus</i>	Chapman's skeletongrass	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Lechea cernua</i>	nodding pinweed	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Liatris ohlingerae</i>	Florida blazing star	G2	S2	E	E
<i>Lithobates capito</i>	Gopher Frog	G2G3	S3	N	N
<i>Matelea floridana</i>	Florida spiny-pod	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Mustela frenata peninsulae</i>	Florida Long-tailed Weasel	G5T3?	S3?	N	N
<i>Nemastylis floridana</i>	celestial lily	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Neofiber alleni</i>	Round-tailed Muskrat	G2	S2	N	N
<i>Nolina atopocarpa</i>	Florida beargrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Nolina brittoniana</i>	Britton's beargrass	G3	S3	E	E
<i>Paronychia chartacea</i> var. <i>chartacea</i>	paper-like nailwort	G3T3	S3	T	E
<i>Peucaea aestivalis</i>	Bachman's Sparrow	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Platanthera integra</i>	yellow fringeless orchid	G3G4	S3	N	E
<i>Plestiodon egregius lividus</i>	Blue-tailed Mole Skink	G5T2	S2	T	FT
<i>Podomys floridanus</i>	Florida Mouse	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Pteroglossaspis ecristata</i>	giant orchid	G2G3	S2	N	T
<i>Rostrhamus sociabilis</i>	Snail Kite	G4G5	S2	E	FE
<i>Sciurus niger niger</i>	Southeastern Fox Squirrel	G5T5	S3	N	N
<i>Ursus americanus floridanus</i>	Florida Black Bear	G5T4	S4	N	N
<i>Warea carteri</i>	Carter's warea	G1	S1	E	E
Matrix Unit ID: 53373					
Likely					
<i>Ammodramus savannarum floridanus</i>	Florida Grasshopper Sparrow	G5T1	S1	E	FE
Dry prairie		G2	S2	N	N
<i>Drymarchon couperi</i>	Eastern Indigo Snake	G3	S2?	T	FT
<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	Gopher Tortoise	G3	S3	C	ST
Potential					
<i>Antigone canadensis pratensis</i>	Florida Sandhill Crane	G5T2	S2	N	ST
<i>Athene cucularia floridana</i>	Florida Burrowing Owl	G4T3	S3	N	ST
<i>Bonamia grandiflora</i>	Florida bonamia	G3	S3	T	E
<i>Calamintha ashei</i>	Ashe's savory	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Calopogon multiflorus</i>	many-flowered grass-pink	G2G3	S2S3	N	T

Definitions: Documented - Rare species and natural communities documented on or near this site.
 Documented-Historic - Rare species and natural communities documented, but not observed/reported within the last twenty years.
 Likely - Rare species and natural communities likely to occur on this site based on suitable habitat and/or known occurrences in the vicinity.
 Potential - This site lies within the known or predicted range of the species listed.

Florida Natural Areas Inventory

Biodiversity Matrix Report



Scientific Name	Common Name	Global Rank	State Rank	Federal Status	State Listing
<i>Centrosema arenicola</i>	sand butterfly pea	G2Q	S2	N	E
<i>Chionanthus pygmaeus</i>	pygmy fringe tree	G2	S2S3	E	E
<i>Coelorachis tuberculosa</i>	Piedmont jointgrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Coleataenia abscissa</i>	cutthroatgrass	G3	S3	N	E
<i>Conradina brevifolia</i>	short-leaved rosemary	G2Q	S2	E	E
<i>Dryobates borealis</i>	Red-cockaded Woodpecker	G3	S2	E, PT	FE
<i>Eriogonum longifolium</i> var. <i>gnaphalifolium</i>	scrub buckwheat	G4T3	S3	T	E
<i>Gymnopogon chapmanianus</i>	Chapman's skeletongrass	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Heterodon simus</i>	Southern Hognose Snake	G2	S2S3	N	N
<i>Lechea cernua</i>	nodding pinweed	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Liatris ohlingerae</i>	Florida blazing star	G2	S2	E	E
<i>Lithobates capito</i>	Gopher Frog	G2G3	S3	N	N
<i>Matelea floridana</i>	Florida spiny-pod	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Mustela frenata peninsulæ</i>	Florida Long-tailed Weasel	G5T3?	S3?	N	N
<i>Nemastylis floridana</i>	celestial lily	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Neofiber alleni</i>	Round-tailed Muskrat	G2	S2	N	N
<i>Nolina atopocarpa</i>	Florida beargrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Nolina brittoniana</i>	Britton's beargrass	G3	S3	E	E
<i>Paronychia chartacea</i> var. <i>chartacea</i>	paper-like nailwort	G3T3	S3	T	E
<i>Peucaea aestivalis</i>	Bachman's Sparrow	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Platanthera integra</i>	yellow fringeless orchid	G3G4	S3	N	E
<i>Plestiodon egregius lividus</i>	Blue-tailed Mole Skink	G5T2	S2	T	FT
<i>Podomys floridanus</i>	Florida Mouse	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Pteroglossaspis ecristata</i>	giant orchid	G2G3	S2	N	T
<i>Rostrhamus sociabilis</i>	Snail Kite	G4G5	S2	E	FE
<i>Sciurus niger niger</i>	Southeastern Fox Squirrel	G5T5	S3	N	N
<i>Ursus americanus floridanus</i>	Florida Black Bear	G5T4	S4	N	N
<i>Warea carteri</i>	Carter's warea	G1	S1	E	E

Matrix Unit ID: 53697

Likely

<i>Ammodramus savannarum floridanus</i>	Florida Grasshopper Sparrow	G5T1	S1	E	FE
<i>Caracara cheriway</i>	Crested Caracara	G5	S2	T	FT
Dry prairie		G2	S2	N	N
<i>Drymarchon couperi</i>	Eastern Indigo Snake	G3	S2?	T	FT

Potential

<i>Antigone canadensis pratensis</i>	Florida Sandhill Crane	G5T2	S2	N	ST
<i>Athene cunicularia floridana</i>	Florida Burrowing Owl	G4T3	S3	N	ST
<i>Bonamia grandiflora</i>	Florida bonamia	G3	S3	T	E
<i>Calamintha ashei</i>	Ashe's savory	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Calopogon multiflorus</i>	many-flowered grass-pink	G2G3	S2S3	N	T
<i>Centrosema arenicola</i>	sand butterfly pea	G2Q	S2	N	E
<i>Chionanthus pygmaeus</i>	pygmy fringe tree	G2	S2S3	E	E
<i>Coelorachis tuberculosa</i>	Piedmont jointgrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Coleataenia abscissa</i>	cutthroatgrass	G3	S3	N	E
<i>Conradina brevifolia</i>	short-leaved rosemary	G2Q	S2	E	E
<i>Dryobates borealis</i>	Red-cockaded Woodpecker	G3	S2	E, PT	FE
<i>Eriogonum longifolium</i> var. <i>gnaphalifolium</i>	scrub buckwheat	G4T3	S3	T	E

Definitions: Documented - Rare species and natural communities documented on or near this site.
 Documented-Historic - Rare species and natural communities documented, but not observed/reported within the last twenty years.
 Likely - Rare species and natural communities likely to occur on this site based on suitable habitat and/or known occurrences in the vicinity.
 Potential - This site lies within the known or predicted range of the species listed.

Florida Natural Areas Inventory

Biodiversity Matrix Report



Scientific Name	Common Name	Global Rank	State Rank	Federal Status	State Listing
<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	Gopher Tortoise	G3	S3	C	ST
<i>Gymnopogon chapmanianus</i>	Chapman's skeletongrass	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Lechea cernua</i>	nodding pinweed	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Liatris ohlingerae</i>	Florida blazing star	G2	S2	E	E
<i>Lithobates capito</i>	Gopher Frog	G2G3	S3	N	N
<i>Lythrum flagellare</i>	lowland loosestrife	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Matelea floridana</i>	Florida spiny-pod	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Mustela frenata peninsulæ</i>	Florida Long-tailed Weasel	G5T3?	S3?	N	N
<i>Nemastylis floridana</i>	celestial lily	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Neofiber alleni</i>	Round-tailed Muskrat	G2	S2	N	N
<i>Nolina atopocarpa</i>	Florida beargrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Nolina brittoniana</i>	Britton's beargrass	G3	S3	E	E
<i>Paronychia chartacea</i> var. <i>chartacea</i>	paper-like nailwort	G3T3	S3	T	E
<i>Peucaea aestivalis</i>	Bachman's Sparrow	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Platanthera integra</i>	yellow fringeless orchid	G3G4	S3	N	E
<i>Plestiodon egregius lividus</i>	Blue-tailed Mole Skink	G5T2	S2	T	FT
<i>Podomys floridanus</i>	Florida Mouse	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Pteroglossaspis ecristata</i>	giant orchid	G2G3	S2	N	T
<i>Rostrhamus sociabilis</i>	Snail Kite	G4G5	S2	E	FE
<i>Sciurus niger niger</i>	Southeastern Fox Squirrel	G5T5	S3	N	N
<i>Ursus americanus floridanus</i>	Florida Black Bear	G5T4	S4	N	N
<i>Warea carteri</i>	Carter's warea	G1	S1	E	E

Matrix Unit ID: 53698

Likely

<i>Ammodramus savannarum floridanus</i>	Florida Grasshopper Sparrow	G5T1	S1	E	FE
Dry prairie		G2	S2	N	N
<i>Drymarchon couperi</i>	Eastern Indigo Snake	G3	S2?	T	FT

Potential

<i>Antigone canadensis pratensis</i>	Florida Sandhill Crane	G5T2	S2	N	ST
<i>Athene cunicularia floridana</i>	Florida Burrowing Owl	G4T3	S3	N	ST
<i>Calamintha ashei</i>	Ashe's savory	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Calopogon multiflorus</i>	many-flowered grass-pink	G2G3	S2S3	N	T
<i>Centrosema arenicola</i>	sand butterfly pea	G2Q	S2	N	E
<i>Chionanthus pygmaeus</i>	pygmy fringe tree	G2	S2S3	E	E
<i>Coelorachis tuberculosa</i>	Piedmont jointgrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Coleataenia abscissa</i>	cutthroatgrass	G3	S3	N	E
<i>Conradina brevifolia</i>	short-leaved rosemary	G2Q	S2	E	E
<i>Dryobates borealis</i>	Red-cockaded Woodpecker	G3	S2	E, PT	FE
<i>Eriogonum longifolium</i> var. <i>gnaphalifolium</i>	scrub buckwheat	G4T3	S3	T	E
<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	Gopher Tortoise	G3	S3	C	ST
<i>Gymnopogon chapmanianus</i>	Chapman's skeletongrass	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Lechea cernua</i>	nodding pinweed	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Liatris ohlingerae</i>	Florida blazing star	G2	S2	E	E
<i>Lithobates capito</i>	Gopher Frog	G2G3	S3	N	N
<i>Lythrum flagellare</i>	lowland loosestrife	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Matelea floridana</i>	Florida spiny-pod	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Mustela frenata peninsulæ</i>	Florida Long-tailed Weasel	G5T3?	S3?	N	N

Definitions: Documented - Rare species and natural communities documented on or near this site.
 Documented-Historic - Rare species and natural communities documented, but not observed/reported within the last twenty years.
 Likely - Rare species and natural communities likely to occur on this site based on suitable habitat and/or known occurrences in the vicinity.
 Potential - This site lies within the known or predicted range of the species listed.

Florida Natural Areas Inventory

Biodiversity Matrix Report



Scientific Name	Common Name	Global Rank	State Rank	Federal Status	State Listing
<i>Nemastylis floridana</i>	celestial lily	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Neofiber alleni</i>	Round-tailed Muskrat	G2	S2	N	N
<i>Nolina atopocarpa</i>	Florida beargrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Nolina brittoniana</i>	Britton's beargrass	G3	S3	E	E
<i>Paronychia chartacea</i> var. <i>chartacea</i>	paper-like nailwort	G3T3	S3	T	E
<i>Peucaea aestivalis</i>	Bachman's Sparrow	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Platanthera integra</i>	yellow fringeless orchid	G3G4	S3	N	E
<i>Plestiodon egregius lividus</i>	Blue-tailed Mole Skink	G5T2	S2	T	FT
<i>Podomys floridanus</i>	Florida Mouse	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Pteroglossaspis ecristata</i>	giant orchid	G2G3	S2	N	T
<i>Rostrhamus sociabilis</i>	Snail Kite	G4G5	S2	E	FE
<i>Sciurus niger niger</i>	Southeastern Fox Squirrel	G5T5	S3	N	N
<i>Ursus americanus floridanus</i>	Florida Black Bear	G5T4	S4	N	N
<i>Warea carteri</i>	Carter's warea	G1	S1	E	E
Matrix Unit ID: 53699					
Documented					
<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	Gopher Tortoise	G3	S3	C	ST
Likely					
<i>Ammodramus savannarum floridanus</i>	Florida Grasshopper Sparrow	G5T1	S1	E	FE
<i>Caracara cheriway</i>	Crested Caracara	G5	S2	T	FT
Dry prairie		G2	S2	N	N
<i>Drymarchon couperi</i>	Eastern Indigo Snake	G3	S2?	T	FT
Potential					
<i>Antigone canadensis pratensis</i>	Florida Sandhill Crane	G5T2	S2	N	ST
<i>Athene cunicularia floridana</i>	Florida Burrowing Owl	G4T3	S3	N	ST
<i>Calamintha ashei</i>	Ashe's savory	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Calopogon multiflorus</i>	many-flowered grass-pink	G2G3	S2S3	N	T
<i>Centrosema arenicola</i>	sand butterfly pea	G2Q	S2	N	E
<i>Chionanthus pygmaeus</i>	pygmy fringe tree	G2	S2S3	E	E
<i>Coelorachis tuberculosa</i>	Piedmont jointgrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Coleataenia abscissa</i>	cutthroatgrass	G3	S3	N	E
<i>Conradina brevifolia</i>	short-leaved rosemary	G2Q	S2	E	E
<i>Dryobates borealis</i>	Red-cockaded Woodpecker	G3	S2	E, PT	FE
<i>Eriogonum longifolium</i> var. <i>gnaphalifolium</i>	scrub buckwheat	G4T3	S3	T	E
<i>Gymnopogon chapmanianus</i>	Chapman's skeletongrass	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Heterodon simus</i>	Southern Hognose Snake	G2	S2S3	N	N
<i>Lechea cernua</i>	nodding pinweed	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Liatris ohlingerae</i>	Florida blazing star	G2	S2	E	E
<i>Lithobates capito</i>	Gopher Frog	G2G3	S3	N	N
<i>Lythrum flagellare</i>	lowland loosestrife	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Matelea floridana</i>	Florida spiny-pod	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Mustela frenata peninsulæ</i>	Florida Long-tailed Weasel	G5T3?	S3?	N	N
<i>Nemastylis floridana</i>	celestial lily	G2	S2	N	E
<i>Neofiber alleni</i>	Round-tailed Muskrat	G2	S2	N	N
<i>Nolina atopocarpa</i>	Florida beargrass	G3	S3	N	T
<i>Nolina brittoniana</i>	Britton's beargrass	G3	S3	E	E

Definitions: Documented - Rare species and natural communities documented on or near this site.
 Documented-Historic - Rare species and natural communities documented, but not observed/reported within the last twenty years.
 Likely - Rare species and natural communities likely to occur on this site based on suitable habitat and/or known occurrences in the vicinity.
 Potential - This site lies within the known or predicted range of the species listed.



1018 Thomasville Road
Suite 200-C
Tallahassee, FL 32303
(850) 224-8207
(850) 681-9364 Fax
www.fnai.org

Florida Natural Areas Inventory Biodiversity Matrix Report



Scientific Name	Common Name	Global Rank	State Rank	Federal Status	State Listing
<i>Paronychia chartacea</i> var. <i>chartacea</i>	paper-like nailwort	G3T3	S3	T	E
<i>Peucaea aestivalis</i>	Bachman's Sparrow	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Platanthera integra</i>	yellow fringeless orchid	G3G4	S3	N	E
<i>Podomys floridanus</i>	Florida Mouse	G3	S3	N	N
<i>Pteroglossaspis ecristata</i>	giant orchid	G2G3	S2	N	T
<i>Rostrhamus sociabilis</i>	Snail Kite	G4G5	S2	E	FE
<i>Sciurus niger niger</i>	Southeastern Fox Squirrel	G5T5	S3	N	N
<i>Ursus americanus floridanus</i>	Florida Black Bear	G5T4	S4	N	N
<i>Warea carteri</i>	Carter's warea	G1	S1	E	E

Definitions: Documented - Rare species and natural communities documented on or near this site.
Documented-Historic - Rare species and natural communities documented, but not observed/reported within the last twenty years.
Likely - Rare species and natural communities likely to occur on this site based on suitable habitat and/or known occurrences in the vicinity.
Potential - This site lies within the known or predicted range of the species listed.

Elements and Element Occurrences

An **element** is any exemplary or rare component of the natural environment, such as a species, natural community, bird rookery, spring, sinkhole, cave, or other ecological feature.

An **element occurrence (EO)** is an area of land and/or water in which a species or natural community is, or was, present. An EO should have practical conservation value for the Element as evidenced by potential continued (or historical) presence and/or regular recurrence at a given location.

Element Ranking and Legal Status

Using a ranking system developed by NatureServe and the Natural Heritage Program Network, the Florida Natural Areas Inventory assigns two ranks for each element. The global rank is based on an element's worldwide status; the state 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.
- GH** = Of historical occurrence throughout its range, may be rediscovered (e.g., ivory-billed woodpecker).
- GX** = Believed to be extinct throughout range.
- GXC** = Extirpated from the wild but still known from captivity or cultivation.
- G#?** = Tentative rank (e.g., G2?).
- G#G#** = Range of rank; insufficient data to assign specific global rank (e.g., G2G3).
- G#T#** = Rank of a taxonomic subgroup such as a subspecies or variety; the G portion of the rank refers to the entire species and the T portion refers to the specific subgroup; 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).
- G#T#Q** = Same as above, but validity as subspecies or variety is questioned.
- GU** = Unrankable; due to a lack of information no rank or range can be assigned (e.g., GUT2).
- GNA** = Ranking is not applicable because the element is not a suitable target for conservation (e.g. a hybrid species).
- GNR** = Element not yet ranked (temporary).
- GNRTNR** = Neither the element nor the taxonomic subgroup has yet been ranked.

FNAI STATE ELEMENT RANK

- S1** = Critically imperiled in Florida 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.
- S2** = Imperiled in Florida 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.
- S3** = Either very rare and local in Florida (21-100 occurrences or less than 10,000 individuals) or found locally in a restricted range or vulnerable to extinction from other factors.
- S4** = Apparently secure in Florida (may be rare in parts of range).
- S5** = Demonstrably secure in Florida.
- SH** = Of historical occurrence in Florida, possibly extirpated, but may be rediscovered (e.g., ivory-billed woodpecker).
- SX** = Believed to be extirpated throughout Florida.
- SU** = Unrankable; due to a lack of information no rank or range can be assigned.
- SNA** = State ranking is not applicable because the element is not a suitable target for conservation (e.g. a hybrid species).
- SNR** = Element not yet ranked (temporary).

FEDERAL LEGAL STATUS

Legal status information 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.

C = Candidate species for which federal listing agencies have sufficient information on biological vulnerability and threats to support proposing to list the species as Endangered or Threatened.

E = Endangered: species in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

E, T = Species currently listed endangered in a portion of its range but only listed as threatened in other areas

E, PDL = Species currently listed endangered but has been proposed for delisting.

E, PT = Species currently listed endangered but has been proposed for listing as threatened.

E, XN = Species currently listed endangered but tracked population is a non-essential experimental population.

T = Threatened: species likely to become Endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

PE = Species proposed for listing as endangered

PS = Partial status: some but not all of the species' infraspecific taxa have federal

PT = Species proposed for listing as threatened

SAT = Treated as threatened due to similarity of appearance to a species which is federally listed such that enforcement personnel have difficulty in attempting to differentiate between the listed and unlisted species.

SC = Not currently listed, but considered a "species of concern" to USFWS.

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 Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, 1 August 1997, and subsequent updates.

C = Candidate for listing at the Federal level by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

FE = Listed as Endangered Species at the Federal level by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

FT = Listed as Threatened Species at the Federal level by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

FXN = Federal listed as an experimental population in Florida

FT(S/A) = Federal Threatened due to similarity of appearance

ST = State population listed as Threatened 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.

SSC = 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. (SSC* for *Pandion haliaetus* (Osprey) indicates that this status applies in Monroe county only.)

N = Not currently listed, nor currently being considered for listing.

Plants: 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://www.doacs.state.fl.us/pi/>.

E = Endangered: species of plants native to Florida 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; includes all species determined to be endangered or threatened pursuant to the U.S. Endangered Species Act.

T = Threatened: 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 number as to cause them to be Endangered.

N = Not currently listed, nor currently being considered for listing.

Element Occurrence Ranking

FNAI ranks of quality of the element occurrence in terms of its viability (EORANK). Viability is estimated using a combination of factors that contribute to continued survival of the element at the location. Among these are the size of the EO, general condition of the EO at the site, and the conditions of the landscape surrounding the EO (e.g. an immediate threat to an EO by local development pressure could lower an EO rank).

A = Excellent estimated viability
A? = Possibly excellent estimated viability
AB = Excellent or good estimated viability
AC = Excellent, good, or fair estimated viability
B = Good estimated viability
B? = Possibly good estimated viability
BC = Good or fair estimated viability
BD = Good, fair, or poor estimated viability
C = Fair estimated viability
C? = Possibly fair estimated viability
CD = Fair or poor estimated viability
D = Poor estimated viability
D? = Possibly poor estimated viability
E = Verified extant (viability not assessed)
F = Failed to find
H = Historical
NR = Not ranked, a placeholder when an EO is not (yet) ranked.
U = Unrankable
X = Extirpated

*For additional detail on the above ranks see: <http://www.natureserve.org/explorer/eorankguide.htm>

FNAI also uses the following EO ranks:

H? = Possibly historical
F? = Possibly failed to find
X? = Possibly extirpated

The following offers further explanation of the H and X ranks as they are used by FNAI:

The rank of H is used when there is a lack of recent field information verifying the continued existence of an EO, such as (a) when an EO is based only on historical collections data; or (b) when an EO was ranked A, B, C, D, or E at one time and is later, without field survey work, considered to be possibly extirpated due to general habitat loss or degradation of the environment in the area. This definition of the H rank is dependent on an interpretation of what constitutes "recent" field information. Generally, if there is no known survey of an EO within the last 20 to 40 years, it should be assigned an H rank. While these time frames represent suggested maximum limits, the actual time period for historical EOs may vary according to the biology of the element and the specific landscape context of each occurrence (including anthropogenic alteration of the environment). Thus, an H rank may be assigned to an EO before the maximum time frames have lapsed. Occurrences that have not been surveyed for periods exceeding these time frames should not be ranked A, B, C, or D. The higher maximum limit for plants and communities (i.e., ranging from 20 to 40 years) is based upon the assumption that occurrences of these elements generally have the potential to persist at a given location for longer periods of time. This greater potential is a reflection of plant biology and community dynamics. However, landscape factors must also be considered. Thus, areas with more anthropogenic impacts on the environment (e.g., development) will be at the lower end of the range, and less-impacted areas will be at the higher end.

The rank of X is assigned to EOs for which there is documented destruction of habitat or environment, or persuasive evidence of eradication based on adequate survey (i.e., thorough or repeated survey efforts by one or more experienced observers at times and under conditions appropriate for the Element at that location).

Exhibit L

Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission

Listed Species Occurrence Records



**Florida Fish
and Wildlife
Conservation
Commission**

Commissioners

Rodney Barreto
Chairman
Coral Gables

Michael W. Sole
Vice Chairman
Tequesta

Steven Hudson
Fort Lauderdale

Gary Lester
Oxford

Gary Nicklaus
Jupiter

Sonya Rood
St. Augustine

Robert A. Spottswood
Key West

Executive Staff

Eric Sutton
Executive Director

Thomas H. Eason, Ph.D.
Assistant Executive Director

Jennifer Fitzwater
Chief of Staff

Fish and Wildlife
Research Institute
Gil McRee
Director

727-896-8626
727-823-0166 FAX

*Managing fish and wildlife
resources for their long-term
well-being and the benefit
of people.*

**Fish and Wildlife
Research Institute**

100 Eighth Avenue SE
St. Petersburg, Florida
33701-5020

Voice: (727) 896-8626

Fax: (727) 823-0166

Hearing/speech-impaired:

(800) 955-8771 (T)

(800) 955-8770 (V)

MyFWC.com/Research

December 10, 2021

Patti Anderson
Land Management Planner
Florida Forest Service
3125 Conner Boulevard
Suite I-258, Mail Stop C-25
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1650

Dear Patti:

This letter is in response to your request for listed species occurrence records and critical habitats for your project (Kissimmee Bend FFS) located in Okeechobee County, Florida. Records from The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's database indicate that listed species occurrence data and critical habitats are located within the project area. Records of Swallowed-tailed kit, Crested caracara, Loggerhead shrike, American white pelican, American alligator, Raccoon and Gopher tortoise were found on, or within a 1-mile distance of, the property. SHCAs were found for Short-tailed hawk, Florida burrowing owl and Florida Grasshopper sparrow within a 1-mile distance of, the property. Enclosed are 8.5 x 11 maps prioritized SHCA's, species richness, priority wetlands for listed species, and land cover for the project site and surrounding area.

This letter and attachments should not be considered as a review or an assessment of the impact upon threatened or endangered species of the project site. It provides FWC's most current data regarding the location of listed species and their associated habitats.

Our SHCA recommendations are intended to be used as a guide. Land development and ownership in Florida is ever-changing and priority areas identified as SHCA might already have been significantly altered due to development or acquired into public ownership. Onsite surveys, literature reviews, and coordination with FWC biologists remain essential steps in documenting the presence or absence of rare and imperiled species and habitats within the project area.

Our fish and wildlife location data represents only those occurrences recorded by FWC staff and other affiliated researchers. It is important to understand that our database does not necessarily contain records of all listed species that may occur in a given area. Also, data on certain species, such as gopher tortoises, are not entered into our database on a site-specific basis.

Therefore, one should not assume that an absence of occurrences in our database indicates that species of significance do not occur in the area.

Patti Anderson
Page 2
December 10th, 2021

The Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) maintains a separate database of listed plant and wildlife species, please contact FNAI directly for specific information on the location of element occurrences within the project area.

Because FNAI is funded to provide information to public agencies only, you may be required to pay a fee for this information. County-wide listed species information can be located at their website (<http://www.fnai.org>).


Please credit the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission in any publication or presentation of these data. If you have any questions or further requests, please contact me at (850) 488-0588 or gisrequests@myfwc.com.

Sincerely,

Steven Nicholl

Steven Nicholl

Environmental Specialist I/GIS Technician
Center for Spatial Analysis
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Fish and Wildlife Research Institute
100 8th Avenue S.E.
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
727-502-4970



Source: Esri, Maxar, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community

Prioritized SHCA's



 Approximate site boundary and 1-mile buffer




Kissimmee Bend FFS


The prioritized SHCA map identifies 5 classes of SHCA based upon Heritage ranking criteria developed by The Nature Conservancy, the Natural Heritage Program Network, and the Florida Natural Areas Inventory. There are 2 possible ranks used to prioritize a species' SHCA: 1) the global rank based on a species worldwide status, and 2) the state rank based upon the species status in Florida. The state and global ranks are based upon many factors such as known occurrence locations, estimated abundance, range, amount of habitat currently protected, perceived levels of threats towards the species, and ecological fragility.



Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
MyFWC.com



FWC ID: 2021_6531 December 12, 2021



Source: Esri, Maxar, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community

Priority Wetlands

- 1-3 Species, Wetlands habitat
- 4-6 Species, Wetlands habitat
- 7-9 Species, Wetlands habitat
- 10-11 Species, Wetlands habitat



Approximate site boundary and 1-mile buffer




Kissimmee Bend FFS


This raster dataset identifies Florida wetlands important to wetland-dependent vertebrates listed by the State of Florida as endangered, threatened, or species of special concern. The dataset also ranks the relative importance of wetland areas based on species richness of the selected vertebrate species.




Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
MyFWC.com



FWC ID: 2021_6531 December 12, 2021



Species Richness



1-3 4-6 7-9 10-13



Approximate site boundary and 1-mile buffer




Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
MyFWC.com



Kissimmee Bend FFS

This dataset represents the richness of potential habitat for selected focal species in Florida. Potential habitat includes areas that have been occupied by the species and areas where occupancy is unknown based on available occurrence records. We combined the potential habitats generated for Florida into a single grid layer indicating diversity. Pixel cell value indicates the total number of species potential habitat identified at the specific location.



FWC ID: 2021_6531 December 12, 2021

Exhibit M

Four-Year Fire History

Kissimmee Bend State Forest Burn Acres by Fiscal Year




Exhibit N

Invasive Species Map




Florida Forest Service

Kissimmee Bend State Forest Non-Native Invasive Species Map

Coordinate System: Florida Albers
High Accuracy Reference Network (HARN) Datum

DISCLAIMER:
This map was created using data from the Florida Forest Service's Invasive Species Inventory. The data is current as of the date of the inventory. The Florida Forest Service does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of the data. The Florida Forest Service is not responsible for any errors or omissions. The Florida Forest Service is not responsible for any damages or liabilities arising from the use of this map. The Florida Forest Service is not responsible for any damages or liabilities arising from the use of this map.



LEGEND

- Kissimmee Bend State Forest
- Invasive Species**
 - Brazilian Pepper
 - Cogon Grass
 - Ligodium
 - Tropical Soda Apple



0.25 0.125 0 Miles



Map Month/Year: June 2023

1,000 500 0 Yards

Exhibit O

Current FNAI Natural Communities and Cover Types Map




Florida Forest Service

Kissimmee Bend State Forest

Current FNAI Natural Communities Cover Type Map

Coordinate System: Florida Albers
High Accuracy Reference Network (HARN) Datum

DISCLAIMER:
This map was prepared by the Florida Forest Service, using data provided by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the United States Geological Survey (USGS). The map is for informational purposes only and does not constitute a warranty or representation of the accuracy or completeness of the data. The map is subject to change without notice. The map is not to be used for navigation or other purposes. The map is not to be used for legal or other purposes. The map is not to be used for any other purpose.



LEGEND

- abandoned field/pasture
- artificial pond
- canal/ditch
- clearing
- depression marsh
- dry prairie
- mesic hammock
- road
- slough marsh
- successional hardwood forest
- wet prairie
- Kissimmee Bend State Forest



0.25 0.125 0 Miles



Map Month/Year: June 2023

1,000 500 0 Feet


Exhibit P

Historic FNAI Natural Communities and Cover Types Map

Kissimmee Bend State Forest
Historic FNAI Natural Communities Map

Coordinate System: Florida Albers
High Accuracy Reference Network (HARN) Datum

USDA/ARMED:
This was the Army's response to the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) request to determine whether USFS lands contain any property that is eligible for acquisition. USFS was not required to do this and did not use the limited public acquisition funds available to it for this purpose.
The Florida Forest Service requested that the USFS not complete the FNAI, as it felt that the USFS was not qualified to do so. The USFS Forest Service has been requested to complete the FNAI on USFS lands, but the USFS has not done so. The USFS has not been requested to complete the FNAI on USFS lands, but the USFS has not done so.



0.25 0.125 0 Miles



Map Month/Year: June 2023

Exhibit Q

Management Prospectus

Florida Forest Service (FFS)
Land Management Prospectus
Triple Diamond Ranch, Okeechobee County, Florida

Florida Forest Service Management:

The FFS management of Triple Diamond Ranch will act to help preserve the water quality of the region, and to provide for a diverse array of resource-based recreational opportunities. The FFS will seek to maintain the property by preserving the Florida ranch type atmosphere, removing invasive species, maintaining some improved pastures, and possibly continuing the grazing operations. This property is not envisioned as a productive timber tract and will not be managed as such.

The FFS utilizes a multiple-use management regime on all environmental lands it manages and will implement frequent prescribed fire. The primary objective of the management of Triple Diamond Ranch is to preserve the water quality in the region and ensure that the resource-based outdoor recreational opportunities of the property will continue to be enjoyed by youth groups, disabled American veterans, and others in the public. The Triple Diamond Ranch will be managed with an emphasis toward protecting and restoring native flora and fauna. FFS may continue an emphasis on Florida Heritage ranching, and possibly continue and expand the existing cattle grazing operations. Equipment required to manage the property includes, but is not limited to, a 4x4 pickup, tractor with implements (bucket, box blade, bush hog, etc.), a commercial grade riding mower, and an UTV/ATV.

Conditions affecting intensity of management:

The property should not require intensive management in the short term. Over the long term, the intensity of management and related costs will significantly increase as management emphasis shifts from protection and planning, to restoration efforts and a broader public use, with more use of the infrastructure already on the property.

Revenue generating potential:

The FFS expects no significant revenue from the management of this property. The amount of future revenue will depend on the acreage that is grazed and the nature and extent of public use.

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

Once the property is acquired and assigned to the FFS, short term management efforts will concentrate on site security, control of vehicle access and management planning. Consideration will be given in the management planning process to accommodate recreational development. The magnitude and diversity of future resource-based recreation opportunities offered will depend on establishment of a management plan for the property, funding for positions and using established infrastructure.

Public Use:

Triple Diamond Ranch lends itself to diverse recreational opportunities, including but not limited to hiking, primitive camping, equestrian uses, group recreational opportunities, and a very strong component featuring specialty hunts for Operation Outdoor Freedom and Youth Hunts. Existing roads may be utilized for trails throughout the property providing off-road bicycling, hiking, horseback riding and access to beautiful vistas throughout the landscape. The infrastructure already

on the property is in excellent shape and the existing residence could be converted to a spacious visitor/educational center. The barn and corrals could be used as part of an equestrian center for trail rides.

Management costs and sources of revenue:

It is anticipated that management funding will come from the Land Acquisition Trust Fund. Estimated budget needs for interim management are as follows:

Salary (1-OPS Park Ranger) \$45,000

Expense \$50,000

OCO \$250,000

Outsourcing \$20,000

TOTAL \$365,000

Cooperators in management activities:

FFS may liaise with the USFWS, local governments, other state agencies, and the water management district to further resource management, recreational and educational opportunities.

Exhibit R

Compliance with Local Comprehensive Plan (Requested of county after MPAG)

From: [Marsh, Emily](#)
To: planninginfo@okeechobeecountyfl.gov
Cc: [Camposano, Brian](#)
Subject: Kissimmee Bend State Forest Draft Land Management Plan for Review
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 10:27:00 AM
Attachments: [8. Okeechobee County Compliance Letter Request_02252025.pdf](#)
[2025 KBSF Draft LMP Okeechobee County Compliance Review_02252025.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Good Morning,

Please see the attached letter and management plan for Kissimmee Bend State Forest. We are asking that you review this plan for compliance with the County's Comprehensive Plan. Since the materials for the exhibits were too large to send digitally, we are sending a paper copy to your office via FedEx, which should arrive by Thursday afternoon (tracking number 772303252741). Thank you!

If you have any questions, concerns, or if I may be of additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Emily

Emily Marsh
State Lands Management Planner
Florida Forest Service
Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

(850) 681-5889
Emily.Marsh@FDACS.gov

The Conner Building
3125 Conner Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1650

www.fdacs.gov

Please note that Florida has a broad public records law (Chapter 119, Florida Statutes). Most written communications to or from state employees are public records obtainable by the public upon request. Emails sent to me at this email address may be considered public and will only be withheld from disclosure if deemed confidential pursuant to the laws of the State of Florida.

Exhibit S

Management Plan Advisory Group Summary

Management Plan Advisory Group Public Hearing
Kissimmee Bend State Forest
10-Year Land Management Plan

January 29, 2025

10:30 A.M.

Meeting Minutes

MPAG Members Present:

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| • Joseph Debree, III | Okeechobee District Manager, Florida Forest Service (FFS) |
| • Andrew West | Science Supervisor, South Florida Water Management District |
| • Josiah Freese | Conservation Biologist, Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission |
| • Audrey Kuipers | District Administrator, Local Soil and Water Conservation District |
| • Paul Gray | Everglades Science Coordinator, Audubon Society |

MPAG Members Not Present:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| • Dennis Wedgworth | Local Property Owner |
| • Brian Pippin | Local Property Owner |
| • Representative Frank Decarlo | Okeechobee County Commissioner |

FFS Staff:

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| • Alan Davis | Land Planning Coordinator |
| • Brian Camposano | Forest Management Assistant Bureau Chief |
| • Duane Weis | Region 4 Deputy Chief of Field Operations |
| • David Grubich | Wildfire Mitigation Specialist and Public Information Officer |
| • Michael Lisiecki | Forest Area Supervisor |
| • Emily Marsh | Land Management Planner |

Guests:

- None

Public Meeting Start Time: 10:30 A.M.

- Land Planning Coordinator, Alan Davis (FFS) opened the meeting by introducing himself and explained the purpose and statutory framework for the Kissimmee Bend State Forest 10-Year Land Management Plan process. He explained that the Plan is not an annual work plan or detailed operational plan but provides general and conceptual guidance for management of Kissimmee Bend State Forest (KBSF) for the next 10-year period.
- Mr. Davis confirmed compliance with the Florida Sunshine Law advising MPAG members to not discuss the draft outside of the public meetings. He stated that the meetings are open to the public, recorded, and minutes taken.
- Mr. Davis stated that both MPAG meetings are open to the public and proper notice was given. The meetings were advertised in the Lake Okeechobee News Newspaper on January 15, 2025; Florida Administrative Register, FFS webpage, as well as posted at the kiosks in the Okeechobee District. The meetings were announced at the Okeechobee County Commissioners meeting on December 19, 2024. He noted that the draft plan goes through various approvals before and after the MPAG meetings but that the FFS Director is granted final authority on changes to the draft plan. He described the day's two meetings: The first meeting is informational and provides opportunity for public comment; the 1:00 p.m. Workshop

meeting provides opportunity for the MPAG members to discuss the public input and to share their personal comments on the draft plan. The public is welcome to attend the Workshop, but participation is limited to MPAG members.

- Mr. Davis then requested MPAG Member introductions and attendance was taken.
- Mr. Davis asked the advisory group to elect an MPAG chairperson. Joe Debree, III was elected to serve as chairperson.
- Mr. Davis asked if there are any questions at this time.
- Mr. Davis then introduced Wildfire Mitigation Specialist and Public Information Officer David Grubich who presented a PowerPoint presentation of the 10-Year Plan. Mr. Davis asked if there were any clarifying questions regarding the presentation.
- Mr. Davis asked if there are any questions. No questions followed.
- No public members attended the meeting, and no public comments were received, and Mr. Davis closed the meeting.

Public Meeting End Time: 10:49 A.M.

Management Plan Advisory Group Workshop Meeting
Kissimmee Bend State Forest
10-Year Land Management Plan

January 29, 2025

1:00 P.M.

Meeting Minutes

MPAG Members Present:

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| • Joseph Debree, III | Okeechobee District Manager, Florida Forest Service (FFS) |
| • Andrew West | Science Supervisor, South Florida Water Management District |
| • Josiah Freese | Conservation Biologist, Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission |
| • Audrey Kuipers | District Administrator, Local Soil and Water Conservation District |
| • Paul Gray | Everglades Science Coordinator, Audubon Society |

MPAG Members Not Present:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| • Dennis Wedgworth | Local Property Owner |
| • Brian Pippin | Local Property Owner |
| • Representative Frank Decarlo | Okeechobee County Commissioner |

FFS Staff:

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| • Alan Davis | Land Planning Coordinator |
| • Brian Camposano | Forest Management Assistant Bureau Chief |
| • Duane Weis | Region 4 Deputy Chief of Field Operations |
| • David Grubich | Wildfire Mitigation Specialist and Public Information Officer |
| • Michael Lisiecki | Forest Area Supervisor |
| • Emily Marsh | Land Management Planner |

Guests:

- None

Workshop Meeting Start Time: 1:00 P.M.

- Land Planning Coordinator, Alan Davis introduced himself and opened the KBSF MPAG Workshop. He reminded the MPAG members of the Florida Sunshine law and that the purpose of the workshop is to review and discuss the draft and that any edits made to the draft would be presented to the FFS Director for approval. He noted that minutes will be recorded and emailed to the MPAG members and will be approved via negative response review. MPAG member appointment will terminate when the final draft is submitted to the Acquisition Restoration Council. Wildfire Mitigation Specialist and Public Information Officer David Grubich was available to make proposed changes to the draft during the page-by-page review.
- Mr. Gray inquired if comments will only be provided today and no comments after this.
- Mr. Davis clarified that no, not as far as the workshop, but there will be another public hearing at the Acquisition Restoration Council Meeting (ARC) that this plan will be approved at. He continued to state that ARC is essentially another public meeting that anyone can come and comment on it.
- Mr. Gray inquired where the Sunshine Committee is. Mr. Davis stated that they are the MPAG Workshop Members and continued to explain that the group are the advisory group for the plan that discusses and makes decisions on what FFS incorporates into the plan based on public comment and the Committee's thoughts.

- Mr. Gray stated that some of the Sunshine Committees he's been on, he wasn't allowed to talk to others about the meeting after he left the meeting.
- Mr. Davis stated that he is correct and that was discussed in the first meeting, and that they're still under the Florida Sunshine Law. Mr. Gray stated ok and just wanted to make sure.
- Mr. Davis stated that we will get started on the Executive Summary, which is page 1 of the plan.
- Page 3: Ms. Kuipers stated that as an outsider looking in, she stated that reading the website and then reading this, she inquired what exactly was the year that the property was acquired be it 2019 or 2020. Mr. Davis stated that he believes it was on the lease in 2019 and then corrected himself by stating 2020. Ms. Kuipers stated that the website states that it was acquired in 2019. Mr. Davis explained that the acquisition dates can be different from the lease dates because acquisition is when it closes and the funds and title are transferred and conveyed to the state. The lease date could be months after the acquisition date because documents need to be drafted and signed. He then stated that the closing date could be totally different than the actual lease date. He further stated that the April 2020 date is when FFS got in under lease, but it could have closed in 2019 as far as the acquisition goes but is not officially under FFS management until we sign the lease. Ms. Kuipers state ok. Mr. Davis asked if there was anything else on page 3.
- Page 5: Mr. Gray suggested that the fire return interval on the bottom of page 5 where it states a 2-to-4-year interval, should be shortened. He explained that he is a member of the Florida Grasshopper Sparrow Working Group, and they manage a lot of dry prairie, and that group is composed of managers at Kissimmee Prairie, Avon Park, Three Lakes Wildlife Management Area (which are the sparrow properties). He continued to explain that they also have Archibald Biological Station helping Airforce range's bio team and surveys that DOD has to do. He then stated that they have various researchers and captive breeding facilities too. He stated that they used to think that a 3-year burn return interval on dry prairie was right, but now there are kind of shifting to 2-year, but he doesn't know if that's right either. He continue to explain that it's because the sparrows aren't doing particularly well. He stated that it's just an idea to adjust the interval, and that a 2-to-4-year interval is fine, but would like to see that shortened a little bit.
- Mr. Davis explained that the return interval accounts for a grace period because of wet seasons. He then mentioned that in Land Management Reviews (LMRs), if FFS says 1 to 2 and they do not burn within the 1-to-2-year range, then they get dinged on the LMR for not burning every 1 to 2 years. He then stated that the current fire return interval gives FFS leeway on years where they can get in there and burn if it's too wet or other factors preventing them to burn.
- Mr. West inquired if the interval can be changed to 1 to 4 years instead of a 2 to 4, so that FFS has the option to start burning on a yearly basis if it's optional. He then stated that native prairies do respond back fast. Mr. Davis stated that the interval range is also an average, so that it's not limiting FFS for 2 to 4 years. Mr. West stated ok and agreed that FFS is just stating the average.
- Mr. Camposano confirmed that this is an average and explained that of all the fire adapted systems on the forest, 2 to 4 years is the average. He then stated that 2 to 4 years is a general average that FFS uses on most state forests. He acknowledged that Mr. Gray and Mr. West are making a good argument about the dry prairie and taking that to a 1 to 4. He then stated that there isn't any timber out there and that is part of the reason why you want to give it a little longer too; so, the prairie can probably take it a little sooner. Mr. Camposano concluded by stating that saying an average fire return interval of 1 to 4 years is perfectly acceptable if you want to do it year after year, but the group has to agree as a whole.
- Mr. Gray stated that it really doesn't make a difference if it's 1 to 4, but that it just gives FFS more of an opportunity to burn.
- Mr. Freese agreed, then stated that having FFS staff try to plan for that shorter interval window. He continued to state that rather than planning for the 4-year window, for FFS staff to plan for the 1 to 2 year, and for FFS to know that, even if we don't change the text.
- Mr. Davis inquired of the group if the 2 should be change to a 1 making it a 1-to-4-year interval. The group agreed and the change was made within the draft plan. He then inquired if there was anything else on page 5.
- Page 6: At the top of the page on page 6 where it talks about dormant and growing season burns, Mr. Gray stated that, again, most dry prairie managers prefer growing season burns. He then stated that they don't all

have to be done during growing season. He continued to state that one thing FFS will find out is that this area is so wet, that by the time it gets dry enough to burn during May or April, frequently there are burn restrictions in place because other places are drier; which can mess with FFS's ability to meet the 1-to-4-year interval. He continued to state that FFS is going to run into years like that because everyone else dries out and fires start.

- Mr. Camposano stated that dormant and growing season burns are in the plan for that reason. He then stated that FFS want to burn things in the growing season whenever they can, but they don't want to give up days in the dormant season just because of the growing season. Mr. Gray agreed and stated that dormant season is better than nothing. Mr. Camposano agreed and stated that that is why it is in the plan the way it is. He then stated that if that answers Mr. Gray's question, he then stated to Ms. Kuipers that he looked up the lease date which is April 13, 2020, so the acquisition date to the state was in 2019. Ms. Kuipers stated ok.
- Mr. Gray inquired if there could be a note stating, "preferably dormant". Mr. Davis stated that it is stated further in the plan that talks about prescribed fire. Mr. Gray thanked Mr. Davis and apologized.
- Mr. Freese stated he had one thing for page 6, then mentioned a discrepancy regarding the fire return interval on page 6 which reads 1,992 acres are within the desire fire return interval, but on page 26 it says only an estimated 182 acres are within the desired return interval. Mr. Camposano stated that that will need to be changed and that can be highlighted. He then inquired what page the discrepancy was on. Mr. Freese stated that on page 6 it reads 1,992 acres. Mr. Camposano stated that that is correct. Mr. Freese stated that on page 26 it reads 182 acres. Mr. Camposano instructed Mr. Grubich to scroll down to page 26. Mr. Gray agreed and stated that he saw that. Mr. Freese pointed out the last sentence of the paragraph on page 26. Mr. Camposano instructed Mr. Grubich to add a comment saying, "Verify or change number". Mr. Davis asked Mr. Grubich to highlight the 182 acres and right click and enter comment. Mr. Grubich inquired Mr. Camposano what to say in comment. Mr. Camposano answered for it to read, "Please revise number to actual burn acreage". Mr. Camposano thanked Mr. Freese for catching that discrepancy. Mr. Davis also thanked Mr. Freese and then inquired the group if there was anything else on page 6.
- Page 8: Mr. Freese requested clarification that the parking lot is not owned by FFS. Mr. Grubich stated that it is owned by the feds. Mr. Freese stated ok, and Mr. Grubich explained that the user has to go through the federal parking lot and the gate and KBSF is 4.5 miles out, and then hang a left and get to a dead end. From there the user would have to drive another mile or 1.5 miles to get to the actual entrance to where the sign is posted for KBSF. Mr. Freese stated got it and thanked Mr. Grubich.
- Mr. Gray stated that he hasn't driven in there, and inquired if the public has access all the way in. Mr. Lisiecki stated that they do on foot and that the gate is open during hunting season, so they can't drive that 4.5-mile stretch. Mr. DeBree added that there are certain areas where users have to stop at because there are no more vehicles beyond certain points. Mr. Lisiecki agreed.
- Mr. Grubich stated that there are also other gates that go into the federal property itself, and some areas don't even have gates for. Mr. DeBree agreed and stated that there is only signage. Mr. Grubich echoed Mr. DeBree stating that there are signs reading "No Vehicles Beyond This point". Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 6.
- Mr. Grubich stated that it's a long walk out there.
- Ms. Kuipers inquired if there is a time later to discuss signage. She then stated that she went on Sunday to visit the property and then inquired if she wasn't supposed to drive around. Mr. Grubich inquired Ms. Kuipers if the gate was open. Ms. Kuipers stated that the gate was already open. Mr. Grubich stated that somebody broke the chain. Ms. Kuipers continued to state that she went out in the northern part of the area.
- Mr. Davis stated that to answer Ms. Kuipers' question, there is a spot later on in the plan to address signage. Ms. Kuipers stated perfect.
- Mr. Lisiecki stated that regarding the gate, there is a lot of people that have access such as FWC and the feds. Ms. Kuipers stated that she saw a UTV that ducked away from her on the way back. Mr. Lisiecki joked that that user was not supposed to be there. Ms. Kuipers stated that she can talk about that later too because the website stated that it directed her to Flying A Ranch. She then continued to state that she determined to take her chances since she had the plan with her and was able to find KBSF. Brian inquired Ms. Kuipers that she went somewhere for Day Use and to pay a Day Use Fee. Ms. Kuipers stated yes and that the website states to

use that area and Reserve America and is supposed to be \$2. Mr. Camposano explained that that's another discussion that he needs to have with the FFS Recreation Coordinator and folks out here because there should not be any Day Use Fees being charged out there because there isn't really any infrastructure there presently at the forest. He continued to state that even the parking lot doesn't belong to FFS, rather, it belongs to the feds, so we usually make sure we have improvements in place before there's an entrance fee; therefore, we might need to take that down. He reassured Ms. Kuipers that it is fine if she didn't pay a Day Use Fee. He then stated that he doesn't know why the website took her to Flying A Campground but will talk with the Recreation Coordinator back in Tallahassee to figure that one out. Ms. Kuipers stated that she didn't dig deeper into that one, but FFS staff reassured her that that will be handled and fixed by FFS staff.

- Mr. West inquired if the gate would be open for small game hunting season since small game season is in. Mr. Lisiecki confirmed and stated yes it would be open for small game hunting season.
- Mr. Lisiecki stated that he doesn't know how it works with the quotas, but he does know that it's all quota, so he is certain that there is a quota for small game. Mr. DeBree stated that there is usually a quota for small game. Mr. Lisiecki stated ok. Mr. West stated that he just doesn't know the rules for driving regarding small game.
- Mr. Camposano stated that FFS didn't see anybody out there even though the gate was open. He then inquired that the feds prefer the gate to be closed. Mr. Lisiecki stated that he doesn't really know and that he was instructed to just keep it closed and locked. Mr. DeBree agreed and stated that it's supposed to be closed and locked. Mr. Lisiecki stated yes. Mr. Camposano inquired if it was the feds' ultimate decision whether to keep the gate closed and locked. Mr. Lisiecki stated he believes so. Mr. Camposano stated ok, and he asked because if it was FFS's choice, then we would choose to leave the gate open.
- Ms. Kuipers stated that the website stated it would provide a gate code. Mr. Freese inquired if the gate was at the end of the federal parking lot. Mr. Lisiecki stated yes and that is part of the issue, and that users have to go through the federal property to get to KBSF so it's kind of the feds' rule regarding the gate.
- Mr. Camposano stated yes and that is the reason why FFS needs legal access back to it.
- Mr. Gray inquired who the federal management entity is. Mr. Freese stated the U.S. Fish and Wildlife manages the federal property. Mr. Gray then inquired who FFS contacts when talking to FWC. Mr. Grubich inquired if it was Oliver. Mr. Lisiecki confirmed. Mr. Gray inquired if he has a bureau, which Mr. Lisiecki responded that he is not sure. An MPAG member stated that he thinks Oliver is at Merritt Island.
- Mr. Grubich stated that he was talking with an FWC Officer, and the officer mentioned that, within his recollection, he only remembers one person ever out there shooting or hunting turkey. He then stated that there hasn't been a whole lot of use.
- Mr. Lisiecki stated that he gets calls all the time from the public inquiring of any nearby hotels and if there is any camping. He continued to say that he gets those all the time leading up to hunting season. Mr. Davis inquired the group if there was anything else on page 8.
- Mr. Gray stated that he saw the language restricting the use of off-road vehicles and praised FFS for including said language because if you drive across prairie when it's wet, those tire tracks will last for years. He then inquired the classification of electric bikes because they are becoming more and more common and gives people a lot of access. He continued to explain that that's not necessarily a bad thing but inquired if they are considered to be a motorized vehicle. Mr. Camposano stated that Class I E-Bikes (pedal assist bikes) are allowed on any trail that a normal bicycle can be on because you still have to pedal. He continued to state that, as of right now, anything that is Class II, Class III or even if they make Class IV E-Bikes, would only be able to be used on a road that is opened to licensed vehicles; so, they are only on our named and numbered roads. He then stated that right now, there isn't a named or numbered road on KBSF so it would be Class I E-Bikes only. He then inquired if the feds allowed bicycling down their road to get to KBSF. Ms. Kuipers answered that she thinks at the sign she read "E-Bike". Mr. Camposano stated ok. He then reiterated that that is for the feds, and he doesn't know if they allow Class II or Class III. He then concluded by stating that for Florida state forests, across the board, it's Class I only on our bike trails, but you take a Class II, III or IV on an open, named, or numbered road.

- Mr. Freese added that it will also be written on the WMA brochure as well. Mr. Gray suggested that he doesn't know if that is in the document and may be good to clarify. He then stated that the e-bikes are not necessarily a bad thing, but they could be used for less stuff.
- Page 9: Mr. Gray requested to add the DeLuca Preserve to the Conservation Areas and Proximity Table (Table 2), which is the area that goes from Yeehaw Junction down to the corner of Kissimmee Prairie's 20,000 acres. He then stated that that is the area that was given to the University of Florida. Mr. Davis inquired Mr. Gray if he was asking for the preserve to be added in. Mr. Gray stated yes, because it is maybe 10 miles northeast of KBSF. Ms. Marsh inquired Mr. Gray of the name of the preserve again. Mr. Gray stated it is called the DeLuca Preserve. He stated that it is the Old Destiny property and explained that it basically goes from the Osceola/Okeechobee County Line to Highway 60 and from the P Vine (trail road) to 441. Ms. Marsh stated ok. Mr. Gray provided the spelling of the preserve. Mr. Davis inquired the manager. Mr. Gray stated that it is the University of Florida and there is a conservation easement on it. He then stated to Mr. Davis that he can just google it.
- Mr. West stated that since we're adding, to add the new Okeechobee Unit for FWC that is directly west of KBSF. Mr. DeBree inquired the name of the unit. Mr. West stated that it's called the Okeechobee Unit and that it's part of the Headwater Everglades, but it's called the Okeechobee Unit. An MPAG member inquired if that is the new one that was just purchased. Mr. West stated yes, apparently at the end of Micco Road. Mr. Grubich inquired if it was Swiftmud (SWFWMD). Mr. Freese stated no, that is a federal piece of property. Mr. West stated that there is the Kissimmee Prairie has part of it and then there is Fish and Wildlife that has the other part. Mr. Gray stated that's right and inquired if that is the Corgon Tract. Mr. West stated yes, the Corgon Tract. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 9.
- Page 10: Mr. Gray stated that, referring to the Revenue Producing Activities section, people want to go out there and pick palmetto berries. He then inquired if FFS restricts that. Mr. Camposano stated that FFS currently doesn't have any active contracts and explained that FFS hasn't done any palmetto harvesting in quite some time. He stated that we want to keep the door open but at the same time, it has to be on the right property for the right reasons. He continued to explain that if FFS does this again in the future then we would want to do it in similar fashion like how Camp Blanding does theirs. However, he noted that Camp Blanding has fencing around their property which does help with a sale. He further stated that it's not necessarily banned or anything like that; but just because it's not in the plan doesn't mean that it can't come back. Rather, it is not high on the radar right now. Mr. Gray stated that, biologically speaking, he recommends prohibiting it because it's a massive crop for deer, turkey, and for a lot of animals, bears and the like. He explained that it's a pretty big issue around here and that a lot of people take these berries. He then stated that migrant workers will go in and pick everything they can. He further explained that a guy was arrested on Kissimmee Prairie a couple years ago and was hiding out but was found a couple of days later. Mr. Camposano stated that he doesn't think that he'll get the Director to approve saying that it is explicitly banned in there. He then stated that FFS doesn't have any plans to do any right now, and that the Commissioner's Office briefly had FFS look into it about a year to a year and a half ago. The result of that investigation was that it wasn't the right time or place, not just for KBSF, but for all FFS state forests. He concluded that they have since moved on from it and doesn't foresee FFS going back to it because they're too busy doing their normal timber management on the rest of their forests and that he doesn't see that opportunity opening up any time soon. Mr. Gray stated that if there is a Wildlife Officer out there and there isn't some sort of prohibition in the plan, then that can pose a problem. Mr. Camposano stated that in law, and in our rule, the public cannot go out into FFS state forests and collect plant material without explicit permission, so that would already be breaking the law. Mr. Camposano stated that he has even kick people off the forest before and take everything they have and scatter it back out in the woods, if they don't have a permit for harvesting or are harvesting sale. Mr. Gray thanked Mr. Camposano. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 10.
- Page 12: Mr. Freese inquired about the equipment section and specifically inquired if this was a spot to add potential for future purchases too or if that would be further into the plan. He then clarified his question and inquired if that list is only what KBSF only has right now. Mr. Davis explained that this is just what KBSF has in

this particular snapshot in time. Mr. Freese stated ok. Camposano promised Mr. Freese that that is not a limiting list. Mr. Freese expressed his relief. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 12.

- Mr. Gray pointed out the Incompatible Uses section at the bottom of the page and noted that it does point out Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs), which is what he was inquiring about earlier. Mr. Camposano stated that E-Bikes are a little bit different than off highway vehicles that they are off highway in the sense that you can take them off the road, but OHVs specifically refer to ATVs, and UTVs. Mr. Camposano explained that they have three (3) state forests that have OHV riding providing areas, and those are the only state forests where the public is allowed to bring their OHV, unless you have a mobility permit issued from FWC that allows for specialized pieces of equipment for a specific purpose. Mr. Camposano stated that if they were to start lumping in Class I E-Bikes into the same category as OHVs, then it wouldn't be good. Mr. Gray agreed. Mr. Camposano added that an E-Bike and a regular bike are supposed to stay on the trails and roads and should not be going through the prairie. Mr. Gray joke that that would be a rough ride. Mr. Camposano agreed. Mr. Gray thanked Mr. Camposano.
- Page 14: Mr. Gray inquired who is the State Forest Liaison Committee. Mr. Camposano stated that KBSF has had one in the past. He explained that Time Elder was here when the last one was done. He then stated that contains a group of representatives of different user groups. He explained that he can't recall the composition of the last meeting, but it's not a huge group at this point because there isn't a lot of forest users; not a lot of people know of KBSF yet and with its access issues. He continued to state that all state forests are required to have liaison panel meetings to discuss, especially when there is public interest in wanting to advance recreational activities on the forest or have concerns about activities going on; or what activities are available on the forest. He stated that FFS discusses this with local managers on the public's behalf (equestrian, hiking, camping groups, etc.). Mr. Camposano concluded that that group will be scheduled by the district when necessary, usually once a year. The purpose of the liaison meeting is to have another venue to talk. He is unsure if the same people on the previous panel would be on the next one, but that is something that the state office will work out with the district. Mr. Gray inquired if the meeting is statewide. Mr. Camposano stated no, and that it is specific to the state forest or district. Mr. Gray stated yes, and he wouldn't think that FFS would want to have a whole committee for this one tract, but to have one for the district. Mr. Camposano reiterated that the Liaison Meetings are typically for the forest, but again, there is usually more activity going on the state forest than what KBSF currently has to offer, so there probably isn't a big need for a liaison committee meeting right now. He then stated that when there becomes a need or feeling like the users want to voice their opinions, then FFS will compile a liaison committee meeting, which will be similar to this MPAG. Mr. Camposano then stated that these meetings are on a forest-by-forest basis. He explained that we wouldn't hold a meeting for all the state forests in Region 4, for an example, because there is way too much diversity and too many people that vary from state forest to state forest. Mr. Gray agreed and stated that he was just curious, then thanked Mr. Camposano. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 14.
- Page 13: Mr. Freese inquired to go back a page to page 13 for a clarifying question. He then stated that there are easements to south and west of the property and inquired if FFS is looking to expand the forest through acquisitions. Mr. Davis stated that there isn't really any land available to continue to acquire for the property. Mr. West added that KBSF is completely land locked. Mr. Davis agreed and reiterated the easements, state and federal agencies directly adjacent to KBSF. Mr. Freese inquired that even if there are easements to the south and west of the property, if those areas are still considered to be private property even though it is undeveloped. Mr. Davis stated yes and continued to explain that the state will not spend acquisition funds on something that is already being protected. Mr. Freese stated ok. Mr. Davis continued to state that since the land is already being protected, then there is no opportunity for FFS to manage it, even if they wanted to. Mr. Freese stated ok. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 13.
- Page 15: Mr. Gray explained that the Kissimmee Prairie Preserve was used as a bombing range in WWII and when Barry Burch first got onto the property, they were burning and did a flight to scout for poachers. On the southwest corner of the preserve, the crew noticed a bomb laying in a palmetto head that had burned off, they ended up calling Department of Defense (DOD) at Avon Park to come out and put some C4 on it and the bomb exploded. He suggested to add some language somewhere in the plan for users to be cautious of potential

explosions that may occur out there. He then stated that it won't prohibit FFS from doing anything on the forest but stressed to add some sort of cautionary language within the plan. Mr. Gray then stated that when Barry Burch, who was Mr. Gray's manager at the time, blew up the bomb, Mr. Burch joked that he was too close to it. Mr. Camposano stated that Mr. Gray's story is an interesting one and that Mr. Camposano cannot recall him ever reading about that in any documentation. He then inquired Mr. Gray if he has any documentation that he can provide to FFS so that it can be added to the files for that forest. Mr. Camposano continued to state that it might be worth sticking a sentence or two in there about that. He then stated that the Ground Disturbing section may not be the right place to put that because that pertains what FFS would do to disturb the ground if they were to build something on the state forest. Mr. Freese suggested to mention it under Past Uses section and Mr. Camposano agreed. Mr. Gray stated that will can send FFS some documentation on it and added that this is also mentioned in some of the original Kissimmee Prairie acquisition documents. They have three (3) different targets, and they used 50 caliber machine guns, so you will find brassings laying around out there. He continued to state that they also mostly dropped concrete bombs with flares on them; so, they weren't really bombs, but they would be practicing. Mr. Gray stressed that he will send FFS documentation. Mr. Camposano stated yes and that all the documentation he has says the property was used as a range and for grazing cattle, but there was no mention of a bombing range, and would like to put in a sentence or two about it. Mr. Gray stated that the other thing they were doing was looking for hazards up P Vine Trail and they were getting all kinds of hits out there. He concluded by stating that it ended up being the old railroad out there and there were a lot of spikes out there.

- Mr. DeBree III inquired if the property was used for the bombing range or if it is because it is on the approach that there could have been remnants of what they were firing across. Mr. Gray stated that it was used as a bombing range. They had targets out there and then stated that he can send over the documentation. Mr. DeBree III inquired if it was on this side of the river. Mr. Gray stated yes and that there is one (1) square mile of the Preserve that says, "No Surface Activity". He continued to state that when he asked DOD what that meant, they responded saying they don't know, and they don't have any record of it. He concluded by reiterating that he will send the documents that he has. Mr. Camposano thanked Mr. Gray and stated his appreciation. Mr. Camposano inquired KBSF staff if they have seen anything like this on the property. Mr. Lisiecki stated no or have even heard of this. Mr. Grubich stated that that is the corner he burned, and nothing went off. Mr. DeBree III stated that he has heard of that on the park side before and that they have pulled up bombs over there when plowing but didn't realize that this property was part of that. Mr. Camposano reiterated that this is why he would like to see documentation on this matter so that FFS can overlay and see where it is and add some language to the plan. Mr. Gray agreed and stated that language just needs to be cautionary. He then stated that he doesn't know if the Prairie has this, but they used to have a sign stating that if the public sees anything suspicious to please report; and there was a picture of a bomb accompanying the sign. Mr. Camposano stated that that must be a little unnerving for a public user to see that sign. R. Gray then stated that he doesn't think the property was used for bombing, but being in proximity here, there is a little bit of a risk. Mr. Camposano agreed and stated that even if it's within proximity, it would be a good idea to mention that within the plan.
- Page 17: Mr. West inquired if there are any plans to back fill the ditches running through the wetlands. He then stated that he understood that FFS is still early in the process and hasn't had the property for long. Mr. DeBree III stated that right now there aren't any plans to do any hydrological restoration there.
- Mr. Gray stated that when he was doing the Kissimmee River restoration, one of their goals was regards to wading bird use and nesting. He continued to state that the Audubon Society had wardens to patrol the region since the 1930s, and they documented different nesting colonies and wading birds on the preserve. He continued to explain that they were not nesting in the river floodplain. Instead, they were nesting in big Basin marshes, and there are several of them. He then stated that he has not has a chance to cross check those against the map to see if any were on there. He concluded that it would be beneficial to plug up those ditches in the long run to get back some of those functions. He explained that the way these go across the property border, you would have to make an agreement with the feds and everyone. He then stated that the Water Management District wants to do water restoration projects, and they even have a rule and acre fee, a storage

north of the lake and a lot of that is heavy to restore wetlands to the extent they can. Mr. Gray concluded by stating that once he has a plan and gets partners, he will be back, because there is a lot of opportunity with the Basin marshes as they are wonderful resources.

- Ms. Kuipers stated that further in the plan it states that restoration could be a possibility. Mr. Gray agreed and stated yes, in the future. He then explained that with the way they cross KBSF's boundaries, FFS cannot fill restore them anyways because FFS would flood their neighbors and we don't have the permission to install all of that, but it would be a tremendous opportunity out on the property. He then stated that the work would be done by the WMD or some other funding source, FFS would just have to cooperate.
- Ms. Kuipers stated that under Number 5, it should state "the removal or installation of" structures. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 17. Mr. Gray stated no, and that he doesn't think anything needs to be changed.
- Mr. Camposano stated that in the third paragraph under number 5, US Fish and Wildlife Service should be included along with WMD as joint cooperators / partners. He explained that because of the shared boundary, the property will almost always have to be working with these agencies. Mr. Freese inquired about stating adjacent landowners in the plan instead and further inquired that the southern boundaries aren't owned by them. Mr. Camposano stated that they are not.
- Mr. West stated that the drainage goes up to the north and some to the west.
- Mr. Camposano stated that he is more concerned about ditches being on the main road and US Fish and Wildlife wanted to do something that would affect our property then FFS and US Fish and Wildlife would need to work together, so those are the kinds of partnerships that Mr. Camposano is expected to see there, because there is no guarantee that a private landowner would be willing to work with us. Mr. Freese agreed. Mr. Gray reminded to add in the preserve regarding partnerships because it would take a lot of planning and people to back up the project. Mr. Camposano agreed. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 17.
- Page 19: Mr. Freese stated that the most recent Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) scientific name for caracara is *Polyborus plancus audubonii* and suggested for that change to be made in Table 4.
- Page 18: Ms. Kuipers stated that while Mr. Grubich is typing in the updated caracara scientific name if they can go back to page 18. She then inquired why the group decided not to put adjacent landowners in the sentences that was previously discussed. Mr. Davis inquired where and Ms. Kuipers directed Mr. Davis to the section she was referring to. Mr. Camposano explained that he suggested to add in US Fish and Wildlife and not adjacent landowners, because of the ownership boundaries. He then stated that if FFS does anything that involves private land then they will have to involve private landowners, otherwise FFS cannot really operate. He then stated that whenever FFS does something water related on state forests, they have to have the WMD involved. He continued to state that with the ownership the way it is and the access into our property, from that standpoint, it makes sense to him to include the feds specifically. He explained that any of FFS's forests that have any private landowners, on any edges or sides, they are going to have to be involved. Mr. Camposano reassured Ms. Kuipers that FFS is not going to put water on private property and flood them out. That wouldn't be something FFS would be willing or allowed to do, as well as it being bad business for a government agency. Mr. Camposano concluded by stating that this is by default; that, FFS cannot do something that is going to affect private property without their expressed consent and permission. Whereas, from a regulatory standpoint, FFS has to work with the WMD and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Ms. Kuipers stated that she was thinking about easements on the west boundary and coordination with NRCS and their wetlands and restoration plans; if that needs to be added. Mr. Camposano stated that he does not know if it *has* to be added but doesn't know if it would hurt it either so that is up to the group to decide.
- Mr. West stated that part of the DRP program is to hold water back, so they are already make plans for that, then it makes sense for FFS to follow suit. Mr. Camposano stated that it does not hurt to add it in, it is just not something we normally do, but we also don't normally have the joint ownership and service either. Mr. West stated that it is the goal as it is with DRP. Mr. Davis inquired the group if they propose a change. Ms. Kuipers stated that she brought it up because if they were going to mention and add US Fish and Wildlife then why not NRCS. Several MPAG members suggest wording and language at once. Mr. West and Ms. Kuipers suggest the term "partners". Ms. Kuipers stated that partners sounds appropriate since landowners are a given. Ms. Marsh

suggested the term applicable or relevant partnering agencies to be used as a “catch all” for all of the agencies that would be potentially involved. Mr. Davis suggested applicable parties or partners. Mr. Camposano inquired applicable parties or partners. Ms. Marsh suggested partners or agencies, and then stated whichever the group prefers. Ms. Kuipers stated partnering agencies to which Ms. Marsh and Mr. Davis agreed. Mr. Camposano stated that using the term “agencies” will take the private landowners out of the equation. Mr. Davis inquired if that change made works for the group. The group agreed.

- Page 19: Mr. Gray stated that the list of rare and endangered species is going to get a lot longer, and somewhere within the text it says that just because it is not on the list does not mean it isn't there; rather FFS just has not yet located those species. He continued to state that he noticed that the Grasshopper sparrow is listed. Mr. Gray explained that someone found the species out on the property back in the 1980s and the working group is very interested in going out there to survey for sparrows. He then inquired if that is a possibility that FFS is willing to entertain. He then stated that the preserve is working on the Corgan Tract, which is West of KBSF, and they are of course working north of KBSF, and they will frequently do field days where FWC will send their crew and Archibald will send their crew, and the prairie will send their crew out to a property to which they will all move around. Mr. Gray inquired if it would be a possibility to set up a day or time for them to come out to KBSF and do a survey and try to get an idea of what they can find. Mr. Camposano stated that yes, but for Mr. Gray's inquiry, it would be best to apply for a Special Use Permit, which is at no cost, to go out there. He explained that a Special Use Permit would allow the agencies to be given access to the property for that specific purpose to take a vehicle out there so that the group doesn't have to walk 4.5 miles and back. He then stated that the valuable information they find, they would presumably report it to FFS so that it could be incorporated into future plans and any management. Mr. Camposano concluded by stating that that is something that would be welcomed our state forests in general because we cannot be everywhere at once. Mr. Camposano stated that FFS appreciates when they have entities like Citizens Science for this purpose. Mr. Camposano acknowledged that it is a little bit more intensive of what Mr. Gray is referring to, but any information FFS can get from people that are documenting and observing things out there is beneficial and appreciated. Mr. Gray stated that it is also free labor for the kids to go out there.
- Mr. Grubich stated that as of yesterday, he has now seen two grasshopper sparrows with the orange band on their leg, so they are there, but then stated that he does not know who is banding and tracking them. Mr. Gray explained that they are banded when they are in the nest, when they are about ready to fledge (about 13 days old). He then stated that they are all big enough for them to be banded, and the bands are all color coded, which allows them to identify each, individual bird. Mr. Gray explained that for each nest they find on all of their properties, they band them. For all the captive-reared birds, that are released are banded to show who is who and who is where. He then stated that they have also seen them go between properties; such as birds from Avon Park found up in the prairie and over up to the loop near the three lakes and all that. He concluded by stating that most of them are sedentary but some of them do migrate.
- Mr. Grubich stated that he and Ms. Marsh saw around at least ten (10) around the food plot we were at, so there is an active group of them. Ms. Marsh agreed. Mr. Grubich then stated that he saw the first one with the deer but then he saw all of these sparrows bouncing around just yesterday and since it's new to him, he was trying to get a picture of them. He then stated that when the bird was chirping at him, he noticed the band on it and was wondering what that was, and when he saw a picture of one later on he knew what the band was. Mr. Gray stated that Mr. Grubich struck gold. He then stated that this time of year, there is also a migratory grasshopper sparrow that comes down from the New England and Mid-West areas, so they are down here too. However, the Florida grasshopper sparrows will be the only ones here by June. Mr. Grubich inquired if the migratory species are darker in color. Mr. Gray stated yes. Mr. Grubich and Ms. Marsh both stated that those are the ones that they saw the other day. Mr. Camposano stated that he didn't know there were out of state grasshopper sparrows and that he learned something new today. Mr. Gray stated yes, and that it is a sub-species. Mr. Grubich stated that those are there now too, just for Mr. Gray to know. Mr. Gray stated yes and that is one of the things, when they do their first survey, they usually start in April, and they get a whole bunch of birds and then three (3) weeks later they are all gone because they were migratory. Mr. Grubich stated that

there are light and dark ones, and he did not know what the dark ones were. Mr. Gray stated that if you see them hand in hand together, they look a lot different. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 19.

- Mr. Gray inquired who he needs to contact to set up a date and time for a survey on KBSF and if that would be Mr. DeBree III. Mr. DeBree III stated yes. Mr. Gray stated ok and that he will talk to the sparrow people and let them know and they will cooperate with FFS. Mr. Grubich volunteered to drive the group out there. Mr. Gray stated that they still had them on the DeLuca property when it was still private property and the DeLucas would let them work out there; so, we never told anybody where it was. He then stated that they referred to the property as "The Ranch", and now that it is owned by the state, they can reveal it. Mr. Camposano stated to Mr. DeBree to call him, and Mr. Camposano will help him with that process.
- Page 24: Mr. Gray stated that on top of the page where it states that visitors can enjoy hiking, stargazing can also be added to that. Mr. Davis requested Mr. Gray to restate that as he could not hear. Mr. Gray repeated that stargazing can also be added. Mr. Camposano inquired if the Kissimmee Prairie State Park is considered to be a dark sky area. The group stated yes. Mr. Camposano stated that they can add stargazing into the plan as that is reasonable. Ms. Kuipers agreed. Mr. Gray stated to put stargazing underneath the Existing section. He then added that when FFS develops their facilities, it would be good to consider dark sky ideas because Kissimmee Prairie State Park is a dark sky park and is the first of the state. He continued to state that it's not complicated, that when you install light fixtures to be sure to be pointing the lights downwards and not pointed towards the sky. He further stated that they are trying to get a dark sky ordinance in Okeechobee County, and the Mayor of all people want to do that. He then stated that trying to protect the dark skies is a really important initiative there. Mr. Gray then stated that when Avon Park Airforce Range was designated, they wrote a letter of support for that because it protects their mission since they don't want the preserve outlined in cities, or the Airforce range; because they are flying people in from ships out in the ocean and the aircraft carrying folks. He then concluded by stating that they want to keep a buffer around the preserve or the range. Mr. Davis inquired of anything else on page 24.
- Ms. Kuipers stated that under Subsection B.2, it has language about evaluating hiking trails. She then inquired how FFS is going to evaluate that if there is no use fee. Mr. Davis stated that FFS evaluates through demand from users of the state forest. Ms. Kuipers restated her inquiry. Mr. Camposano stated that Liaison Meetings are one of the avenues of evaluations that FFS uses. He stated that at those meetings, FFS would ask the group if trails and / or other infrastructure are a desired. Mr. Camposano then echoed Mr. Davis's sentiment that it is based on what the demand is and if the public come to the office to make suggestions. From there, KBSF staff would start to look into that and start planning a Liaison Panel Meeting to see what actual support the public has. Mr. Camposano explained that FFS can amend a plan and add stuff in, but then they would need to do a plan amendment to add the trailheads, since we do not have a location for them right now. He then stated that DEP is going to want to see where the public input is on this matter, so FFS will always be required to have public input. He concluded by stating that it is not just a matter of whether or not the public wants it, but whether or not FFS can install it. He further explained that KBSF is a challenging property because trails going through a bunch of wetlands, it is going to be tricky. He continued to state that it is not going to be impossible, because there are a few dirt roads out there now and one sort of main road. Mr. Camposano ended by stating that is the evaluation through public feedback and whether FFS can feasibility do it or not. He then stated that currently, there is very little demand out there and FFS is not going to just to put a trail in and not have anyone ever use it and create a use that needs to be managed and maintained for no reason. He continued to state that if the demand rises, then FFS will have local meetings to make sure there is public support for it and move forward if there is funding and all that stuff that goes along with it.
- Mr. West inquired Mr. Camposano that he is talking about adding in potential campsites out there and the access to those sites. Mr. Camposano stated yes. Mr. West inquired if the public can drive up to those sites. Mr. Camposano stated that in theory, yes and continued to state that they were also talked about being hike-in campsites, but that is a long hike. He continued to state that FFS has other hike-in campsites at other state forests but does not know if any of them are that long. Mr. West agreed and stated that the Florida Trail does not go by this proposed campground and suggested it to be close to this one. Mr. Camposano stated that that is something FFS would need to do down the road. He stated that the sites have been identified for the

campground, but they are not actually in place yet. Mr. Camposano continued to state that the sites were also envisioned as...Mr. West inquired for a hunt camp. Mr. Camposano answered not for true hunt camps, but they would probably be used more during hunting season more than anything; which in that case, the gate is open and those could be driven to. Mr. Grubich stated to find a spot on semi-dry land. Mr. West agreed. Mr. Gray joked about getting a hammock. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 24.

- Page 28: Mr. Gray stated that under Adjacent Neighborhood Contacts at the bottom of page 28 / top of page 29, it says families. He then stated that a lot of FFS's adjacent neighbors are agencies, not families and suggested to change that. Ms. Kuipers suggested adjacent neighbors instead. Mr. Gray stated yes and then suggested "a list of neighbors who requested to be notified. These entities are contacted via phone or by email" or something like that, because they are not families, so it is not necessarily accurate. Mr. Davis inquired if neighbors would be better. Mr. Gray stated yes.
- Page 30: Mr. Freese inquired if there were plans to put cattle on the property in the future. Mr. DeBree III stated no. Mr. Freese stated ok.
- Mr. Camposano stated that the discussion had been that the acreage FFS has by themselves would not be enough to logistically sustain without damaging the resource. Mr. Freese agreed and stated that the fact that FFS has burned the entire property in four (4) years, and if FFS can keep that up, then there would be no need for cattle grazing.
- Mr. Camposano stated that they would like to generate revenue on the property somehow, but FFS is kind of at an impasse right now. He explained that without the feds' assistance to increase the area to have it be equitable then it won't be done. Mr. Gray stated that it would have to be grazed carefully, and it may not be worth it.
- Mr. Gray then inquired about timber sales on the property and how FFS is handling cabbage palms. Mr. Camposano stated that it is funny that Mr. Gray is bringing up this topic because this was a topic of discussion in yesterday's truck ride. Mr. Camposano then stated that has been done on 1-2 forests, both near Orlando District (Charles H. Bronson State Forest and Little Big Econ State Forest), but does not know if Mr. Gray has seen those forests and the amount of palm trees they have down there. He stated that it makes KBSF look like there is hardly any trees. Mr. Camposano stated that the one thing he has learned from those contracts is that the buyers are very particular. They get orders from companies and landscapers for very specific trees so if you do not have tens of thousands of trees all in a small area, then they do not usually contract as much since it is an "as needed" contract. He further explained that you would not want to spend the time and equipment out there, especially with not a lot of roads, dragging trees and how damaging the equipment can be, and the digging, so it is probably not the best spot. Mr. Camposano then stated that the 2 forests near Orlando District, has actually led to restoration of those systems whereas you are not as choked out or near as choked out you would be here versus Orlando. He concluded by stating that the thought has crossed their minds but there is not enough density out there to be able to do it on KBSF. Mr. Gray stated that, with the Kissimmee Prairie, Cabbage palms are considered somewhat invasive, that they are more common in the open prairie than they used to be. He then stated that they have a program which grasshopper sparrows will give them 400 yards of tree. He further stated that they just don't like trees, and he thinks it's hawks. He then stated that on Kissimmee Prairie, where they have isolated cabbage palm trees, they have actually been going around and cutting them down as part of land management. He then stated that FFS can wait until the grasshopper people come out and they can give FFS a better idea of whether or not that would be a management consideration to try to fit the cabbage palms in the open prairie. Mr. Camposano stated that FFS would take that into consideration. He then stated that he is unsure if they would sell them, because FFS does this on other state forests, but to do mechanical removal whether that is doing it ourselves or contract out the work. He concluded by stating that FFS, at this point, has not assessed the property enough to truly make a determination, because, again, there are too many and FFS needs to remove some. He then stated that by looking at them he can say that there is not enough to be able to sell them given the breadth of size classes you would need or if it exists, and what the landscapers need is very narrow in that window. Mr. Gray stated that the prairie was just sawing them down with a chainsaw and from what he hears, that is a nightmare. Mr. Camposano agreed and stated that that is a young man's work right there and that is hard. He explained that it is hard enough to knock them over with a

dozer. Mr. Gray stated that this was just something for future thought and to see if the sparrow people will bring it up. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 30.

- Mr. West inquired if FFS has a budget for invasive species control, if they are treating them in-house, etc. He then stated that it does not appear that KBSF has a lot of invasives based on the current list or what the staff are looking at. Mr. Camposano stated that as of right now, though there are some invasives right now, it does not appear to be the worst problem that he has seen. He continued to state that because it is a new property, FFS is still trying to get everything figured out. He then stated that staff has been treating some cogongrass, Japanese climbing fern, and candlestick. He continued to state that there might have been some additional treatments done from the first conversation he has had. Mr. Camposano stated that treatments have been done in-house and FFS does have a budget to do contractual projects, if necessary, but we need to get a better handle on exactly all of the points that are out and make sure we are sending the contractor to go get everything that we are aware of. He further stated that this is something that FFS can look at over the next year or two. Mr. Freese added that if funding ever does become an issue, there is also the FWC Uplands program to get some funding to treat over 2,000 acres. Mr. Camposano stated that the Seminole Gaming Compact has been pretty good to FFS this year, as long as that keeps moving forward, FFS should have sufficient funding to be able to do this to a point where it is actually problematic to take other agencies' funding because we have our own to spend now, which is a good problem to have. Mr. Camposano further stated that this is the first year of that and we have actually added a lot of invasive projects state-wide, and again this is a property that FFS wants to make sure they get to at some point in time. He concluded by stating that there is funding available. Mr. West stated ok and then mentioned the hog problem.
- Mr. West stated that USDA has a program where they fly around in helicopters. He further stated that if the hunts are not doing enough, then that may be something else to look at. Mr. Camposano inquired if he's talking about USDA shooting from helicopters. Mr. Freese stated yes. Mr. Camposano inquired if it been done before on Water Management property. Mr. Freese stated yes and that it is through the USDA. Mr. Camposano stated that he knows who it is through, but inquired Mr. West if he does not have any private landowners nearby the lands and how his agency deals with the public perceptions of that. Mr. West stated that a few were actually on board with the idea because some of the hogs were leaving WMD property and migrating onto the landowners' properties. Mr. Camposano inquired that WMD talked to the landowners first this to see if they were on board or if they just went ahead and did it. Mr. West stated that they talked to a few of them that knew had an issue, but they started on project lands so that it was not on the public use side of the property. The other areas they have not gone into it yet, but WMD is looking into it, specifically lands that may turn in to a WMD project in the future. Mr. West reiterated that he knows that they talked to the neighbors there and a lot of them have cattle leases on their properties, so they were all for the program. Mr. Camposano stated that a lot of ranchers and private landowners are digging this idea, from his understanding. He then inquired if they also do this on private lands. Mr. West stated yes.
- Mr. DeBree III suggested that aerial means may be conflicted due to flight restrictions that get put in around that area. Mr. Camposano inquired if there were already any permanent restrictions with the property. Mr. DeBree III answered that they do shut down, but when they are active, the restrictions do expand. He further stated that it would have to be coordinated with the feds. Mr. Grubich stated that you can skirt the eastern edge of the property, but the property itself is in a restricted area.
- Mr. Gray stated that Kissimmee Prairie has done aerial hog control. He further stated that it is possible but FFS would have to coordinate with the range. Mr. Camposano stated that FFS they have tried to do this on a different state forest a few years ago and someone higher in the General Counsel's Office got cold feet about it because of the perception. He then stated that he was approached by the same manager and asked Mr. Camposano about it yesterday for a different forest. He continued to state that as he is thinking about it for KBSF, aside from the air restrictions, it is so isolated that you may not have as many neighbor complaints or concerns; so, it might be a property, if we can bypass the restricted airspace part, to try to do this. Mr. West stated that if the Prairie is already doing this, then it should not take much to sign on to because they are already hitting that area. Mr. Camposano stated that the hunters that do come out there are not interested in hogs. Mr. Freese stated that probably not hogs, but you still might get some hunter pushback because FWC gets

pushback on their WMA that they manage. He further stated that hunters do not even want FWC to trap the hogs. Mr. Camposano stated that FWC has a USDA contract for trapping on the Joe Budd WMA that has done fantastic from what he understands. Mr. Freese stated yes but is still considered contentious. Mr. Camposano apologized for going off track from the meeting but stated that this is something that FFS would consider. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 31. Mr. Camposano thanked Mr. Freese for his perspective on that topic.

- Mr. Gray stated that the preserve has a hog trapper too that can help. He then stated that he believes they just get paid for the value of the hogs that are taken off the property. He continued to state that they do not pay them. Mr. Camposano inquired who was that. Mr. Gray stated the preserve. Mr. DeBree III stated that the hog is their payment. Mr. Gray stated yes and to work out a deal with the trapper. Mr. Camposano stated that this is something they will look into for a couple of state forests, especially because FFS has some decent funding right now whether it is trapping or aerial. He then stated that the trapping is a little less contentious, because you do not have a helicopter flying over your head with a rifle. Mr. Freese corrected that they use a shotgun. Mr. Camposano stated that shotgun, or whatever it is they use to shoot, and continued to state that FFS is going to look at it from a couple of different perspectives and try to get something on the books for KBSF. Mr. Gray stated that there is already a lot of shooting at night.
- Page 31: Mr. Gray inquired if FFS has not had any rights to nutrush or whatever it is called. Mr. Freese stated it is called *Scleria*. Mr. Camposano stated that FNAI probably did not find any when they did the natural community mapping. Mr. West stated that there is some on the river down by Eggers and Megacarpa and concluded that it is on the Kissimmee River. Mr. Gray stated that is bad stuff, if you can prevent it that is great. Mr. West inquired if that was on the prairie itself. Mr. Gray stated yes and that it is an annual, so it leaves seeds behind, so you kill it, and it comes right back. Mr. Camposano stated that from the survey we have done and the survey that FNAI has done, FFS has not had it detected yet, but if it is detected then it will be added to the list and will be treated, just like anything else on their list. Mr. West stated that if FFS finds it, to hit it early. Mr. Gray agreed. Mr. Camposano stated that down in FFS's Caloosahatchee District, on OK Slough State Forest, that they have had some of the *Scleria* species and they have done some treatment down there on that. Mr. West stated that they have three (3) of them down there. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 31.
- Page 32: Mr. Gray stated that on Table 7 it reads "Clearing of 24 acres..." and inquired if that was the food plot or something. Mr. Camposano stated no. Mr. Freese stated that it is wrong then and stated that he assumed it was the food plot because that is generally what FNAI calls it. He then stated that FNAI will generally them wildlife clearings. Mr. Camposano stated wildlife openings. Mr. Freese agreed, but the 24 acres is probably referring to the food plot. Mr. Camposano promised the group that the food plot is not 24 acres in size. He then stated that the one they were at yesterday was about one (1) acre. Mr. Grubich stated that the food plot is not very big. Mr. Camposano stated that he would have to go back to the map to see how and where they mapped that as. He then stated that it could be multiple "somethings" added together and does not remember all those areas were.
- Mr. Gray inquired if FFS lets the food plots revert back to what it was. Mr. Camposano stated that FFS is not maintaining the food plot, not replanting it, but rather letting it go and burning it. Mr. Gray stated that is good.
- Ms. Kuipers inquired if FFS just calls it a food plot or if it is a managed food plot. Mr. Davis stated that it is not managed. Mr. Grubich stated that it used to be a food plot. Mr. Camposano stated that it is just an opening right now, essentially. Mr. Grubich stated that there is a solar well on it. Ms. Kuipers stated that she thinks she saw it during her visit, a small one. Mr. Grubich stated that is it and continued to explain that if you take a left turn going that way. Ms. Kuipers hesitantly stated sure. Mr. Grubich then stated that there is only one turn to make. Ms. Kuipers stated that they had to turn around because then you could not go past a certain point. Mr. Grubich stated that you pass it on the drive coming in from the other way.
- Mr. Freese stated that since there are no cattle out there, if FFS is planning to abandon the wells at some point. Mr. DeBree III stated that most of them have been abandoned, but FFS did leave a few of them out there as a water source for burning since the wells are not really doing anything. Mr. Gray stated yes, that can help. Mr. West stated that there is not much else out there.

- Page 33: Mr. Gray stated that he really likes FFS's fire prescription on wetlands and thought that was good.
- Page 34: Mr. Freese stated that, regarding the fire regimes for the wetlands, he likes that it allows to burn with the surrounding uplands. He then suggested to add some language about encouraging fire to carry across the wetlands as well. He explained that it talks about burning when it is dry as possible, but to add language saying ignition techniques to encourage the wetlands to burn across to keep the basin itself open. He then stated that he does not know how FFS wants to do it or if that is just something to keep in mind, in house, when FFS does their annual burn planning. He concluded by stating to try to get the actual basin itself to burn and not just the edges. Mr. Davis inquired if there is or is no change.
- Mr. Freese stated that change is needed to Fire Regimes on Depression marsh but would also be the same for Slough marsh as well. He then stated that he is fine with keeping this in house, but to contain verbiage of actually trying to get the marsh itself to burn, not just the edges. He agreed that burning the edges is great, but to get the actual marsh itself to burn on, at least, that eight (8) year cycle would be great. Mr. DeBree III stated that if FFS gets it to burn, they will let it burn. Mr. Freese stated that is great and that was all he was suggesting. Mr. Grubich added that if it is too wet you will see a wet line going through it, so it will not get in there; but if it is dry enough then FFS will burn it. Mr. Freese stated that is perfect and that does not need to be stated within the plan and can be kept in house. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else on page 34.
- Mr. Davis asked if there were any questions or comments on the exhibits. None followed but Mr. Gray requested to go back to page 11.
- Page 11: Mr. Gray requested to add language under On-Site Housing that alludes to the development of the property would be under consideration of dark sky principles or something to that effect. He continued to state that if FFS decides to put housing out there, that they would do it according to dark sky principles. Mr. Davis inquired if this is for improvements. Mr. Gray stated maybe under On-Site Housing or under the Improvements section, and even for campgrounds. He explained that he wants a note in there to remind FFS that if they put something out there to try to remember to not to install a big, glaring light out there. He stated that he knows that is far into the future and that FFS does not have any plans for it, but again, this is a ten-year plan, so he believes it is appropriate. Mr. Davis stated that this is FFS's generic language and stated that he is unsure if we should change it. He continued to explain that FFS does not have any plans to put on site housing for employees, while that may change, but does not think it would be enough to disturb anything as far as light pollution goes. Mr. Grubich agreed and stated that especially if it is just a little campsite. Mr. Davis stated that if FFS puts something out there, it is because of a need for FFS. He then inquired the group of their thoughts on the matter.
- Mr. DeBree III stated that he would push against adding that language in, just in case, not that FFS would encourage light pollution. Mr. Davis agreed. Mr. Gray restated that there should be some sort of restriction in there.
- Mr. Camposano stated that he is hesitant to tailor it that way because then it could apply to anything for any reason. He then stated that if you were to go to any of our state forests at night, they are most likely some of the darkest places around. He continued to state that FFS does not generally install a lot of infrastructure, lights or buildings, or anything like that. Mr. Camposano reiterated that there are no plans for any power or lighting or buildings out there. He then stated that he does not see FFS doing that any time in the future, but if they did, FFS does not want a whole lot of light; it would be minimized to the greatest extent possible. He further stated that even the campgrounds have only enough light for people to walk around safely from their campground to the bathroom, for an example, but otherwise...Mr. Gray interjected and stated that he would not make it a requirement because FFS cannot require their agency to do something, but suggested to add language "in consideration of" because that way, it is a reminder in the plan that this is a dark sky area and as FFS thinks about doing something in the future, that they are mindful of it. Mr. Camposano stated that because the property itself has not been designated that way, so without the actual designation, FFS can just try to aim for it. He continued to state that he does not plan on seeing any light out there or anything that FFS puts out there that would brighten the skies, unless they want to do a night burn, but that is temporary. He concluded by stating that he agrees with Mr. Davis about keeping the language the way it is but know that if we get to a project-by-project basis, that, it will be developed with minimal light. He then reiterated that it is a pretty rural area.

- Mr. Lisiecki stated that he does not foresee anything ever going out there. Mr. Camposano agreed. Mr. DeBree and Mr. Lisiecki both expressed that it would be a lot of money for just a small building, if you even wanted that so it will never be worth it. Mr. Davis inquired the group if they are good with no changes. Mr. Lisiecki stated yes. Mr. Camposano stated that as far as houses go on the federal property, there are fed houses (FWC Officer) which gives FFS plenty of site security at this time that does not warrant FFS to build housing out there for extra security measures to protect the property. Mr. Lisiecki added that their cooperation with them is good enough if we have anything, then it would be on that little piece of property they have already.
- Mr. DeBree III stated that, if anything, the private side has more light out there than anything else. Mr. Lisiecki agreed. Mr. Davis inquired if there was anything else in the plan.
- Mr. Gray stated that they have a sensor in order to maintain the dark sky certification, they have to measure light and send in an annual report to the International Dark Sky Association. He continued to state that they have a sensor in the middle of the preserve, and it is still pretty dark, but they feel that the Viking properties are getting lighter and lighter, so they put a sensor on the border. He continued to state that it is indeed getting lighter really fast. Mr. DeBree III stated that if that place blows up and construction goes there, then that place is going to be pretty lit up, and FFS's little building would not be a comparison to what would happen there. Mr. Gray wearily agreed. He continued to state that the argument is that school kids are waiting for the school busses in the dark and parents do not want that. Mr. Gray's response to their concern was that it is fine, but to shield the light and have the light shine down on the kids, but don't shine it up into the sky, and that has been an ongoing issue. Mr. Gray continued to state that that is part of the Dark Sky Ordinance that the county is trying to pass. The people's concerns are that the county is going to black everyone out, to which Mr. Gray responded that they are just trying to get rid of glare.
- Mr. Davis asked each MPAG member to comment on the draft plan. Mr. DeBree III stated that he thinks that some good changes were made and off to a good start. Mr. Freese stated that the plan is well written and agreed with Mr. DeBree that the changes made were good and wanted to commend FFS for great forest management so far, particularly getting the whole property burned already in four (4) years with limited staff, resources and infrastructure available. He then expressed his excitement to see what FFS does next. Mr. West stated that he likes the plan and FFS did a good job writing it and appreciates the burn program that FFS already established at KBSF. Ms. Kuipers stated that she enjoyed participating in the group and thinks that the plan is good and liked all the changes that were amended today. She then stated that if FFS needed a test dummy again to go through and see how the public navigates through the property. Mr. Gray stated that he also thinks it is a well written plan and that FFS considers a lot of stuff. He expressed that even though a lot of this is boiler plate but FFS covered the basis. He then stated that he is glad FFS is here. He concluded by stating he would like more dark sky but is a very good plan.
- Mr. Davis noted that the draft will be submitted to the Acquisition and Restoration Council for review. Consideration by the Council will likely occur at the June 13, 2025, public meeting.
- Mr. Davis thanked everyone for their time and participation and adjourned the meeting.

Workshop Meeting End Time: 2:19 P.M.

Exhibit T

Arthropod Control Plan

Okeechobee County, Florida

Board of County Commissioners

Okeechobee County



EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
707 NW 6th Street
Okeechobee, Florida 34972
863-763-3212
Fax 863-763-4565

June 6, 2022

To Whom It May Concern:

Okeechobee County Mosquito control has no plans to apply mosquito control treatments in areas designated as environmentally sensitive. In some cases, aerial applications maybe made the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (DACS) after a tropical cyclone event.

Okeechobee County will coordinate operations with DACS to ensure the environmentally sensitive areas are placed on the do not spray list.

If you would like additional information you can telephone me at (863) 763-3212, (863)-634-6273 mobile.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "O. Mitchell Smeykal".

O. Mitchell Smeykal, FPEM, FMI
Director,

Okeechobee Emergency Management/Mosquito Control

David Hazellief
District 1

District 2

Bradley G. Goodbread
District 3

Terry W. Burroughs
District 4

Kelly Owens
District 5