

SEIS – Significant Issues and Indicator Measures

1. *Water Quality*: Concern was expressed that S&Gs as proposed are more restrictive than necessary to protect the water resources from increased sedimentation resulting from oil and gas development (i.e. road building, timing of erosion control measures, etc). Specifically, the issue was raised that as proposed the standards and guides go beyond what is required by the State best management practices which are specifically designed to ensure that the water resource is protected. Conversely, concern was expressed that certain methods of road construction result in increased sedimentation and therefore should not be permitted (construction during the winter)

Indicator measures:

- Kinds of riparian areas protected (i.e. streams, wetlands, water bodies)
- Widths of buffer distances
- Emphasis on design and location of roads, well pads and other infrastructure
- Road surfacing requirements
- Erosion and sedimentation control
- Maintenance of aquatic habitat

2. *Visual resources*: Concern was expressed that S&Gs as proposed do not adequately address concerns related to visual quality associated with special areas or special features on the forest (areas with higher levels of scenic integrity, or features such as the North Country National Scenic trail).

Indicator measures:

- Can Scenic Integrity Levels (SILs) be maintained?
- If not, can SILs be restored within reasonable timeframes?
- Will impacts to special features be minimized?

3. *Seasonal operating restrictions/Hours of Operation*: Concern was expressed that proposed S&Gs regarding hours of operations could create a situation in which drilling operations cannot be effectively implemented without causing risk of adversely impacting the social, economic and operational aspects associated with oil and gas development activities.

Indicator measures:

- Seasonal restrictions for nesting birds
- Seasonal restrictions on stream crossings to protect wild trout spawning
- Operating restrictions for recreationists

4. *Marcellus shale*: Concern was expressed that S&Gs as proposed do not adequately address the level of road construction and stabilization needed to mitigate for increased sedimentation that may occur due to the level of activities associated with potential future Marcellus shale drilling (ie equipment transport). In addition, concern was expressed that since Marcellus shale drilling would be new, standards and guidelines may not have

adequately addressed the complexity of this new technology (ie water withdrawal, water transport, storage and treatment).

Indicator measures:

- Wildlife protection
- Water quality protection
- Maintains recreation opportunity

5. *Reclamation*: Concern was expressed that the standards and guidelines (design criteria) as proposed do not adequately address concerns related to the need for short and long term reclamation needs.

Indicator measures:

- Are there short term reclamation measures included in S&Gs
- Are there long term reclamation measures included in S&Gs

6. *Fragmentation*: Concern was expressed that S&Gs as proposed do not adequately address the concern of increased fragmentation. Specifically, concern was expressed that the S&Gs need to address minimizing road systems and other surface occupancy for oil and gas development through effective transportation planning and layout.

Indicator measures:

- Will high quality remote habitat areas be maintained?
- Will impacts to species sensitive to fragmentation be minimized?
- Will habitat connectivity and core (interior) habitat be maintained.
- Will deer and turkey winter ranges remain intact