APPENDIX A. Identification of Possible Trail Routes

In addition to identifying a "Corridor of Opportunity" for the Ice Age NST, planners have found it useful and desirable to identify possible routes for the trail within the corridor. Because of the corridor's extensive width (generally 1-5 miles), identifying possible routes would focus efforts to establish the trail (time and money), and enable planners to design routes that best exemplify the trail's mission and goals. The trail was divided up into segments spanning the corridor's entire length. Again, since participation in the Ice Age NST project is voluntary, the trail's ultimate location would be determined by the willingness of landowners to sell lands or grant permission to cross their property.

To help design the alternative routes, the Ice Age NST Planning Team identified ten objectives listed below:

- Trail should provide scenic vistas
- Trail should traverse a variety of glacial features.
- Trail links other significant archeological, historical, cultural, geographical, geological, and biological sites.
- Trail utilizes public lands when possible.
- Trail traverses through a variety of plant communities.
- Trail has local landowner and town support.
- Trail avoids development in rural areas.
- Trail provides support facilities.
- Trail links to communities.
- Trail links other significant resource areas.

After the possible trail routes were developed based on the ten objectives, the desirability of each alternative could be evaluated on the basis of criteria grouped into three broad categories of concern: **trail quality, environmental considerations**, and **sociological considerations**.

Trail quality is an assessment of each proposed route from the hiker's point of view. These criteria evaluate, as objectively as possible, how well each route meets the purpose and objectives of the Ice Age NST as set forth in the National Trails System Act. The purpose of National Scenic Trail, as stated in the Act, is "to provide for maximum outdoor recreation potential and for the conservation and enjoyment of the nationally significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities of the areas through which such trails may pass" [16 U.S.C. 1242(a)(3)]. Criteria studied under **trail quality** include:

- Length the length of each proposed route. Information was obtained from GIS digital files compiled by Waushara County.
- Road Crossings the identification and number of road crossings. A high number of crossings may take away from the user's experience of the trail and create a greater potential for accidents.
- Diversity and Interest of Route identifies the significant points of interest that are designed into each route to create a desirable hiking experience. Elements evaluated may

include significant geologic features, the amount of trail located in the sun and shade, amount of trail located on both hills and valley, scenic views, and visually outstanding, unique or geographically limited plant communities. Information was obtained from the Core Team members, aerial photographs, and topographic maps.

• Existing development and the probability of future development (low, moderate, high) – the level of existing development and the degree to which each route is likely to be affected by future development. Assessments of future development, while speculative, are based on extrapolations of current patterns of development. Information was obtained from recent aerial photographs, detailed topographic maps and, where available, proposed land use from local land management plans.

Environmental considerations are those impacts that the trail might have on the local natural resources. Information on these impacts has been gathered by questioning Federal, State and County agencies, and interested private organizations and individuals. A list of the agencies, organizations, and individuals contacted is in Section 9 of this document. Criteria studied under **environmental considerations** include:

- Construction Impacts/Number of Stream Crossings an evaluation of each possible route based on the degree of development needed to construct the trail. The assessment is based on slope, bridge installations, potential of soil erosion or excessive compaction, and impacts to wetlands, floodplains and fisheries. Information sources included, but were not limited to the WDNR Bureaus of Wildlife Management and Water Resources Management.
- Rare, endangered, and threatened species identifies if a route goes through an occurrence of a plant or animal species that have been identified by the Federal or State government as being endangered or threatened. Information was obtained from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and WDNR Bureaus of Wildlife Management and Endangered Resources, and the University of Wisconsin's environmental, biology, and natural resources experts.

Sociological considerations are those impacts that the trail might have on the local human environment, affected landowners, and communities through which the trail may pass. Criteria studied under **sociological considerations** include:

- Number of affected landowners the number of landowners whose property might be crossed by each route.
- Percentage of public land utilized the percentage of public lands crossed in relation to the total length of the possible route.
- Secondary benefits potential positive outcomes resulting from the development of the trail through an area that affect public access, natural resource preservation or

enhancement, or economic resources. Information was obtained from local officials, University of Wisconsin staff, local chapters of the Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation, and landowners.

What it means if a possible trail route option goes through your property: Participation by landowners in the Ice Age NST project is voluntary. Planners recognize that actual trail placement will be modified due to the need for landowner acceptance and land-use constraints. The next section provides a summary of each possible route.

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTES

TABLE 1–Existing Trail Route 1:

| | EXISTING TRAIL ROUTE 1 |
|------------------------|---|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment | 1.5 miles |
| Length | |
| Road Crossings | 0 |
| Diversity and Interest | This segment passes through Chaffee Creek State |
| of Route | Fisheries Area (SFA). Chaffee Creek SFA contains |
| | different ecosystems from uplands to lowlands |
| | including a calcareous fen and oak savanna. There is a |
| | kettle along this segment as well as many wildflowers. |
| Existing | None. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources |
| Development and | owns the land that the existing trail runs through. |
| Probability of Future | |
| Development | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ | This trail segment was originally constructed in the late |
| Number of Stream | 80s and has been upgraded in the last five years. The |
| Crossings | original construction included a bridge to cross Chaffee Creek. |
| | Cleek. |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Threatened, or | No known E, 1, 5 species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Special Concern | |
| Species Identified by | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | |
| BER | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Approx. Number of | 1 landowner, State of Wisconsin |
| Landowners | |
| Affected | |
| Public Lands Used | 100% - Chaffee Creek State Fisheries Area |

TABLE 2—Possible Trail Route Options 2A & 2B

| | POSSIBLE ROUTE | POSSIBLE ROUTE |
|------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | OPTION 2A | OPTION 2B |
| TRAIL QUALITY | | |
| Approx. Segment | 1 mile | 1.5 miles |
| Length | | |
| Road Crossings | 1-town road | 1-town road |
| Diversity and Interest | The trail follows the | The trail follows the moraine |
| of Route | moraine through oak | through oak savanna and |
| | savanna and some pine | some pine plantations. |
| | plantations. | |
| Existing Development | Agricultural use is | Agricultural use is present. |
| and Probability of | present. Preservation of | Preservation of agricultural |
| Future Development | agricultural areas is | areas is planned for the |
| | planned for the future. | future. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Trail would be built | Trail would be built |
| Number of Stream | entirely on uplands | primarily on uplands. One |
| Crossings | through oak savanna | stream crossing would be required. |
| | overstory. Trail will be primarily on uplands and | Tequited. |
| | would consist of | |
| | sustainable trail | |
| | construction. | |
| | construction. | |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species | No known E, T, S species in |
| Threatened, or | in the vicinity of the | the vicinity of the segment. |
| Special Concern | segment. | |
| Species Identified by | | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | | |
| BER | | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Number of | 2 | 2 |
| Landowners Affected | | |
| Public Lands Used | ? | None |
| Secondary Benefits | * in 2005, parcel was | |
| | purchased for this route. | |

TABLE 3-Existing Trail Route 3:

| | EXISTING TRAIL ROUTE 3 | |
|------------------------|--|--|
| TRAIL QUALITY | | |
| Approx. Segment | 1.5 miles | |
| Length | | |
| Road Crossings | 0 | |
| Diversity and Interest | Wedde Creek State Fisheries Area (SFA) with Class A | |
| of Route | Trout Stream. Oak Barrens, pine plantations. Trail-head | |
| | located at south end of SFA. | |
| Existing Development | None. Existing trail winds through Wedde Creek State | |
| and Probability of | Fishery Area. No development is intended for the future. | |
| Future Development | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Existing trail was built as a brushed footpath in the late | |
| Number of Stream | 80s. It may require upgrading in future years. Trail | |
| Crossings | utilizes an existing snowmobile bridge to cross Wedde | |
| | Creek. | |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. | |
| Threatened, or | No known E, 1, 5 species in the vicinity of the segment. | |
| Special Concern | | |
| Species Identified by | | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | | |
| BER | | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Number of | 1-State of Wisconsin | |
| Landowners Affected | | |
| Public Lands Used | 100% Wedde Creek State Fisheries Area | |
| Secondary Benefits | The trail shares an existing stream crossing with a local | |
| | snowmobile club. | |
| | | |

TABLE 4–Possible Trail Route Option 4:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE OPTION 4 |
|------------------------|--|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment | .5 mile |
| Length | |
| Road Crossings | 1- town road |
| Diversity and Interest | Wooded, hummocky glacial topography, trail passes by a |
| of Route | game farm. |
| Existing Development | Existing residential development with agricultural |
| and Probability of | preservation and protection of nearby resources is |
| Future Development | suggested for the future. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Trail would be built entirely on uplands and would consist |
| Number of Stream | of sustainable side hill trail construction since the |
| Crossings | topography is moderately steep. |
| | |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Threatened, or | |
| Special Concern | |
| Species Identified by | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | |
| BER | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Number of | 1 |
| Landowners Affected | |
| Public Lands Used | None |
| Secondary Benefits | |

TABLE 5-Connecting Road Segment 200:

| | CONNECTING ROAD ROUTE 200 |
|---|---|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment | 2 miles |
| Length | |
| Road Crossings | 2 |
| Diversity and Interest | TEMPORARY ROAD CONNECTION—Allows |
| of Route | connection of existing segments of trail until an off-road |
| | route can be obtained. |
| | This route follows Cyprus Road to County JJ, north along |
| | County JJ through unincorporated Richford near an |
| | Amish community. |
| Existing Development | Existing residential with a kennel is located along Cypress |
| and Probability of | Road. Scattered farmsteads and a cemetery are located |
| Future Development | along CTH JJ. Future use includes preservation of the |
| | agricultural lands and wetland resources. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ Number of Stream | Not applicable |
| Crossings | |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Threatened, or | No known E, 1, 5 species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Special Concern | |
| Species Identified by | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | |
| BER | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Number of | Not applicable |
| Landowners Affected | |
| Landowner Attitudes | |
| Public Lands Used | 100% public roads |
| Secondary Benefits | |
| | |

TABLE 6–Possible Trail Route Options 5A & 5B:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| | ROUTE SEGMENT 5A | SEGMENT 5B |
| TRAIL QUALITY | KOUTE SEOWENT SA | SEGMENT 5D |
| Approx. Segment | 1.5 miles | 1.25 miles off road and .75 |
| Length | | mile on road. |
| Road Crossings | 1-town road | 1/3 of segment would follow |
| | | County Trunk JJ into |
| | | Richford. |
| Diversity and Interest | This segment passes | This option is closely aligned |
| of Route | through undulating glacial | with County JJ and passes |
| | topography along the west | along the edge of glacial |
| | side of unincorporated | topography entering |
| | Richford to the Mecan | unincorporated Richford |
| | Springs State Fishery | from the south. |
| | Area. | |
| Existing Development | Existing use is woodland | Existing development |
| and Probability of | with some planted woodlots. Future | consists of residential with |
| Future Development | scattered residential is a | some commercial and public facilities through the |
| | possibility with | community of Richford. No |
| | preservation of open | future growth is planned at |
| | spaces and agricultural | this time. Preservation of the |
| | lands. | surrounding woodlots is |
| | | planned for the future. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Trail would be built | Approximately 2/3 of the |
| Number of Stream | entirely on uplands and | trail would be built on |
| Crossings | would consist of | uplands and would consist of |
| | sustainable side hill trail | sustainable side hill trail |
| | construction since | construction. Remaining trail |
| | topography is moderately | would be built along side a road or on flat terrain. |
| | steep. | Toad of on that terrain. |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species | No known E, T, S species in |
| Threatened, or | in the vicinity of the | the vicinity of the segment. |
| Special Concern | segment. | the vicinity of the segment. |
| Species Identified by | | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | | |
| BER | | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Number of | 6 | 3 |
| Landowners Affected | | |
| Public Lands Used | None | 35% public road |
| Secondary Benefits | | |

TABLE 7—Existing Trail Route 6:

| | EXISTING TRAIL ROUTE 6 |
|--|---|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment Length | 4 miles |
| Road Crossings | State Highway 21 county trunk town road |
| Diversity and Interest of Route | The trail follows the Mecan River to its headwaters in Mecan Springs State Natural Area. This area is very scenic with impressive stream improvements. |
| Existing Development and Probability of Future Development | A small portion of this existing trail segments runs through scattered residential within planted woodlots. The remaining portion is located on WDNR lands where future development is unlikely. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ Number of Stream Crossings | Trail was built over the last couple of years (2003-4) by IAPTF MSC and the local chapter volunteers. Construction consisted of creating sustainable trail out of the indigenous mineral soil. There is one stream crossing with an existing bridge in place. |
| Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern Species Identified by USFWS or WDNR- BER | Karner Blue |
| SOCIOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Number of Landowners Affected | 2 |
| Public Lands Used | 85% Mecan River State Fisheries Area and Mecan Springs State Natural Area |
| Secondary Benefits | Access for fishing & hunting, beautiful outdoor setting, three species of trout, big stone flies. |

TABLE 8—Possible Route Options 7A, 7B, & 7C

| | DOCCIDI E TD A II | DOCCIDIETDAU | DOSSIDI E TD A II |
|--|---|---|--|
| | POSSIBLE TRAIL | POSSIBLE TRAIL | POSSIBLE TRAIL |
| | ROUTE | ROUTE | ROUTE |
| | SEGMENT 7A | SEGMENT 7B | SEGMENT 7C |
| TRAIL QUALITY | 2.5 miles | 2 | 2 |
| Approx. Segment | 3.5 miles | 3 miles | 2 miles |
| Length | 2 (| 2 4 | 1 4 1 |
| Road Crossings | 2 – town roads | 3 – town roads | 1- town road |
| Diversity and Interest of Route | Trail leaves Mecan Springs SFA and moves northwest into an area of restored prairie skirting fallow fields and undulating glacial topography to the Greenwood Wild- life Area which includes many bird species and 4 kettle ponds. | Trail leaves Mecan Springs SFA and meanders north along Chicago Ave. in an area of pine plantations and open ag fields. | Trail wraps around the north side of Mecan Fisheries SFA and follows up-lands through a mix of open and wooded landscapes. There are kettle ponds as well as a view from the north of Mecan Springs. |
| Existing Development and Probability of Future Development | Scattered farms and single family residences. No future development is planned at this time. | Scattered farms and single family residences. Possible scattered 5 acre minimum residential lots may be developed in the future. | Scattered farms and single family residences. Possible scattered 5 acre minimum residential lots may be developed in the future |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS | | | |
| Construction Impacts/ Number of Stream Crossings | Southern portion of the trail would consist of sustainable trail construction through gently sloping open fields and woodlots. Northern half would be similar construction techniques on moderately steep topography. | Construction would consist of sustainable trail construction through gently sloping open fields and pine plantations. | Trail around Mecan Springs would be build on uplands requiring some side hill construction. Remaining trail would be built with sustainable techniques for gently sloping topography. |

| Endangered, | Karner Blue | Karner Blue | Karner Blue |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Threatened, or | Butterfly | Butterfly | Butterfly |
| Special Concern | | | |
| Species Identified by | | | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | | | |
| BER | | | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | | |
| Number of | 8 | 8 | 4 |
| Landowners Affected | | | |
| Public Lands Used | 25 % Greenwood | 10% Greenwood | 50% Greenwood |
| | Wildlife Area | Wildlife Area | Wildlife Area |
| Secondary Benefits | Securing a route | | |
| | here would expand | | |
| | Karner Blue habitat | | |
| | and provide a | | |
| | continuous corridor | | |
| | between two State | | |
| | properties. | | |
| | * A parcel of land | | |
| | has been purchased | | |
| | along this route, but | | |
| | this action does not | | |
| | determine the | | |
| | location of the | | |
| | entire route. | | |

TABLE 9—Existing Trail Route 8:

| | EXISTING TRAIL ROUTE 8 |
|------------------------|--|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment | 1.5 miles |
| Length | |
| Road Crossings | 1- town road |
| Diversity and Interest | Trail passes through the Greenwood Wildlife Area which |
| of Route | has a cluster of kettle ponds and diverse habitats for many species of birds and other wildlife. |
| Existing Development | No development presently exists or is planned for in the |
| and Probability of | in future. Greenwood Wildlife Area is a State Wildlife |
| Future Development | Area |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Existing trail was built in 2004 and consists of a brushed |
| Number of Stream | footpath. |
| Crossings | |
| Endangered, | Karner Blue Butterfly |
| Threatened, or | |
| Special Concern | |
| Species Identified by | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | |
| BER | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Number of | 1-State of Wisconsin |
| Landowners Affected | |
| Landowner Attitudes | |
| Public Lands Used | 100% Greenwood Wildlife Area |
| Secondary Benefits | Utilize public land: good site for a parking lot/trailhead |
| | and interpretive displays to educate the public about the |
| | sites wildlife and geologic history |

TABLE 10—Possible Trail Route Options 9A & 9B

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
| | ROUTE OPTION 9A | OPTION 9B | |
| TRAIL QUALITY | | | |
| Approx. Segment | 2.5 miles | 1.5 miles | |
| Length | | | |
| Road Crossings | 2- county road | 1- county road | |
| Diversity and Interest | Trail exits Greenwood | Trail exits Greenwood WA | |
| of Route | WA on the NE side and | to the east passing through | |
| | passes through existing ag | undulating glacial | |
| | uses and pine plantation on the terminal moraine. | topography following the terminal moraine. Oak | |
| | on the terminar moranie. | woodlands & scattered | |
| | | prairie remnants. | |
| Existing Development | Scattered residences exist | Wooded area with no | |
| and Probability of | with agricultural uses. | residences. Existing trail is | |
| Future Development | Future residential | developed through WDNR | |
| | development is planned, 3 | owned land. No future | |
| | acre lots 1000 feet from water bodies and 5 acre | development is planned. | |
| | lots in agricultural and | | |
| | vacant areas. | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Trail would be built | Trail would be built entirely | |
| Number of Stream | entirely on uplands. | on uplands. Construction | |
| Crossings | Construction would | would consist of creating sustainable trail out of | |
| | consist of creating sustainable trail out of | mineral soil. | |
| | mineral soil. | | |
| | | | |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species | No known E, T, S species in | |
| Threatened, or | in the vicinity of the | the vicinity of the segment. | |
| Special Concern | segment. | | |
| Species Identified by | | | |
| USFWS or WDNR- BER | | | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | | |
| Number of | 7 | 2 | |
| Landowners Affected | | | |
| Public Lands Used | 30% Greenwood Wildlife | 5% Greenwood Wildlife | |
| | Area | Area; 55% other DNR land | |
| Secondary Benefits | | Trail would provide connection to 240 acres of | |
| | | WDNR land in Section 29 | |
| | l | WDINK Ianu III SECHOII 27 | |

TABLE 11–Possible Trail Route Option 10:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE OPTION 10 |
|------------------------|--|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment | 1.5 miles |
| Length | |
| Road Crossings | 1 –county road |
| Diversity and Interest | Trail passes through undulating glacial terrain and oak |
| of Route | woodlands from south to north |
| Existing Development | Scattered old fields, agricultural fields and woodlots |
| and Probability of | presently exist. Minimum 5 acre scattered residential lots |
| Future Development | may occur in the future. |
| | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Trail would be built entirely on uplands. Construction |
| Number of Stream | would consist of creating sustainable trail out of the |
| Crossings | indigenous mineral soil. |
| | |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Threatened, or | |
| Special Concern | |
| Species Identified by | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | |
| BER | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Number of | 4 |
| Landowners Affected | 50/ DND 1 |
| Public Lands Used | 5% DNR land |
| Secondary Benefits | Provide connection between Bohn Lake and Maierhafer |
| | property, both now owned by WDNR. |

TABLE 12–Possible Trail Route Options 11A & 11B:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE |
|--|--|---|
| | ROUTE OPTION 11A | OPTION 11B |
| TRAIL QUALITY | | |
| Approx. Segment | 3 miles | 4.5 miles |
| Length | | |
| Road Crossings | 1- county road 1 - town road | 2 – town roads 1 –county road |
| Diversity and Interest of Route | This segment would follow one of the most impressive tunnel channels in the county passing kettle ponds through undulating glacial topography. Oak woodlands and scattered grasslands. | This segment would follow tree lines and parcel lines through ag fields, pine plantations and open spaces to George Sorenson Recreation Area. |
| Existing Development and Probability of Future Development | Scattered residences with some agricultural fields and woodlots. Possible future residential development is planned with 1 and 3 acre lots, and 5 acre lots in agricultural and vacant areas. | Scattered residences with some agricultural fields and woodlots. Possible future residential development is planned with 1 and 3 acre lots, and 5 acre lots in agricultural and vacant areas. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Construction Impacts/ Number of Stream Crossings | Trail would be built on uplands. Construction would consist of creating a sustainable trail out of indigenous mineral soil. | Trail would be built on uplands. Construction would consist of creating sustainable trail out of indigenous mineral soil. |
| Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern Species Identified by USFWS or WDNR- BER | Karner Blue | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Number of Landowners Affected | 8 | 13 |
| Public Lands Used | 40% DNR land | 5% Sorenson County Park |

| | Lake, a site with a pristine kettle pond and high | Potential for access to campsites at County Park. |
|--|---|---|
| | natural values. | |

TABLE 13–Possible Trail Route Option 12:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE OPTION 12 |
|------------------------|--|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment | .5 mile |
| Length | |
| Road Crossings | 1 – town road |
| Diversity and Interest | Pine plantation and some open spaces that would connect |
| of Route | Route Options 11A or 11B to existing trail |
| Existing Development | Planted woodlots with some scattered residential |
| and Probability of | development. Future use may include scattered 5 acre |
| Future Development | residential lots. |
| | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Trail would be built on uplands. Construction would |
| Number of Stream | consist of creating sustainable trail out of indigenous |
| Crossings | mineral soil. |
| | |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Threatened, or | No known E, 1, 5 species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Special Concern | |
| Species Identified by | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | |
| BER | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Number of | 4 |
| Landowners Affected | |
| Public Lands Used | None |
| Secondary Benefits | |

TABLE 14–Existing Trail Route 13:

| | EXISTING TRAIL ROUTE 13 |
|------------------------|--|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment | 3 miles |
| Length | |
| Road Crossings | 1 – town road |
| Diversity and Interest | Existing trail travels on the terminal moraine through |
| of Route | undulating glacial topography, hills, restored prairie and woodlots, and by dry kettles. |
| Existing Development | Sawmill and houses exist within the woodlands. |
| and Probability of | Scattered 5 acres or more residential lots are proposed for |
| Future Development | future use along with protection of wetland areas. |
| | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Trail already exists. |
| Number of Stream | |
| Crossings | |
| | |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Threatened, or | |
| Special Concern | |
| Species Identified by | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | |
| BER | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Number of | 6 |
| Landowners Affected | |
| Public Lands Used | 0 |
| Secondary Benefits | Trail segment showcases a variety of silvicultural |
| | practices. |

TABLE 15—Existing Trail Route 14:

| | EXISTING TRAIL ROUTE OPTION 14 |
|------------------------|--|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment | .5 mile |
| Length | |
| Road Crossings | 0 |
| Diversity and Interest | Short segment that would connect either 15A or 15B to |
| of Route | other options. Trail passes through undulating glacial |
| | topography on the terminal moraine north to County 0. |
| Existing Development | Existing land use is woodlots. Possible scattered 5 acre |
| and Probability of | residential development may occur in the future. |
| Future Development | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Trail already exists. |
| Number of Stream | |
| Crossings | |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Threatened, or | |
| Special Concern | |
| Species Identified by | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | |
| BER | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Number of | 1 |
| Landowners Affected | |
| Public Lands Used | None |
| Secondary Benefits | Bluebird habitat |

TABLE 16–Possible Route Options 15A & 15B:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE |
|--|--|--|
| | ROUTE OPTION 15A | OPTION 15B |
| TRAIL QUALITY | | |
| Approx. Segment Length | 4.5 miles | 2 miles |
| Road Crossings | State Highway 21 2 - county roads 1 - town road | 1 – State Highway 21 1- town road |
| Diversity and Interest of Route | Trail would pass through undulating glacial topography and by scattered grasslands and kettle ponds as well as oak woodlands and rugged terrain. | Trail would pass through undulating glacial topography and by scattered grasslands, pine plantations and oak woodlands. |
| Existing Development and Probability of Future Development | Residences are located along the roadways with planted woodlots. No future development is planned and preservation of woodlands is recommended. | Scattered residential development exists along roadways amongst pine plantations. Preservation of woodlots with some scattered residential development is a future possibility. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Construction Impacts/ Number of Stream Crossings | Trail would be built on uplands. Construction would consist of creating sustainable trail out of indigenous mineral soil. | Trail would be built on uplands. Construction would consist of creating sustainable trail out of indigenous mineral soil. |
| Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern Species Identified by USFWS or WDNR- BER | Karner Blue | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| SOCIOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Number of Landowners Affected | 11, a few of these landowners are not interested in the Ice NST | 4 |
| Public Lands Used Secondary Benefits | None Establishment of the trail here would likely preserve Karner Blue habitat. | None |

TABLE 17–Possible Trail Route Options 16A & 16B:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | ROUTE OPTION 16A | OPTION 16B |
| TRAIL QUALITY | | |
| Approx. Segment | 3 miles | 4 miles |
| Length | | |
| Road Crossings | 2 – county roads | 2 – county roads |
| | | 1 – town road |
| Diversity and Interest | Option would pass | Trail would follow |
| of Route | directly east of | undulating glacial |
| | subdivision. Trail would | topography and pass through |
| | be located on scenic | a mixture of scattered |
| | undulating to rugged | grasslands, pine plantations and oak woodlands and |
| | topography and would skirt kettle ponds pass | along an agricultural field. |
| | through primarily oak | along an agricultural field. |
| | woodlands. | |
| Existing Development | Residential development | Scattered residential |
| and Probability of | exists in subdivision to | development along roadways |
| Future Development | east of trail option. | exists. In the future, possible |
| | Residential infill of | scattered residential lots to |
| | subdivision lots is | be developed in the |
| | proposed for the future | woodlands. |
| | along with preservation of | |
| | woodlands. | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Trail would be built on | Trail would be built on |
| Number of Stream | uplands. Construction | uplands. Construction would |
| Crossings | would consist of side hill | consist of side hill |
| | sustainable trail built out | sustainable trail built out of |
| | of indigenous mineral | indigenous mineral soil. |
| | soil. | |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species | No known E, T, S species in |
| Threatened, or | in the vicinity of the | the vicinity of the segment. |
| Special Concern | segment. | |
| Species Identified by | | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | | |
| BER | | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Number of | 9 | 10 |
| Landowners Affected | N | |
| Public Lands Used | None | None |

TABLE 18–Possible Trail Route Option 17:

| le |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| wn road |
| segment of trail would provide a connection for 15A or 16A to trail route options to the north and Trail would travel along undulating glacial graphy through upland woods and pine plantations. |
| lopment consists of a farmstead to the north of the osed trail. Pine plantations exist with scattered ential development along roadways. A continuation s type of development is possible in the future. o slopes may limit available building sites. |
| |
| would be built on uplands. Construction would st of side hill sustainable trail built out of indigenous ral soil |
| nown E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

TABLE 19–Possible Trail Route Option 18:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE OPTION 18 |
|------------------------|--|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment | 1.5 miles |
| Length | |
| Road Crossings | 2 -town roads |
| Diversity and Interest | Trail would pass through a mixture of pine plantations |
| of Route | and upland woods and culminate with a scenic overview |
| | to the north of a broad glacial valley. |
| Existing Development | A few residences exist along Apache Road. Preservation |
| and Probability of | of the woodlands with possible scattered residential is |
| Future Development | planned for the future. |
| | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ | Trail would be built on uplands. Construction would |
| Number of Stream | consist of side hill sustainable trail built out of indigenous |
| Crossings | mineral soil |
| Endangered, | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| Threatened, or | |
| Special Concern | |
| Species Identified by | |
| USFWS or WDNR- | |
| BER | |
| SOCIOLOGICAL | |
| CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Number of | 3 |
| Landowners Affected | |
| Public Lands Used | None |
| Secondary Benefits | |

TABLE 20–Possible Trail Route Options 19A & 19B:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE |
|--|---|---|
| | SEGMENT 19A | SEGMENT 19B |
| TRAIL QUALITY | | |
| Approx. Segment Length | 3.5 miles | 4 miles |
| Road Crossings | 1 – county road 1 – town road | 2 – county roads |
| Diversity and Interest of Route | Trail would follow a narrow glacial drainageway before traveling over undulating glacial terrain past a number of small kettle ponds through a mixture of oak woodlands and pine plantations. | Trail would travel through a broad glacial valley along an agricultural field and then follow very scenic glacial topography through oak woodlands past a number of small kettle ponds. |
| Existing Development and Probability of Future Development | Scattered residential exist among woodlands along the roadways and near Twin Lakes. Preservation of the woodlands with possible future residential development around Twin Lakes (east of the trail) is planned for the future. | The Camp Moshava development surrounds Fish Lake; scattered residential exists along the roadways. Currently, no development is planned for the future. Preservation of the existing woodlands is expected to be maintained in the future. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Construction Impacts/ Number of Stream Crossings | Trail would be built on uplands. Construction would consist of creating side hill sustainable trail built out of indigenous mineral soil. | Trail would be built on uplands, some rather steep. Construction would consist of creating side hill sustainable trail built out of indigenous mineral soil. Toward the south end of the segment the trail would need to cross the Pine River. A bridge, or upgrading of the current crossing would be required. |
| Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern Species Identified by USFWS or WDNR- BER | Karner Blue | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |

| SOCIOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS | | |
|--------------------------------|------|------|
| Number of | 6 | 7 |
| Landowners Affected | | |
| Public Lands Used | None | None |
| Secondary Benefits | | |

TABLE 21–Possible Trail Route Option 20:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE OPTION 20 |
|--|---|
| TRAIL QUALITY | |
| Approx. Segment Length | 1 mile |
| Road Crossings | 1 – county road |
| Diversity and Interest of Route | Trail would follow glacial topography through a pine plantation and some open land. Route would allow connection to either 21A or 21B |
| Existing Development and Probability of Future Development | Present use consists of planted woodlots and agricultural fields with scattered residences along roadways. Future development of scattered residences is possible, but unlikely. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS | |
| Construction Impacts/ Number of Stream Crossings | Trail would be built on relatively flat uplands. Construction would consist of creating sustainable trail built out of indigenous mineral soil. |
| Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern Species Identified by USFWS or WDNR- BER | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| SOCIOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Number of Landowners Affected | 2 |
| Public Lands Used | None |
| Secondary Benefits | |

Table 22–Possible Route Option 21A & 21B:

| | POSSIBLE TRAIL | POSSIBLE TRAIL ROUTE |
|--|---|--|
| | ROUTE SEGMENT 21A | SEGMENT 21B |
| TRAIL QUALITY | | |
| Approx. Segment Length | .5 mile | .5 mile |
| Road Crossings | 1 – town road | 0 |
| Diversity and Interest of Route | Trail would follow glacial topography primarily through a pine plantation. | Trail would follow undulating glacial topography primarily through a pine plantation. |
| Existing Development and Probability of Future Development | Use is primarily planted woodlots with agricultural lands. Scattered residential development in vacant areas along roadways is a possibility. | Use is primarily planted woodlots with agricultural lands. Scattered residential development in vacant areas along roadways is a possibility. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Construction Impacts/ Number of Stream Crossings | Trail would be built on relatively flat uplands. Construction would consist of creating sustainable trail built out of indigenous mineral soil. | Trail would be built on uplands. Construction would consist of creating sustainable trail out of indigenous mineral soil. |
| Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern Species Identified by USFWS or WDNR- BER SOCIOLOGICAL | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. | No known E, T, S species in the vicinity of the segment. |
| CONSIDERATIONS | | |
| Number of Landowners Affected | 2 | 1 |
| Public Lands Used | Up to 100% if trail is located on forest land owned by the Town of Rose. | None |
| Secondary Benefits | | |

Insert MAP 1 Possible Route Options Back Side Map 1

Insert MAP 2 Possible Route Options Back Side of Map 2

Insert MAP 3 Possible Route Options Back Side of Map 3

Insert MAP 4 Possible Route Options Back Side of Map 4