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**FOREST INFORMATION SUMMARY**

**LAND OF**
New England Forestry Foundation  
Chris Pryor  
PO Box 1346  
Littleton MA  01460  
1-978-952-6856  
newenglandforestry.org

**FOREST NAME**
Chase Kimball and Mary Lee Evens Kimball

**TOWN**
Pomfret  
Windham County  
CT

**ROAD**
202 Wolf Den Road, Pomfret, CT 06259

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL ID</th>
<th>TAX MAP</th>
<th>LOT N</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>BOOK</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomfret</td>
<td>39B</td>
<td>0F04</td>
<td>166.91</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARCEL NOTES**
The property was surveyed by Messier and Associates Inc of Manchester CT and was obtained from the town records 8/8/2008. Property boundary lines were painted in red in 2010.

**REFERENCE MAPS**
- USGS Survey
- Aerial Photo
- Forest Stand Map - Color Orthophotos
- Soils Data - USDA Web Soil Survey
- Vicinity of Rare, Threatened & Endangered Species

**OTHER DATA**
- FOREST CODE: CTWDHPFT39B0F04
- # OF COMPARTMENTS
- TOTAL ACRES IN LB: 166.9
MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES:  Chase Kimball and Mary Lee Evens Kimball

Refer to NEFF’s Regional Plan for the foundation’s objectives. Additional specific objectives for the Chase Kimball Forest include the exclusion of hunters, protection of cultural resources and wildlife habitat. Provide periodic sales and active interpretation of sustainable management for the suburban audience.

Regional Management Objectives
Social: NEFF’s forests are owned to fulfill the original goal of teaching private forestland owners the benefits of sustainable forestry. To this end they are all demonstration forests. Additionally, the forests are NEFF’s endowment and as such they are an important source of operating revenue. Within this context individual forests may be utilized to show different aspects of good forestry including varieties of income generation, silviculture, recreation and biodiversity management.

Timber Products and tree utilization will vary by woodlot and economics. The closer a forest is to pulpwood, or biomass market the better the utilization will be.

Ecological: Practices recommended in this management plan address the preparation of products sold in commercial forest products markets. However, many trees also provide non-commercial values such as wildlife habitat, visual quality enhancement, and water quality protection. Certain trees (e.g., large cavity trees) that have minimal commercial value, may be particularly valuable for wildlife habitat. Such trees should be retained. At times, it may be desirable to fell culls or low value trees to achieve safety or silvicultural objectives. The decision may be made to leave these trees on site to provide woody debris for wildlife habitat or nutrient recycling rather than merchandizing them for low value products.

Additional information is located in the forest management plan for this property.

FOREST DESCRIPTION

The forest was donated by Mary Lee Evans Kimball through her will dated 1984. It came to the foundation on March 14, 1997. It is named after her husband.

The region was once the domain of the Mohegan Chief Uncas. The name Mashamoquet is Indian for "stream of good fishing" and originally was applied to the entire area. Later, Captain John Sabin built a house here to serve as an outpost and the settlement gradually increased in size. In 1723, parish and township privileges were granted and the town became Pomfret, named after Pontefract in Yorkshire, England.

There was a harvest on this lot in 1999 done in accordance with the original Connwood Mtg Plan written in 1999. It was a significant harvest removing 48% of the pine sawlogs, 37% of the oak sawlogs, 25% of other hardwood sawlogs and 12 % of the pulpwood. Original total tons/ac were about 41 and post harvest tons/ac were about 31.

The property was inventoried by Chris Fox of the Monadnock Center in July of 2008 to update the management plan. Information on past management by Connwood is limited to what is in this plan and that information is located at NEFF offices. A hard copy of the survey and all current information is in the files at the Monadnock Center.

A harvest was completed in the northern most section of the property, area 1 as delineated on the forest stand map, in accordance with the 2008 management plan. This harvest removed mature red oak and black oak individuals in dominant canopy positions as well as poor quality red maple in intermediate canopy positions. Total basal area in this area was reduced by approximately 25 sq. ft./acre during this harvest.

The property was re-inventoried by Nathan Piche of the Tomhannock center in August of 2018 to update the management plan.

Chase Kimball and Mary Lee Evens Kimball Memorial
The survey for the property indicates that there is some right to pass and repass over the old road from Jericho Road and Wolf Den Road to the old railroad property which is now owned by the State of Connecticut.

**FOREST CERTIFICATIONS**

This forest is certified under the following program(s):

BV-FM/COC
COMPARTMENT LOCATION
The Kimball Memorial Forest has a 911 address of 202 Wolf Den Road, Pomfret, CT 06259. The property is located in northeastern Connecticut within Windham County. Compartment 1 includes the entire property.

ACCESS
There is 1730 feet of frontage on Wolf Den Road, BUT this only gives good logging access to a narrow area along the road. The majority of the land is behind a wetland which presents access issues. Contact Connecticut Department of Energy & Environmental Protection personnel for specific information on crossing regulations. Five logical management units/stands have been identified.

Unit/Stand 1 - Oak & northern hardwood stand located at the northern end of the property. North of a wetland area. This is the area that was involved in the timber harvest in 2010.

Wetland - Wetland area dividing the north end from the south end of the property.

Unit/Stand 2 - Oak & northern hardwood stand located in the center of the property. Stand conditions in this unit are similar to stand 1, however, it is delineated as a different unit because no timber harvesting was completed here, resulting in a more dense forest.

Unit/Stand 3 - Mixedwoods stand, located in the center of the property, dominated by white pine and red maple.

Unit/Stand 4 - Oak & northern hardwood stand located at the southern end of the property. Red oak and black oak are abundant in dominant and co-dominant canopy positions. Red maple is common in intermediate canopy positions. White pine is also scattered throughout the stand.

BOUNDARIES
The property was surveyed in 1990. The boundaries along Jericho Road are posted with NEFF signs and a large NEFF sign is located here as well. The entire boundary is posted with black and yellow “No Hunting” signs. The boundaries not located along the road have been blazed and painted, however, in many places these marks are either faded or grown over and need to be redone.

TIMBER MANAGEMENT
Conwood proposed and conducted a harvest in 1999 consisting of both some shelterwood and some improvement work.

The past harvest, in the area now designated as stand 3 & 4, had resulted in a stand of oak and mixed hardwood dominated by sawtimber sized stems of fair to good quality. In some areas Connwood foresters attempted to attain some regeneration using the shelterwood method. In these areas the overstory consists of well-spaced sawtimber size trees. Regeneration of the area largely failed due to a combination of deer browse and dense fern and blueberry growing in the understory. Future attempts should employ a combination of soil scarification and clearcutting to try and overwhelm the deer with browse and break up the fern cover.
COMPARTMENT DESCRIPTION  (continued)

HARVESTING SYSTEM & RATIONALE
Future management should use even-aged regeneration methods and focus on growing a combination of oak, pine and northern hardwoods. The major problem for management is the large deer population. White-tailed deer prefer oak browse to other species and have frustrated past efforts to regenerate portions of the forest. Ideally, a deer management program would help to reduce numbers of deer in the area. Currently, there is a prohibition of hunting on the property which is unlikely to be removed. In order to regenerate desirable species in sufficient density to provide wildlife habitat and produce quality growing stock, a combination of seed tree and clear cut methods should be used with soil scarification to break up dense fern, blueberry and sweet pepperbush growing in the understory. Recommended harvests should take into account current market conditions. Harvests should not be forced into arbitrary time schedules when market conditions would result in a significant loss of harvest value. Current harvests should focus on thinning the slower growing stands in an attempt to improve growth of these stands. This will require a cordwood market. An attempt should be made to market the cordwood and pulpwood although markets for these products have historically been poor in CT.

WILDLIFE HABITAT
This tract of land is adjacent to the 1,800 acres of state park and forest. As a result, this land is part of a large block of forestland, creating ideal habitat for a variety of species. The property is dominated by oak, creating an abundant mast crop. Vernal pools are present on the property, creating breeding habitat for many amphibians. This tract of land also contains both wooded and open wetlands, ideal for many avian, amphibian and mammal species. Two large shrub swamp and wet meadows are present on the property which are potentially significant habitat features for certain species. These features are significant in that they are limited in scope in the state. The Kimball Memorial Forest and adjacent forestland is dominated by mature forest. Creating some young dense stands on the property would help to diversify the habitat available on the property and in the area as a whole. These stands can be created through regeneration harvests but, should consider current market conditions. As regenerated stands develop and become less dense they lose their value to some wildlife species. A portion of the forest should be regenerated every 10 to 15 years to maintain an element of young forest on the property.

RECREATION
Hunting is prohibited on the property as a condition of the donation. There is a foot path along the old railroad bed running along the west side of the forest. Several trails have been flagged through the property. These trails receive light use with some evidence of limited ATV traffic. A trail through the wetland in the northeastern section of the property has been developed. Planking has been installed so hikers can walk through the wetland without getting their feet wet.

WATER QUALITY, WETLANDS & RIPARIAN ZONES
Elliott Brook and network of streams and wetlands on the property drain to the south into Baker Pond and Black well Brook. Management of the timber using good forest practices should protect the quality of the water in these streams while diversifying the habitat within and along their edges. In riparian areas around these streams and wetlands a buffer of at least 50 feet will be maintained during all forest management activities. No timber harvesting will take place in these riparian buffer zones. Furthermore, all Best Management Practices (BMP’s) for water quality while harvesting forest products found in the 2012 Connecticut Field Guide will be followed and will be vital in protecting the water quality of streams, wetlands and the associate riparian areas on the property.
CULTURAL FEATURES
Old roads, cart paths, a well, stonewalls, barbed wire and homestead site indicate past use of this areas for a homestead. These features can be considered historically and culturally significant. As a result these features should not be disturbed in any way during forest management activities.

RARE & ENDANGERED SPECIES
A request for information to the state yields a letter identifying the area as being in the general vicinity of known Eastern Hognosed Snake occurrence. This is a listed CT Species of Concern. Shapefiles from the Natural Diversity Database indicate on species known in the vicinity of the southern edge of the property and two records to the east on the property of the State of Connecticut.

PLANT COMMUNITIES
No unusual plant communities have been observed.

FOREST HEALTH: INSECTS & DISEASES
The gypsy moth is causing significant defoliation throughout the property, particularly on red oak and black oak individuals. There is a fungus that specifically attacks the gypsy moth caterpillars. This fungus has kept the gypsy moth population in check, however, the fungus needs rain to become activated. Dry spring/early summer conditions in the last several years has resulted in gypsy moth populations to grow substantially, reaching outbreak status in south-central and eastern Connecticut. This has resulted in the mortality of some individuals throughout the property, succumbing to repeated defoliation.

Individual trees can be treated with insecticides in order to protect them from gypsy moth. Unfortunately, it is not feasible to treat an entire tract of forestland in this manor. Adaptive management through monitoring damage and salvage harvests are the best approach to controlling gypsy moth in the woodland setting. Timber harvests should aim to salvage dead trees whenever possible. It is recommended that salvage harvests take place as soon as possible because the value of wood degrades rapidly once a tree dies.

FOREST HEALTH: INVASIVE & EXOTIC SPECIES
There is a moderate density of Japanese barberry found on the property. This shrub is an invasive plant and is extremely competitive, often threatening to displace native understory vegetation. This plant can also inhibit desirable regeneration from becoming established. The density of this invasive is moderate and is mostly located on the eastern edge of the tract. As a result, it is not currently posing a significant impact to the health or quality of the forest. However, it is recommended that this invasive plant be removed via herbicide treatment or manual pulling in order to prevent it from becoming an issue in the future.

FOREST PROTECTION
Best Management Practices (BMP’s) will be followed, and will be vital in protecting water quality. Special care must be taken during any entry to protect the water quality. The forester will ensure compliance with BMP’s.

Special considerations must be taken during any entry to protect the soil integrity. BMP’s will be followed and will be vital in protecting soil properties. The forester will monitor BMP compliance on active timber sales. A winter harvest when soils are frozen or summer harvest when soils are dry would minimize compaction where applicable. The integrity of the soil properties of the tract will be least impacted if these recommendations are followed.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLES
During timber harvesting activities, retention areas will be left as a representative sample of the natural forest community contained within the property. On this property the wetland areas as well as stand 3 will be left as representative sample areas.
SURROUNDING PROPERTIES
Surrounding properties are a mixture of residential housing, agricultural land and forestland.

SOILS INFORMATION
Area 1 Dominant Soil Series: 47C Woodbridge fine sandy loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes, extremely stony
Area 2 Dominant Soil Series: 47C Woodbridge fine sandy loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes, extremely stony
Area 3 Dominant Soil Series: 47C Woodbridge fine sandy loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes, extremely stony
Area 4 Dominant Soil Series: 47C Woodbridge fine sandy loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes, extremely stony
Wetland Dominant Soils Series: 3 Ridgebury, Leicester, and Whitman soils, 0 to 8 percent slopes, extremely stony

The forestland soils on the Kimball Memorial Forest have an average site index of 72 for red oak. This indicates that on average these soils are capable of growing a red oak to 72 feet in 50 years. These soils are capable of growing and producing as much as 57 cubic feet of fiber per acre per year. These are nutrient rich soils that make for a productive stand of timber. There are wetlands on the property that feature wet, saturated soils. These areas should not be disturbed during forest management activities in order to not disturb the water quality of those areas. Forest management activities that take place on this tract of land would be best to complete during the dry summer months or during the frozen winter months. Erosion potential is moderate and erosion control measures are needed during and after silvicultural treatments. Furthermore, any management activities that take place on this tract of land will use caution in regards to current soil conditions when operating in order to not severely damage soil structure and composition.

AESTHETICS
During all forest management activities, slash will be cut down to three feet or less in order to maintain an aesthetically pleasing stand of timber. Cutting slash down to this low level will also make recreating on the property easier and more enjoyable.

FIRE MANAGEMENT
Fire is not used as a management tool on this property.

MONITORING - See NEFCo Regional Management Standard

REVISION/UPDATES - See NEFCo Regional Management Standard

CONTRACTOR/WORKER REQUIREMENTS - See NEFCo Regional Management Standard

PLAN AVAILABILITY - See NEFCo Regional Management Standard

ALLOWABLE CUT - See NEFCo Regional Management Standard

CHEMICAL USE - See NEFCo Regional Management Standard
# ESTIMATED TIMBER INVENTORY AND VALUE

Chase Kimball and Mary Lee Evens Kimball

Compartment 1 of 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR OF INVENTORY</th>
<th>END YEAR OF ESTIMATE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED GROWTH RATES % PER YEAR</th>
<th>SPECIES /PRODUCT</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
<th>$/UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>SFTWD 0.025 HDWD 0.015 PULP 0.015</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>MBF</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spruce /Fir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hemlock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Pine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other softwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Softwood Pal/Tie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>523.1</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>130,763.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Oak</td>
<td>203.4</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>40,688.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Oak</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>1,439.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>4,845.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Ash</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>7,453.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Birch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow /Black Birch</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>1,636.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Cherry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9,864.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Hardwood</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,193.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardwood Pallet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Softwood Pulp</td>
<td>161.5</td>
<td>CORDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spruce/Fir pulp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hemlock Pulp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardwood Pulp</td>
<td>2,433.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>24,335.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gr Stock: Softwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gr Stock: Hardwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATED TIMBER VALUE** $227,540.21

**NOTE:** This table displays the estimated timber inventory at the “end” year. It is based on the following:
1. Starting inventory volumes are from the year of the cruise displayed.
2. Growth of the starting volume using the percentages displayed, compounded annually.
3. Less any harvest occurring in the interim years, and subsequent changes in compounded growth.

**INVENTORY** 20 BAF

**METHODS:** 1 point completed for every 3 acres of forestland
New England Forestry Foundation, Inc.
Chase Kimball & Mary Lee Evens Kimball Memorial Forest
Pomfret, CT
Compartment 1 Areas Map

Sketch map for management and planning purposes only, NOT A LEGAL SURVEY
Data obtained from CT DEEP, & New England Forestry Consultants, Inc.
This Section of the management plan contains descriptive information about each of the land areas that collectively make up a Compartment. Each Area was delimited based on key attributes which make it reasonable to treat that acreage as a management unit. The key attributes can be related to one or more of a variety of features from human defined land uses, to distinct or limiting natural features. Some examples are:

*Land Use Characteristics:* Timber management, Agriculture, Wildlife management, recreational use, reserve or buffer lands, historic and esthetic sites.

*Natural Features:* Soil types, terrain, accessibility, or biological features, such as plant communities, wetlands, water bodies, and habitat types.

The attributes are not necessarily exclusive, and are more frequently interrelated than discreet features. The size of the areas is also dependent on the key attributes. Generally the higher the value or importance of the attribute, the smaller the area can potentially be. For general timber management purposes the upper size is limited by what is a practical planning unit as determined by operations layout/timing and by the forester’s ability to manage the area within a single operating interval. In simple terms the Area unit defines the “where” in the standard “where, what, how much, and when” management query.
Implement a seed tree harvest on 20 acres in the northwestern most corner of the area. This treatment should remove approximately 88 sq. ft./acre and should retain 10 sq. ft./acre in large sawtimber sized red oak.
Area Id: 2
Total Acres: 48.9
Timber Mgmt Acres: 48.9

Land Use: Forest, Hardwoods

Mgmt Priorities: Timber - Hardwood, REC Recreation & Aesthetics

Restrictions: Water

Timber Management Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Class</th>
<th>Sawlog</th>
<th>% Seedling</th>
<th>Sapling</th>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Sawlog</th>
<th>Lg Dia 26+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crop Tree Stocking</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Basal Area: 151
Ba Ags: 95
Ba Ugs: 56
Mean Stand Diameter: 12.0
Volume / Acre Mbf: 7
Volume/acres Cords: 26.0
Trees/acre: 191.0

Major Tree Species
- Red Oak
- Red Maple
- Black Oak
- Yellow Birch
- White Oak

Ba Ft2
- % Total Ba: 35%
- % Total Ba: 28%
- % Total Ba: 22%
- % Total Ba: 9%
- % Total Ba: 3%

Narrative: Oak and Mixed Hardwoods

Much of this area was likely old pasture except for areas too wet which may have been forested for longer than much of the abandoned pasture in the area. The forest is dominated by red oak followed by red maple, black oak, yellow birch and white oak. Site quality is fair to excellent. The better drained areas contain some of the best oak on the property. Much of the oak throughout the stand is defoliated due to a gypsy moth outbreak. This has resulted in the mortality of many individuals. A salvage harvest is recommended for this area in order to salvage the value of standing dead oak before rot and decay compromises the integrity of the wood, thereby reducing their value. A moderate density of Japanese barberry is present in this stand, particularly on the eastern most edge of the area where the stand borders an agricultural field on an adjacent property. This stand has a shrub swamp to the north of it and includes forested wetlands. The long term management of this area should focus on even-aged management methods, along with adjacent areas.

Recommended Treatment(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Salvage Harvest</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salvage harvest should be completed within this stand in order to salvage the value of red oak, white oak and black oak that have died as a result of repeated gypsy moth defoliation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Id</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Timber Mgmt Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Use**: Forest, Mixedwoods  
**Mgmt Priorities**: Reserve, Reserve  
**Restrictions**: None  
**Soil Type(s)**: 47C,  
**Timber Management Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Class</th>
<th>Sawlog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crop Tree Stocking</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Basal Area</th>
<th>Ba Ags 80</th>
<th>Ba Ugs 80</th>
<th>Mean Stand Diameter</th>
<th>Trees/acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume / Acre Mbf</th>
<th>Volume/acres Cords</th>
<th>% Total Ba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Tree Species</th>
<th>Ba Ft2</th>
<th>% Total Ba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative**

Mixedwoods  
This stand is dominated by white pine in the dominant and co-dominant canopy positions. Red maple is present in intermediate canopy positions, growing beneath the towering canopy of white pine. The white pine weevil has resulted in the poor growth form of many of the white pines present within this stand. The white pine is also over mature, which is evident in the data (the average diameter of white pine in this stand is 25 inches). As a result, many are past their prime and are rotten, broken or damaged. This has created excellent wildlife habitat for a variety of species that live in cavities of white pine trees. It is recommended that this stand be left as a reserve area in order to maintain this wildlife habitat. Also, this is the only area on the property that is dominated by a conifer, so it should be left as a reserve to maintain the diversity that this stand brings to the property.

**Recommended Treatment(s)**

No treatments are recommended at this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Forest, Hardwoods</th>
<th>Soil Type(s)</th>
<th>47C,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Priorities</td>
<td>Timber, REC Recreation &amp; Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictions</td>
<td>Historic/cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size Class</td>
<td>Pole Sawlog</td>
<td>% Seedling</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sapling</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pole</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop Tree Stocking</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Sawlog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lg Dia 26+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Basal Area</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Ba Ft2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Total Ba</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume / Acre Mbf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ba Ugs</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Stand Diameter</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trees/acre</td>
<td>166.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Tree Species</td>
<td>Red oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Ash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/cultural</td>
<td>Mixed Oak and Hardwoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This area is dominated by red oak, black oak, and white oak with components of hickory, red maple, white ash and sugar maple. The site quality is good with less well drained soils than other mixed oak stands on the Kimball Forest. Some of the area consists of forested wetlands that are operable during the winter or the drier part of the summer. Also included is a small shrub swamp that is associated with the perennial watercourse that runs southerly through the stand. This area should be managed for high quality red oak sawlogs using even-aged regeneration methods. The past harvest thinned a portion of this forest and there is a good stocking of high quality stems. Due to the quality of the timber in this area, future thinnings should be timed to coordinate with good red oak markets. Currently, much of the area is not in need of a thinning, however, small portions not thinned in past harvests may be thinned during harvest operations in adjacent stands. In the northwestern most corner of this stand there is an old homestead site. Here there are stone walls, barbed wire fencing, a cellar hole and a well. This area is considered historically and culturally significant. As a result, all forest management activities will avoid this area in order to preserve these historic/cultural elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Treatment(s)** No treatments are recommended at this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Id</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Timber Mgmt Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Use**
Wetland, Wetland

**Mgmt Priorities**
S&W Soil & Water, HAB Habitat

**Restrictions**
Wetlands

**Timber Management Data**
Not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop Tree Stocking</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Class</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Basal Area</th>
<th>Ba Ags</th>
<th>Ba Ugs</th>
<th>Mean Stand Diameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume/Acre Mbf</td>
<td>Volume/acres Cords</td>
<td>Trees/acre</td>
<td>154.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Tree Species</td>
<td>Ba Ft2</td>
<td>% Total Ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative**
This is a wetland area. Herbaceous wetland species dominate this area and in some areas red maple and yellow birch in the pole size class are scattered throughout. No management activities are recommended for this area in order to preserve it as wildlife habitat, not disturb water quality and to not damage soil composition.

**Recommended Treatment(s)**
No treatments are recommended at this time.
# Recommended Treatment Report

**Chase Kimball and Mary Lee Evens Kimball Memorial Forest**

**2020 - 2028**

By year, these are the recommended activities, with their estimated cash flow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Treatment Type, subtype</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Net Cash Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Seed Tree, Recommended</td>
<td>Implement a seed tree harvest on 20 acres in the northwestern most corner of the area. This treatment should remove approximately 88 sq. ft./acre and should retain 10 sq. ft./acre in large sawtimber sized red oak and black oak individuals that have full, healthy crowns to serve as a seed source. Harvest should be completed in the summer in order to scarify the soil and damage competing vegetation such as mountain laurel, sweet pepper bush and highbush blueberry.</td>
<td>$16,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>Salvage Harvest, Recommended</td>
<td>Salvage harvest should be completed within this stand in order to salvage the value of red oak, white oak and black oak that have died as a result of repeated gypsy moth defoliation.</td>
<td>$31,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2028 |
|------|------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| all  | all  | Management Plan, Update Recommended | Update management plan | -$2,500 |

Chase Kimball and Mary Lee Evens Kimball Memorial Forest
Estimated net cash flow from all compartments on this forest is: $45390

This is a proposed plan of work and subject to change based on the owner’s needs and goals. Timing of activities may be changed based on market conditions or other influences. Dollar figures are based on “today’s dollars” and do not reflect changes due to inflation or market fluctuations. All figures are estimates, actual costs and income are subject to change based on detailed estimates, service work orders, and contracts.
### Completed Treatment Report

#### Chase Kimball and Mary Lee Evens Kimball Memorial

#### 2003 - 2018

By year, these are the completed activities, with their actual cash flow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Treatment Type, subtype</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>Harvest Inter., Thinning</td>
<td>Completed Sawtimber and cordwood thinning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Harvest Inter., Thinning</td>
<td>Completed Crown thinning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Harvest Inter., Thinning</td>
<td>Completed Crown thinning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Harvest Regen., Patch Cut</td>
<td>Completed Patch cut to regenerate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2003

- **Management Plan Update**
  - Service requested by PF. to provide inventory volume and valuation for forest. ARt Talmadge Conwood Invoice 991-03 8/29/03. Half of invoice to this forest

### 2008

- **Management Plan Update**
  - Update by Monadnock Center

### 2009

- **Boundary Blaze, paint**
  - repaint and blaze
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>Management Plan, Update</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Update management plan
Sketch map for management and planning purposes only, NOT A LEGAL SURVEY
Data obtained from CT DEEP, & New England Forestry Consultants, Inc.
3 Ridgebury, Leicester, and Whitman soils, extremely stony
45B Woodbridge fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes
46B Woodbridge fine sandy loam, 2 to 8 percent slopes, very stony
47C Woodbridge fine sandy loam, 2 to 15 percent slopes, extremely stony
59C Gloucester gravelly sandy loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes, extremely stony
62C Canton and Charlton soils, 3 to 15 percent slopes, extremely stony
73C Charlton-Chatfield complex, 3 to 15 percent slopes, very rocky
85B Paxton and Montauk fine sandy loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes, very stony