

Appendix A – Analysis and Alternatives Considered

Appendix A – Analysis and Alternatives Considered	1
Introduction.....	2
Park Classification	2
Resource Analysis and Alternatives	3
Natural Resource Protection Strategies/Management	3
1. Designations.....	3
2. Stream Management and Protection	9
3. Lakes.....	14
4. Dams	16
5. Invasive Species Management.....	17
7. Open Fields	20
8. Mowed Lawn Areas.....	21
9. Wildlife Resources and Nuisance Wildlife.....	22
10. Rare and Endangered Species.....	23
11. Subsurface Resources	24
Recreation Resource Development/Management.....	25
1. Camping.....	25
2. Primitive / Carry In Camping	27
3. Backpack Camping	28
4. Cabins and Cottages.....	29
5. Group Camps	31
6. Visitor Center and Education/Interpretive Center	33
7. Equestrian Staging/Camping Area.....	35
8. Swimming.....	37
9. Picnicking	39
10. Court and Field Games	40
11. Playgrounds.....	41
12. Boating.....	42
13. Hunting	44
14. Fishing.....	46
15. Sledding	47
16. Stargazing	49
Cultural Resource Protection Strategies/Management	50
Archaeological Resources.....	50
Historic Resources	50
Scenic Resource Protection.....	50
1. Fauna and Flora Observation.....	50
2. Vista Management	52
Infrastructure Development	54
1. Regional Maintenance Center.....	54
2. Sawmill	56
3. Red House Maintenance Facility.....	58
4. Quaker Area Maintenance Facility	59
5. Quaker Area Administration Building.....	60
6. Utilities: Electric	61
7. Vehicular Entrance Control/Access.....	62
8. Premier Entrance on ASP 2	64

9.	Regional Administration Headquarters.....	66
10.	Roads/Bridges	68

Introduction

This appendix contains the results of detailed analysis and considerable discussion of elements of natural resource protection, recreation resource development and operations proposed for the park. Each element is analyzed using the inventory information (Chapters 2 and 3), park goals (Chapter 4), and other factors. Each element analysis includes considerations as to the appropriateness of each alternative for the park. Findings from this analysis are used in identifying the preferred alternative for each element of the resource categories. The status quo, alternatives, considerations and preferred alternative for individual elements are described in tabular form.

A complete description of the park master plan that is the combination of all the preferred alternatives is found in Chapter 6 of this document.

Park Classification

Since its development in 1974, the land classification system has been a component of OPRHP's planning process and the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). It is constantly being updated as new information is developed. The current system utilizes natural and cultural resources characteristics, land uses, levels of improvements, physical capacity and other management related data to identify appropriate activities and classifications for lands administered by OPRHP. More information on the land classification system can be found in SCORP (OPRHP 2009)

Background for Analysis

Allegany State Park is currently classified as a Scenic Park. This classification is appropriate because of its significant scenic features, high level of use, and mix of natural areas with limited developed areas.

Alternatives:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Scenic Park

Considerations:

The park will retain its current classification.

Preferred Alternative – Status Quo

No change to the park classification is being recommended.

Resource Analysis and Alternatives

Natural Resource Protection Strategies/Management

1. Designations

The Allegany State Park planning process addresses two laws that allow state agencies to designate lands under their jurisdiction as Natural Heritage Areas (NHA), and Bird Conservation Areas (BCA).

Natural Heritage Area(s)

The goal of the New York Natural Heritage Areas Program (NHA) is to provide state land managers with a tool to recognize and assist in the protection of rare animals, rare plants, and significant natural communities on state-owned land. The NHA Program was established in 2002 in amendments to the Environmental Conservation Law (§11-0539.7). An NHA designation does not preclude existing or future land use proposals, nor should the designation prohibit park development or operational needs. In order to be eligible for NHA designation, an area must meet any one of the following criteria:

- provide habitat for "endangered species" or "threatened species" of animals or plants;
- provide habitat for rare species as defined by the Natural Heritage Program (NHP); or
- contain "significant ecological communities" where such term means all rare ecological communities that are rare in the state as well as outstanding examples of more common communities.

Background for Analysis

There is currently no NHA designated within Allegany State Park. The 2004 NHP report (Evans 2004) and the 2008-2009 NHP study (Lundgren, Smith and Evans 2010 in prep.) identified almost the entire park as significant natural communities (Figure 10). Eighteen mapped occurrences of eight different natural community types within the park are considered ecologically significant from a statewide perspective. Statewide rare or uncommon types include four occurrences of Allegheny oak forest, six of maple-basswood rich mesic forest, and one expansive occurrence of rich mesophytic forest. Outstanding examples of more common communities (also of statewide significance) are a large hemlock-northern hardwood forest, beech-maple mesic forests, two rocky headwater streams and one intermittent stream. A small sliver of a large floodplain forest also occurs within the park. The park contains the largest known extent of old growth forest in the state outside of the Adirondacks and Catskills. The park also supports documented populations of 17 rare species of plants and animals and historical records for many others. The NHP recognizes the exceptional importance of the park to biodiversity for both its ecological communities and species and considers the entire park as eligible as an NHA. To summarize, the park contains and supports all three of the NHA criteria listed in the law.

Alternatives:

Considerations :

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

There would not be any statewide recognition of the significant ecological communities.

Alternative 2

Alternatives:

Considerations :

Designate selected areas of the park.

This would provide statewide recognition of the selected significant ecological communities but not the park as a whole.

Alternative 3

Designate the entire park.

This would provide statewide recognition of the importance of the broader unglaciated landscape and the associated ecological communities

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 3 – Designate the entire park.

This direction will provide greater recognition for the park and the opportunity to highlight the significant ecological communities in the park.

Bird Conservation Area

The Bird Conservation Area (BCA) program aims to integrate bird conservation into agency planning, management and research projects, within the context of the agency mission. Bird Conservation Areas are described under Article 11, Title 20 of the Environmental Conservation Law (ECL). The designation itself does not preclude existing or future land use proposals, nor should the designation prohibit park development or operational needs. In addition to recognizing the importance of bird conservation within the planning process, BCA designation can create heightened public awareness of the site's important bird community, as well as funding opportunities for bird-related education, research and conservation.

Background for Analysis

There is currently no BCA designated within Allegany State Park. In order to qualify for designation as a BCA, a site must meet at least one of the nine criteria outlined in the ECL. Following staff evaluation of the bird community and habitat, it was determined that the park meets five of the nine BCA criteria as shown below and that the entire park is eligible for BCA designation.

Migratory Concentration Site – The forests, meadows, and beaver ponds of Allegany State Park provide significant stopover habitat for migratory songbirds during both spring and fall migration. A minimum of 62 species of Neotropical migratory songbirds use the park as a stopover location. (OPRHP 2008)

Diverse Species Concentration Site – The large extent of interior forest habitat at Allegany, and the wide range of habitat types, attract a high diversity of bird species. Over 220 species have been observed within the park boundaries. (OPRHP 2008)

Individual Species Concentration Site – Allegany State Park supports one of the largest populations of Cerulean Warblers found in New York, a state species of special concern. (Rosenberg et al. 2000) In addition, a large breeding population of Ospreys is found in within the park. (New York Breeding Bird Atlas 2000)

Species at Risk Site – In addition to the breeding Cerulean Warblers and Ospreys (both special concern) found within the park, Bald Eagles (state threatened), Sharp-shinned Hawks, Cooper's Hawks, Northern Goshawks, and Red-shouldered Hawks (special concern) occur commonly within the park. (OPRHP 2008)

Bird Research Site – Allegany State Park has been the site of numerous bird research projects beginning in the 1920s with research by State Museum scientists. These studies have investigated long-term changes in the park's bird community, and the influence of disturbances, such as tornados, on the distribution of birds within the park. Bird research is ongoing at Allegany, including two long-term bird banding projects. (White 1988, Baird 1990, LeBlanc and White 2000)

Alternatives:

Considerations :

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

There would not be any statewide recognition of the park and its importance to bird populations.

Alternative 2

This would provide statewide recognition of the

Alternatives:

Considerations :

Designate selected areas of the park.

park's importance in selected areas but not the park as a whole.

There are five different criteria within the BCA law that have been met at Allegany State Park. Delineation of areas for each would be difficult at best.

Alternative 3

Designate the entire park.

This would provide statewide recognition of the importance of the park as a whole to bird populations.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 3 – Designate the entire park.

This alternative provides the opportunity for greater recognition of the park as an important habitat for resident and migratory bird populations. This alternative also most easily responds to the best examples of bird habitat and responds to changes that may occur through natural processes.

Park Preservation Areas

Background for Analysis

There are currently no Park Preservation Areas designated in Allegany State Park. The New York Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law (PRHPL) directs OPRHP to operate and maintain the State Park and Historic Site system to conserve, protect, and enhance the natural, ecological, historic, cultural, and recreational resources contained therein and to provide for the public enjoyment of and access to these resources in a manner which will protect them for future generations (PRHPL Section 3.02). Moreover, Article 20 within the PRHPL is designed to provide long term protection to unique and valuable natural or historical features (Appendix XX).

Many varied recreation opportunities exist in Allegany State Park. The Park's public campgrounds, cabin loops, group camps, picnic and day use areas, swimming beaches, and educational facilities draw patrons from a wide area. The park's developed road network provides public access to the park's amenities and scenic driving experiences. Allegany's expansive forests also support a wide variety of additional recreational opportunities including hiking, snowmobiling, horse back-riding, cross-country skiing, bicycling, hunting and fishing. These recreational activities are important traditions that contribute to the park's rich character and history and are entirely compatible with maintaining the ecological health of the park.

In addition to its outstanding recreational values, the vast scale, diversity, and ecological integrity of Allegany State Park's mature forests, streams, and wetlands are unique within the New York State Park system. Allegany State Park consists of 64,000 acres of forests that have been permanently protected as public parkland and allowed to develop for nearly a century into magnificent mature forests. The park's forested ecosystems provide habitat for many species of wildlife – mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and insects – that have evolved to thrive in large, intact, mature forests, a type of habitat that is becoming more rare across New York's landscape. The park's intact landscape also supports high quality streams and wetlands that harbor a rich diversity of fish and aquatic species. And, the park is home to the largest old growth forests anywhere in New York outside of the Adirondack and Catskill Parks, as well as numerous rare, threatened and endangered species of plants and animals.

Alternatives:	Considerations :
Alternative 1 – Status Quo	There would not be any Park Preservation Areas designated.
Alternative 2	
Designate a selected area of the park.	This would create a Park Preservation area within Allegany State Park according to PRHPL section 20. Sections of the park can be excluded from the Park Preservation Area to provide continued availability of existing uses.
Alternative 3	
Designate entire park as a Park Preserve	The nature of the activities within the park and the level of development to not support

Alternatives:

Considerations :

this designation.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

The designation of a Park Preservation Area in Allegany State Park will increase the recognition and protection of important, unique natural, historic and cultural resources while allowing for continued passive recreation including hiking, biking, horseback riding, cross-country skiing, back-country camping, hunting and fishing. The exclusion of certain areas from the designation will also insure that the availability of operational needs and motorized recreation will continue.

2. Stream Management and Protection

Management of Streams for Native Brook Trout

Background for Analysis

Currently five streams or sections of streams are managed to maintain native brook trout populations. Four of these include sections of Quaker Run, Stoddard Brook, Beehunter Creek and Trib 17 of Red House Brook. The fifth is McIntosh Brook which is managed as a pilot project, in partnership with Trout Unlimited and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

Beaver dams are removed from park streams only when they are affecting park roads or other infrastructure. No beaver dams are currently present on McIntosh Brook but under the research pilot project they will be removed in the future if they are found within the project area.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 - Status Quo

Those streams now managed will continue to be managed including the pilot project on McIntosh Brook. Beaver dams will not be removed for stream management purposes except in the McIntosh Brook pilot project area. They will continue to be removed for infrastructure protection.

Alternative 2

Same as alternative 1 but if the McIntosh Brook project is successful it can be expanded into other streams on a case by case basis.

If results of pilot project are promising, could have beneficial impact on trout in other waterways in the park.

Careful consideration will be made as to the current condition of the stream and the possible positive benefits and impacts of management.

Alternative 3

Remove beaver dams where impacting native brook trout

Open up streams where beaver impoundments are warming the waters and inhibiting travel of trout up and downstream and mitigate other impacts of the beaver dams.

Alternative 4

Discontinue pilot project on McIntosh Brook.

Information will no longer be gathered on effects of various specific stream management techniques. Other streams that may benefit from this type of management will not be identified.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

Under this alternative the trout streams of the park will continue to be managed in the way they are at present. McIntosh Brook will continue as a pilot project for brook trout habitat improvement. If positive results are seen from the pilot project, an expansion of habitat improvement measures may be made into other streams in the park.

Stream Bank Protection

Background for Analysis

Stream bank erosion is occurring in certain developed and undeveloped areas of the park. , Erosion events in developed areas may be cause a threat to park infrastructure such as bridges, trails, culverts or roads. Currently, the park staff engages in stream bank protection where infrastructure is threatened. Stream bank protection has been accomplished using natural materials such as native plantings, rip rap and, on occasion where necessary, channel dredging. Trees have been planted along stream banks for stabilization and stream shading.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 - Status Quo

Stream bank protection will be used where infrastructure (buildings, roads, bridges, culverts, utilities, etc) is being threatened, and maintaining existing stream channels in high use areas.

In natural areas stream meanders may result in loss of vegetation and soil. At the same time there may be buildup of new soil where the eroded soil settles out, or it may be carried further downstream and deposited to form new bank configurations.

Alternative 2

Alternative 1 and using stream stabilization techniques in undeveloped areas.

Stream banks will not meander in their natural course. Deposition of materials and natural flow of soil downstream will be diminished.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 1

Park staff will continue to take actions such as rip-rap and plantings to protect park infrastructure where they deem it may be threatened in the future. These actions will help increase native plant populations, provide trees for bank protection and shading, preserve existing stream channels in high use areas, while allowing natural processes to occur in the undeveloped parts of the park.

Stream Water Quality

Background for Analysis

The Natural Heritage Report (2004) identified three significant natural stream communities within the park and indicated that additional significant natural stream communities were likely to be identified with further survey work.

Currently, there is not any regular testing or routine monitoring of stream water in the park. Information about surface water quality is lacking and the baseline conditions have not been established in most of the streams. In 2009, OPRHP staff performed limited sampling of Quaker Run and some of its tributaries to help identify baseline conditions of the streams prior to oil well drilling activities proposed. Water quality of these streams was quite high.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Water quality monitoring is not regularly conducted

Changes to the water quality in Quaker Run and its tributaries would not be monitored

Water quality in other streams in the park would remain unknown

Alternative 2

Develop a monitoring program for Quaker Run and its tributaries including baseline and annual sampling to detect any major changes in stream water quality.

Annual monitoring will assure that if the stream water quality begins to deteriorate in the park, OPRHP will be able to document the change over time and take appropriate actions.

Begin a stream monitoring program on other streams within the park to establish a baseline and monitor changes over time.

The streams to be monitored would be prioritized based on the consideration of factors that may affect stream water quality such as location of proposed new development or capital projects in the park.

Alternative 3

Alternative 2 plus develop and implement at least one station for real time monitoring of potential impacts from oil drilling activities across the border in PA.

Monitoring would provide immediate notification of major pollution incidents impacting Quaker Run so that actions could be taken quickly to remediate the source of the problem in conjunction with the PA Dept. of Environmental Protection.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 3

Continuation of an annual monitoring program in Quaker Run will provide for documentation of adverse impacts over time. Installation of a real time monitoring station will provide timely information and response to spills potentially impacting Quaker Run and its tributaries. Establishing baseline water quality information on the other streams in the park will provide the basis for determining any future adverse impacts within the park.

3. Lakes

Aquatic Invasives

Background for Analysis.

Water quality monitoring of the lakes in the park was conducted in July 2009, including baseline aquatic plant monitoring. Eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*) was found in both Quaker and Red House Lakes, but was noted as fairly sparse in the rake toss surveys. Virtually no aquatic plants were found in Science Lake. No impairments to uses of the lakes from aquatic plants were identified at this time. Eurasian watermilfoil is more likely to be a threat in Red House Lake than in Quaker Lake because the rocky shoreline surrounding most of Quaker Lake appears to limit and deter plant growth. A dense growth of the native species Coontail (*Ceratophyllum demersum*), which can act invasively under certain conditions, was noted near the inlet of Quaker Lake.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1

Status Quo

Eurasian watermilfoil will most likely continue to spread in Red House and Quaker Lakes until it causes impairments to aesthetics, boating and swimming.

Alternative 2

Visual surveys for aquatic plants and invasive species conducted annually. In particular, levels of milfoil in Quaker and Red House Lakes would be assessed.

If milfoil appears to be increasing, a more detailed survey will be conducted.

Based on the survey results, management recommendations would be made and implemented immediately.

Install signage at all boat launches informing patrons about transporting invasive species on boats and equipment.

Provides ability to respond to and control the invasive species before it causes major impairments. Potential control options include mechanical harvesting (hand or suction pulling), biological controls, use of benthic barriers, and other methods.

OPRHP and DEC currently have signs that can be used to educate the public.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

Conducting a detailed plant survey and instituting management procedures will allow for the most appropriate control option to be employed to manage the Eurasian watermilfoil. Potential options include the use of bio-controls, manual controls, and others. Signage will be installed at all boat launch sites informing patrons about transporting invasive species on boats and equipment.

Dredging of Lakes

Background for Analysis

The southern end of Quaker Lake near the inlet was dredged and the inlet restored in 1999. This may have been the first work conducted on that lake since it was constructed in 1968. Red House Lake was last dredged in 2000 with a previous dredging in 1979. The EMB Lake Report (EMB, 2006) recommended that plans for periodic assessment and removal of sediment from all three lakes be prepared including exploration of opportunities for the creation of in-stream sediment basins for the settling and removal of sediment prior to entering the lakes. A bathymetric survey of Science Lake was conducted in 2008. The maximum depth was found to be approximately sixteen feet in the area near the dam with the minimum depth of less than one foot in areas near the inlet. In general, the northeast end of the lake is very shallow while the other half of the lake near closer to the dam is much deeper. This lake receives considerable sediment loads from upstream. All dredging activities in the park require a permit from DEC and site specific SEQR review and documentation.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Maintenance dredging of Quaker and Red House Lakes will continue on a periodic basis as necessary.

Alternative 2

Continue periodic maintenance dredging of Red House and Quaker Lakes.

This will continue to support recreational boating and fishing in the shallow areas of the lakes.

Explore the possibility of creating a sediment basin and/or designing maintenance dredging activities at Red House Lake that will direct water and sediment flow away from the beach.

This would improve water clarity at the Red House bathing beach possibly resulting in fewer closures.

Periodic maintenance dredging of Science Lake.

This would establish a desirable depth profile for fish and allow the lake to continue serving as a catch basin for sediments before they reach Quaker Lake.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

In addition to continuing the periodic maintenance dredging in Red House and Quaker Lakes, this alternative may improve the conditions at the beach on Red House Lake. Periodic dredging of Science Lake may also improve the lake for fish and maintain its value as a sediment trap upstream of Quaker Lake.

4. Dams

Background for Analysis

The three lakes in the park are formed by dams on their feeder streams and are key features in the ongoing year-round public recreational opportunities in the park. The dams are contributing features of the park (Appendix H). The Science Lake dam was built in 1926, the Red House dam in 1929 and the Quaker Lake dam in 1964. All three dams receive ongoing inspection. The Science Lake dam is scheduled for rehabilitation in the near future.

Maintenance of the dam structures has been conducted over the years, and an annual inspection monitors the structural and operational integrity of the dams. One specific item, recommended by an engineering investigation, is the need to remove trees from the embankments at the Red House Lake Dam as a safety factor.

The Quaker Lake dam is operating according to its designed parameters and needs no attention other than usual maintenance and monitoring which is ongoing.

Alternative

Considerations`

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

The Science Lake dam will be rehabilitated in the near future according to the current schedule.

A plan for removing trees from Red House dam would be implemented over a period of time improving the viability of that structure.

All three dams would continue to receive regular inspections and maintenance as required by the DEC dam regulations and recently developed IMP for the three park dams.

Preferred Alternative: - Status Quo

Alternative 2 – This alternative includes the currently scheduled rehabilitation of Science Lake dam, a priority for the park for safety and environmental reasons. This alternative will also improve the condition of the Red House dam by removing the vegetation which could adversely affect its structural integrity.

5. Invasive Species Management

Background for Analysis

There is currently no comprehensive invasive species management plan in effect at Allegany State Park. Although much of the park is currently invasive species free, invasive species have been recognized as a potential major threat to the ecological communities in the park. Current known invasive species in the park and potential threats are discussed in Chapter 3, Environmental Setting. Invasive species in the park are currently managed on a case by case basis as the need arises (e.g. Emerald Ash Borer in Randolph in 2009). OPRHP has developed a statewide invasive species management plan template modeled on the *Minnewaska Invasive Species Management Plan*, approved in 2008, (O'Brien and Cady-Sawyer, 2008) which can serve as a model for other state parks.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Invasive species would continue to be handled on a case by case basis with no coordinated effort at inventory and prioritization of control work. Some new invasives may move into the park without being identified.

Alternative 2

Develop an Invasive Species Management Plan for Allegany State Park based on the OPRHP template and implement the plan.

This plan would identify the invasive species that pose significant risks to the natural ecological communities of the park.

Identify invasive species in the park and prioritize control projects. Identify core areas that are invasive free zones and take steps to keep invasives out of these areas.

The plan would identify a planning process to follow in order to manage and control invasive species in the park.

Continued implementation of this plan is the most effective tool in efforts to control invasive species.

Monitor trails for early detection and early eradication of new populations of invasives.

Trails constitute an important point of access to invasive species. Monitoring would provide the opportunity for early detection and eradication.

Work with partners including DEC, NYS Department of Agriculture and Markets, Cornell University, Finger Lakes Trail Council, and others to assure a coordinated approach to control.

Cooperation with partners would help to coordinate with invasive species programs outside the park, especially where the possibility exists for movement of invasives into the park from other areas

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

The statewide invasive species management plan contains protocols for identifying, controlling and eradicating invasive species in any park in the OPRHP system. Completion of such a plan for Allegany State Park and implementation of the plan will give clear direction to the staff that will be monitoring and controlling invasives. The plan will have sections specifically dealing with the issue as it pertains to Allegany State Park as well as sections describing invasive species management in general throughout the state.

6. Spring Seeps and Ephemeral Wetlands

Background for Analysis

Seeps and ephemeral wetlands occur at Allegany State Park. Generally, these occur outside of the high use areas of the park. The locations of many of the seeps are known. These resources are very valuable in maintaining biodiversity in the park and currently are not in areas being considered for facility development.

There are no maps specifically identifying the locations of these resources.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

No change in mapping or documenting location of seeps and ephemeral wetlands. Staff knowledge of locations will continue to be the only information available when facility development is being considered.

Alternative 2

Identify and evaluate presence of spring seeps and ephemeral wetlands on site when facility development is being considered.

Each area of development would be analyzed for the presence of these resources before a decision is made to proceed.

Map the park's spring seeps and ephemeral wetlands and develop management strategies for their protection.

Locations would be available for analysis of future development of facilities and for protection of the resource.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

This alternative will provide for protection of these resources as projects are being considered and developed. Ultimately the location of seeps and ephemeral wetlands will be mapped and continue to be updated as new information becomes available.

7. Open Fields

Background for Analysis

Open fields at the park are currently maintained periodically on a rotational basis. These fields provide a diversity of landscapes in the park and open grassland habitat for various wildlife species.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Open fields at the park would continue to be maintained as open fields with periodic mowing.

Alternative 2

Discontinue maintenance of open fields

Fields would revert, over years through natural succession, to forest appropriate for the location.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 1

Continuation of periodic mowing of open fields is considered to be the most effective way to balance and maintain the park's current mix of community types. A rotational mowing schedule will be developed to assure proper timing of mowing activities to protect wildlife species using the habitat.

8. Mowed Lawn Areas

Background for Analysis

Lawn areas at the park are mowed for safety, recreational needs, to maintain landscapes and for road maintenance. The park is using and further developing a reduced mowing program for cost and energy savings. The remaining lawn areas are viewed as important to be mowed.

Alternatives:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Considerations:

Lawn areas and roadside areas would continue to be mowed at a reduced rate to accommodate safety and maintenance while achieving further cost and energy reductions.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 1

The maintenance of lawn areas and roadsides, even in a reduced mowing regime, is a matter of safety and will be continued as deemed necessary by park staff and regional management.

9. Wildlife Resources and Nuisance Wildlife

Background for Analysis

Approximately 84% of the 330,000 acre State Park System is considered natural habitat. As a general rule State Parks will follow a “passive management” approach, allowing natural processes to maintain wildlife populations. There are times, however, when a more active management approach will be necessary in an effort to reach ecological balance.

OPRHP, through an integrated approach, will actively manage wildlife on lands and waters under its jurisdiction to: protect the health and safety of park staff and patrons, protect species at risk, protect and enhance biodiversity, and prevent damage to park buildings or infrastructure. Habitat management in the support of wildlife populations and biodiversity will be based on goals that lead to the appropriate functioning of local ecosystems. Wildlife management generally begins at the facility level with an evaluation of the need for a management activity by the facility manager and staff.

There are particular protocols for dealing with nuisance wildlife on a species by species basis.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Continue current park policies regarding wildlife and nuisance wildlife.

Preferred Alternative – Status Quo

The recommendation is to continue the park policies concerning wildlife. Current policies and programs dealing with wildlife resources at the park are adequate and effective. The park will continue its relationship with OPRHP partners as an aspect of these policies, including nuisance wildlife on a case by case basis.

10. Rare and Endangered Species

Background for Analysis

Rare and Endangered species of plants and wildlife have been documented at Allegany State Park including 17 known species and several other records of historic species that may still be present in the park (see Chapter 3 – Environmental Setting for a discussion of these occurrences). OPRHP, in cooperation with DEC and the NHP maintains records of species and their locations in the state parks, including Allegany State Park. These records are used to assist in developing and maintaining park facilities in keeping with the agency’s stewardship responsibilities.

Alternatives:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Considerations:

Endangered species are protected by park and OPRHP policies.

Preferred Alternative – Status Quo

OPRHP will continue to maintain responsible stewardship practices concerning rare and endangered species and the habitats that support them.

11. Subsurface Resources

Background for Analysis

Based on regional ownership records it is estimated that approximately 50% of the mineral rights beneath public lands within Allegany State Park are held by private interests. The agency policy on the development of oil and gas resources in state parks and historic sites (OPRHP, 2009) prohibits the development, extraction, or offer for leasing of state-owned oil and gas resources with the exception of existing leases currently in place. It also sets forth the agency's protocol in the event of a private sub-surface owner attempting to exercise their sub-surface rights. This protocol includes the following: satisfactory documentation of legal ownership of the subsurface rights; submittal of an application to OPRHP for a *Permit for Commercial Use of State Parkland: Oil, Gas and Mineral Proposals*; application to NYS DEC for a permit under Article 23; and full review of the project under the State Environmental Quality Review Act with OPRHP acting as Lead Agency. The 2002 New York State Open Space Plan (NYSDEC & NYSOPRHP, 2002) identified acquisition of privately-owned inholdings and subsurface mineral rights in Allegany State Park as a Priority Conservation Project in Region 9 to protect recreation and environmental resources. Subsequent versions of the New York State Open Space Plan have combined all State Parks across the state into one priority project entitled *State Park & State Historic Site Protection*. The description indicates the importance of improving access, protecting viewsheds, eliminating in-holdings and providing buffers to protect the resources in state parks and historic sites. While Allegany State Park and its subsurface rights are no longer specifically mentioned, they are still covered under the statewide provision of the New York State Open Space Plan. Some mineral rights were purchased by the state from a willing seller in 2002. OPRHP continues to pursue this option following the State land acquisition process when there is a willing seller and resources are available.

There have also been attempts over the years to protect the surface resources of the park from the impacts of subsurface exploration and development through various proposed legislation. However, none of these have been passed.

Some of the abandoned wells in the park have been plugged by private parties or park forces in the past. DEC has indicated that an additional 75 wells were likely plugged based on the technology at the time they were abandoned and they are not considered a threat to park resources. The Agency continues to monitor and fence these wells for public safety. There are also a few privately-owned wells within the park that are currently considered "active" under DEC regulations.

Preferred Alternative – Status Quo

In keeping with current policy, OPRHP will not lease any additional publically-owned subsurface rights. The current underground gas storage lease with NFG will continue to be operated until it comes up for renewal in 2014. Renewal of that lease will not be addressed at this time. With respect to exercising privately owned oil and gas rights the recommended approach is the continued use of the agency's protocol including adequate documentation of subsurface rights ownership, and use of the OPRHP permit and environmental review process. Acquisition of privately owned subsurface rights will continue to be pursued following the state land acquisition process when there is a willing seller and resources are available.

Recreation Resource Development/Management

The recreation resource development alternatives primarily focus on the recreation use areas of the park, namely the highly used areas of Red House and Quaker. Together, these areas currently constitute approximately seven percent of the park, including roads, and trails. This section of the chapter also includes other forms of recreation such as hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation. Each recreation and support element is discussed individually.

1. Camping

Background for Analysis

There are currently 331 camp sites in the park (130 in Red House; within Quaker there are 164 at Cain Hollow Campground, 25 at Diehl Trail and 12 at the equestrian area near Group Camp 10). During the 2009 summer season between Memorial Day and Labor Day, combined cabin and campsite utilization in the Red House area was 89%, the Quaker area was 69%. The Red House area was utilized near capacity during the weekends (93%). The design criteria for camping areas ranges between 25–35 sites to a loop with 7500 square feet per site and approximately 75 feet of frontage (SCORP, 2009). Currently, the number of sites per loop averages 40 to 45 in Red House and 25 to 30 in Cain Hollow. The frontage for campsites in the Red House area is an average of 50 feet or less. Cain Hollow averages 75 feet. Diehl Trail Campsites are available during the late fall and early spring season when Cain Hollow is closed. Existing campsites are not designed to accommodate on-site boat and trailer storage.

There are six wash houses at the Cain Hollow Campground. Two were recently replaced and the other four are in poor condition, needing replacement. Other wash houses - 3 at Red House, 1 at Diehl Trail and 1 at the equestrian area.

Roads in the Cain Hollow area are in poor condition and are currently being patched with cold patch. Red House roads similarly need improvement and are causing some drainage problems.

Although RV's utilize the Red House area, the electric utilities are inadequate for today's needs and the road system and site designs do not correctly accommodate these vehicles.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Aesthetic and environmental decline would continue in the Red House area due to the site density. The number of sites will remain the same and there will be no adequate sites for RV's

Alternative 2

Reduce site density in Red House. Redevelop loop A to accommodate large recreational vehicles. The new sites will be provided with electricity of sufficient amperage for RV's.

Utilization rates indicate that the existing capacity should be maintained or expanded. Reduction in density will help maintain the environmental integrity of the area as well as provide a better camping experience and provide sites designed for larger RV's.

Provide electrical upgrades for Red House and Cain Hollow

Improvement to facilities for campground users

Alternatives:	Considerations:
Continue to upgrade, rehabilitate or replace wash-houses in Cain Hollow and Red House	Improvements to facilities for park patrons, can be done with sustainable practices.
Upgrade Red House RV dump-station.	Improvements to sanitary facilities and environmental protection.
Develop dish-wash-stations near wash-houses.	Improvement to patron services. Increased use of water and need for gray water collection/disposal
Develop a satellite bear proof refuse/recycling station at Red House campground.	More convenient for campers. Would require increased maintenance, staff time and commitment
Improve drainage and condition of roads in the Cain Hollow and Red House camping areas.	Improvement of facilities for public use and mitigates impacts of improper stormwater management.
Alternative 3	
Same as Alternative 2 except Designate an area in Cain Hollow for storage of boats and trailers	More responsibility will be placed on park personnel for security. Owners may not like parking their boats and trailers out of their immediate campsite area.

Preferred Alternative - Alternative 2:

This alternative, including continued upgrading and replacement of wash houses and roads, will provide improvements to health and safety at the camping areas in the park. It will also improve protection of natural resources and afford a better camping experience for patrons. Redevelopment of Loop A for RV camping at Red House will allow more appropriate camp sites for those vehicles, improved electrical service, and a lower density of sites.

2. Primitive / Carry In Camping

Background for Analysis:

Carry in or primitive camping involves camp sites that are located away from the main camping area and do not have parking or vehicle access immediately adjacent to the campsite. The patron parks in a designated parking area and carries all camping equipment to the campsite. These campsites are typically provided with picnic tables and fire rings.

A designated primitive/carry in camping area currently does not exist. Such an area would expand the variety of overnight camping opportunities.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Carry in type camping opportunities would not be provided

Alternative 2

Develop primitive camping opportunities in Cain Hollow

This type of camping opportunity would be consistent with the character of the park and provide another type of camping opportunity. Support facilities and a level of control currently exist at Cain Hollow

Alternative 3

Develop primitive camping opportunities near Red House camping area

The configuration and topography of the Red House Camping area is not conducive for this type of development. Any expansion would encroach on other existing facilities

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

A designated carry in area in the vicinity of Cain Hollow is recommended due to its close proximity to support services and the ability to provide security and controlled use.

3. Backpack Camping

Background for Analysis

Backpack camping allows campers to camp using their own equipment in areas designated for that activity which are remote, away from the developed areas in the park. There are no developed campsites within the designated area and campers must hike there from a designated parking area, or from existing trails and trail heads. This is a carry in-carry out operation requiring a permit with other conditions developed by the park as part of the permit system.

The Finger Lakes Trail (FLT) is the only long distance hiking trail that traverses Allegany State Park. The section of the FLT through the park is also part of the 3,200 mile North Country Trail which extends both north and south beyond the park. Backpack camping opportunities exist and lean-tos have been constructed at points along the trail, which are used mainly by through hikers.

These existing backpack camping areas are limited to overnight use by hikers and each may be used by hiking groups or individuals for one night only. Through hikers may camp for a total of two nights (in two different locations) while hiking through the park.

There are no other backpack camping opportunities in the park.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Backpack camping opportunities would continue as is and be limited within the park to those along the Finger Lakes/North Country Trail.

Alternative 2

Alternative 1 plus designate a by-permit backpack area within the Wolf Road area of the park.

This type of camping opportunity is consistent with the character of the park.

The addition of the Wolf Run area would expand a type of camping opportunity that is being requested by park patrons.

Parking and development of permits and rules would be necessary.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

Continue use of designated backpack camping areas along the Finger Lakes Trail/North Country Trail and designate of a portion of the Wolf Run area for backpack camping by permit.

4. Cabins and Cottages

Background for Analysis

There are 367 cabins in Allegany State Park; 158 in Red House and 209 in Quaker. The cabins provide a variety of accommodations ranging from the 256 sq. ft. one room cabins for four people to the 396 sq. ft. three room cabins accommodating six people. These rustic cabins generally include cots or bunks, cooking ranges, electric refrigerators and lighting (some cabins are not electrified), a heat source (wood, LP gas or electric), and a table with benches. Sanitary facilities are available at centrally located washhouses and potable water is available from water spigots at several locations in the cabin areas. A number of cabins are modified for use by the physically disabled.

Over sixty percent of the cabins are more than 50 years old and many are in need of rehabilitation. Many cabins are currently being rehabilitated or replaced under the guidance of a Letter of Resolution (LOR) from the State Historic Preservation Office. A new LOR was written in 2009, superseding the previous LOR, for further work on historic structures, including cabins within the park (Appendix H). According to the new LOR replacement of cabins that are no longer fit for the originally intended service is allowed if replaced with new cabins of pre-approved design.

Additionally, full service cottages have been developed. Nine in the Quaker and one in the Red House areas. These cottages include kitchens, running water, accessible bathrooms, linens and dishes. The cottages are close to 900 sq.ft. and can accommodate up to 6 people. The cottage in Red House includes most of these amenities.

There is a high demand for the existing cabins and cottages.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Maintain the current number of cabins

Follow the 2009 LOR for cabin replacements (Appendix H).

The current level of service will be maintained.

Rehabilitate cabins until it is no longer feasible to do so, then replace with insulated cabins using approved designs set forth in the LOR. Cabins in poor condition will be replaced with new cabins. Redesign of layouts and relocation of cabins would occur on trails with areas of concern. (e.g. steep slope and flood prone)

Alternative 2

Same as Alternative 1 plus provide an additional 5-10 cottages in a new loop on Bova Rd. uphill from Camp Allegany and additional cottages in Quaker in the same footprint as cabins replaced on Parallel Trail.

The level of service would increase consistent with demand and the environmental character of the park

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

Existing cabins will be rehabilitated where cost effective or replaced with new cabins where not. The replacement cabins will follow the requirements of the 2009 Letter of Resolution. A new cottage loop will be constructed in Red House and new cottages will continue to replace cabins on Parallel Trail in Quaker.

5. Group Camps

Background for Analysis

Five group camps exist within the park.

- Camp Allegany (sleeping quarters for 74 people, recreation hall for 67, classrooms to seat up to 204, and 65 person mess hall) was reconstructed in the late 1970's as a residential youth facility. It currently meets health department standards for a youth camp.
- Camp Turner was constructed in the late 1980's as a youth camp. This camp is operated through a concession agreement with the Buffalo Catholic Diocese.
- Group Camps 5 (80 person capacity) and 12 (100 person capacity) are in excess of 50 years of age. These camps are available for public rental. Both require major rehabilitation.
- Group Camp 10 (60 person capacity) has a renovated washhouse and other structures which are in need of rehabilitation. This facility is currently not in public use.

Attendance patterns indicate that the camps are utilized close to 100% during the peak summer vacation season and all weekends during the remainder of the operating season. However, estimates of the size of the groups utilizing the facilities range from 10 to 150+. There has been a trend of reduced reservations by organizations and an increase by family groups.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Group Camps 5, 10 and 12 would continue to serve as currently utilized facilities and be maintained and/or rehabilitated according to the current schedule.

The existing uses at Camp Allegany and Camp Turner would be maintained.

Alternative 2

Group Camp 5 – Rebuild designed for 72 people with barracks style accommodations for family group camping. Design and build new wash house.

Improvements to group camps would improve the camping experience. Each camp would have specific types of facilities which would expand the park's ability to accommodate camping requests from diverse types of groups.

Group Camp 12 – Rebuild designed for 100 people. Replace existing cabins with same style. Design and build new wash house and rehabilitate mess hall, improve landscape infrastructure and drainage and create open mowed field in recreation area.

Alternatives:	Considerations:
Camp Allegany - Continue use and development as an education facility. Rehabilitate barracks and mess hall, rehabilitate water and electric infrastructure and maintain current capacity of 74	Current use is appropriate to the park's overall character and mission. Improvements will improve patron experience and may attract more use by educational organizations.
Camp Turner - Continue current use. Provide a new corral area on the north side of ASP 3, define the footprint of the concession area, and evaluate rehabilitation and athletic area needs.	Moving the equestrian corral would have a positive impact on the natural resources. Improvements may be made according to need and the concession agreement.
Group Camp 10 Consider development for equestrian use along with equestrian camp sites across ASP 2. Maintain three cabins, rehabilitate the mess hall open the wash house to the public.	Site design would be needed to accommodate the new use of permanent overnight equestrian camp in the park in combination with day use. New use would likely increase traffic at this point in the park. Red House Creek would likely need buffering of from runoff.
Alternative 3	
Along with Alternative 2, consider future expansion of group camps or addition of more group camps based on need.	Specific expansion or addition of group camps would accommodate actual numbers requesting those accommodations.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

This alternative answers the need to maintain a level of service that accurately reflects actual current demand on the group camps and the need for some new structures and rehabilitation of others. The education focus of Camp Allegany will benefit the park patron, the region, and educational institutions. Camp Turner will continue as a concession agreement with some improved facilities. A new equestrian overnight facility in the group camp 10 area will add new opportunities for park users. The feasibility of providing this opportunity at group camp 10 and the current area across ASP 2 is being evaluated and is discussed below under "Equestrian Staging/Camping Area."

6. Visitor Center and Education/Interpretive Center

Background for Analysis

There is currently no central visitor center at the park. The various functions that a visitor center would provide, such as information desk, orientation to the park, park history presentations, meeting rooms, etc. are currently spread out at various locations throughout the park.

In addition, park interpretation of the natural and cultural setting at Allegany State Park has played an ever increasing role in the activity of the park's visitors. The park's interpretive initiative has increased the quality of this experience for its visitors despite limitation of facilities and staffing which have made it difficult to maintain a quality program. The program directly serves over 25,000 visitors annually, and more are served through self-guided activities, interpretative signage and publications. The park interpretive program is part of OPRHP's Environmental Education and Interpretive (EE&I) initiative.

The current facilities available to support the programs are two small naturalist cabins, one in Red House and one in Quaker, the Regional Administration Building and the Quaker Store Museum for small groups. Additional summer facilities utilized include the Quaker Amphitheater and picnic pavilions.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 Status Quo

No visitor center or EE&I facility expansion or development

Current level of service would be maintained. The EE&I program would continue in its current format.

Visitor center functions would continue to be decentralized.

Alternative 2

Construct a LEED certified, multi-use, visitor center and nature center in the Beehunter area with facilities for

- Program and exhibit space
- Park information and orientation facilities
- Meeting rooms available for community groups. One room can be set up as an auditorium for multi media presentations
- Park store including bookstore
- Program Staff offices

Park visitor services would be centralized giving the patron a more coordinated and convenient way to get information about the park.

LEED certification would make the building sustainable and would be a model for green infrastructure.

User experience of this offering will be improved and expand the ability to deliver programs and information to park patrons.

Reduced stress on the Administration building for program and staff space.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 3

Alternative 2 plus provide an outdoor amphitheatre as part of the Visitor Center.

This would provide additional program facilities and enhance user experience in Red House.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

The primary focus of this alternative is a new, full service, visitor and nature center to be built in the Beehunter area. The presence of this facility will add exciting opportunities to provide users with information and assistance. A new visitor center will be an improvement over the current decentralized services and will enhance the patrons experience of the park by providing information to help them plan their stay. New meeting rooms will add functionality for park programs and for community groups. The center would be in close proximity to trails that would be utilized for nature hikes.

Additional room for EE&I will enhance the program at the park and can include offices, classroom, exhibits, presentation space and a gathering spot before going out on park tours. The new amphitheatre will afford a program opportunity presently missing in the Red House area.

7. Equestrian Staging/Camping Area

Background for Analysis

An equestrian camping/staging area located near Camp 10 on the east side of ASP 2, has no permanent support facilities but includes covered tie stalls, potable water (trucked in), parking, and 12 campsites. The Stony Cabin area (2 cabins) in Quaker, with no formal staging area and minimal level of support, is also currently used by equestrians camping in the park. Group Camp 12 has been rented as a group camp facility by horseback riding groups for special events. The concessionaire at Camp Turner operates a small corral and saddle ride.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Horseback riding restricted to designated trails.

The existing trail system would be maintained.

Continued use of Stony Cabin area and Group Camp 12 and the camping area near Group Camp 10.

A limited level equestrian overnight facility would be maintained

Alternative 2

Develop a permanent equestrian staging and camping area in Group Camp 10 and including the existing facilities across ASP 2. Provide the necessary support facilities to both areas. Phase in camp facilities to meet increased demand. Provide new trail connector to existing equestrian trails in Red House. Three cabins will be rehabilitated and left in place.

Preliminary design and feasibility for this location would need to be completed.

This would provide a centralized equestrian camping in the Group Camp 10 area.

Utilities are present as are several useable buildings. Site would need to be developed.

Site is already within a section of the park accessed through control points.

There is a gas line right-of-way across the road. The lease agreement allows for utilities to be installed crossing underneath the pipeline.

Phase out the use of Stony Cabin area as the new area at Group Camp 10 is developed.

This would transition equestrian camping gradually to Camp 10, eventually eliminating the use of Stony Creek cabins by equestrian users

Develop day-use staging areas with limited facilities (no camping) at three other key locations in the park (Bay State, Bradford, Rice Brook)

This would provide opportunities for users to access the equestrian trail system at other points in the park (but without any overnight facilities).

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 4

Develop a permanent equestrian camping area in the Bay State area of the park. Supply all necessary facilities. Could be started as one-loop pilot project and expand to meet increased demand.

Preliminary design and feasibility would be needed for this area.

There are no existing utilities.

Possible need for acquisition.

No existing control for access to this area.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

This alternative will keep equestrian camping centralized and provide for an efficient operation. The area already has utilities to Group Camp 10, which can be extended across the road as necessary. A site-specific feasibility study will need to be performed in order to design the facility. This site has good connections to the trail system. The development of three staging areas would broaden the access of equestrian users to the designated trail system.

8. Swimming

Background for Analysis

Swimming beaches are maintained at Red House Lake and Quaker Lake. During a typical season, the beach facilities are seldom utilized to capacity. Diving is not permitted at the Red House Beach. Historically Quaker Beach provided diving opportunities, however, due to equipment condition, and increased safety and legal issues; the diving board has been removed.

For maintenance purposes, both beaches are within a "controlled" situation since the lake levels can be regulated. This allows for draw down and easy beach rehabilitation and maintenance. Red House Lake beach is subject to both sediment and turbidity problems. As a result, periodic dredging is required. Flooding conditions on Red House Lake results in periodic closings because of high turbidity and bacteria. This situation could be partially exacerbated by the breaking of beaver dams upstream. There have been periods of high bacterial counts during the summer for both beaches, however, the beaches have typically been closed only one or two times per season. There is a resident population of Canada Geese which can sometimes create problems with beach operations. Several control measures such as egg addling, noisemakers, and dogs are in place.

Bath houses at both beaches need upgrading.

There are no pool facilities available to the general public within the park. In the past, a pool (Fancher Pool) was maintained in the Quaker area. It was closed and demolished in 1985 due to low utilization, severe damage by a storm due to its location in a floodplain, and considerable costs for rehabilitation. As a result of the closing, cabin users near the former Fancher Pool area must travel three miles to swim at Quaker Beach.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 - Status Quo

Beach facilities will continue to be operated and maintained on Red House Lake and Quaker Lake.

Current level of service is maintained. Continue maintenance dredging as necessary. Continue monitoring water quality for turbidity and *E. coli*. Current Canada Goose control measures would remain in place.

Alternative 2

Same as Alternative 1 with the following additions:

Upgrade bath houses at both beaches

Improvements to existing facilities could be done in a sustainable manner

Consider reinstating diving at Quaker Lake pending further study

Patrons request diving. A study will be conducted to advise on the ability to allow diving at this site.

Improve drainage at Quaker beach

Improvement to facility and safety.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

The capacity of existing swimming facilities is sufficient to meet existing and future demands. Bath houses are in need of upgrade which can be done in a way to meet sustainable objectives such as the use of geothermal or other alternative energy and energy saving practices.

9. Picnicking

Background for Analysis

Picnic facilities currently have a capacity of approximately 3000 patrons. This includes two shelters at Red House and one at Quaker. These shelters are fully utilized during the peak summer season. An outdoor picnic area has evolved near the Quaker beach and is heavily used.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 Status Quo

Maintain the existing level of service

The current level of service would be maintained.

Alternative 2

Maintain existing facilities and add one shelter at both Quaker and Red House.

The overall level of service would be improved.

Upgrade restrooms at picnic areas.

Improvements to level and quality of service. Designs would take sustainable practices into account.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

There is a high demand for group picnic shelters which will be satisfied by the development of new shelters. If there is additional demand, other new shelters will be considered. Upgraded restrooms will improve the level and quality of service.

10. Court and Field Games

Background for Analysis

Tennis courts, basketball courts and informal field game areas are currently provided in both the Red House and Quaker areas. Two miniature golf courses operated by a concessionaire exist, one in the Red House area near the beach and one in Quaker near the Quaker Museum Gift Shop.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 Status Quo

Maintain the existing level of service

There will continue to be a need for additional field facilities in Quaker and other court activities in both high use areas.

Alternative 2

Upgrade basketball courts, tennis courts, volleyball courts, ball-fields and horseshoe pits in the Quaker and Red House areas

This will provide activities generally provided in State parks that are utilized by a wide spectrum of park patrons. Expansion of hard court facilities may change the natural resource focus of activities within the park.

Miniature golf course upgrades will be performed by the concessionaire

Develop basketball court facilities in the Cain Hollow area

Same as above and would extend the level of service and convenience to the Cain Hollow campers.

Alternative 3

Same as Alternative 2 with the addition of lighting of the court and field facilities.

Same as Alternative 2 with extended daily use of the facilities. The facilities are generally used during the seasons where there are longer daylight hours so the net benefit may be minor. In addition, the natural character of the surrounding area would change with the addition of intensive artificial lighting. Would need to be a “dark sky” type of lighting.

Alternative 4

Same as Alternative 2 plus develop a Disc Golf course in the park.

Design standards and amount of space and amenities would be difficult at this park.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

This alternative will upgrade and improve the existing court and field facilities that currently exist at the highly used areas at Red House, Quaker, and Cain Hollow areas.

11. Playgrounds

Background for Analysis

Playground areas are currently maintained at the Beehunter picnic area, Quaker picnic area, Red House campground, Cain Hollow campground, and Quaker Lake beach area. These areas provide the patrons with playground apparatus. The playgrounds at the Red House picnic area and beach have been removed due to safety considerations.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 Status Quo

The existing level of service would be maintained. Service levels would not be expanded when site opportunities exist or when new sites with complimentary facilities are developed.

Alternative 2

Maintain the existing playground areas and rehabilitate, improve and replace equipment as needed.

The existing level of service would be improved and safety to the park patron increased.

Replace playground equipment in the Red House area

Re-establishes a previous user amenity.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

This alternative provides upgraded and new facilities that will provide increased service and safety for park patrons.

12. Boating

Background for Analysis

Red House Lake. There is a small trailered boat launch at the northwest corner of the lake and another for canoes near the concession boat operation near the beach. The use of gas or electric motors is prohibited. Rowboats and paddle boats can be rented for use on the lake. Parking is provided and additional facilities for the launch are not needed. Overall, the condition of these facilities is good to very good.

Quaker Lake. There is a small trailered boat launch at the north end of Quaker Lake near the dam. Boats are limited to the use of electric motors only, with a five hp maximum. This restriction limits the ability to use the entire length of the lake. Parking and other facilities at the existing boat launch occasionally reach capacity.

Friends Boat Launch. This site provides an improved access road, concrete ramp and parking for 35 cars with trailers. Provides water access to the Allegheny Reservoir. This area is prone to flooding.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Maintain Red House site as is

Support facilities are adequate

Maintain the existing site at Quaker Lake

The lack of access to the entire lake would continue to be a concern and capacity issues would continue to be present

Maintain status quo at Friends boat launch site on Allegheny Reservoir.

No new facilities would be developed at this site.

Alternative 2

Improve sanitary facilities and accessibility at Friends Boat Launch

Improved service for patrons.

Improve parking area at the existing Quaker launch site

Provide greater parking capacity.

Deepen the launch area at existing Quaker launch site

This would improve the launch ramp facility.

Consider a boat rental facility near the Quaker Lake beach area.

This could be a planned capital improvement within a concessionaire's agreement.

Develop a car top boat launch site at the southern end of Quaker Lake

Increases the ability to use the entire lake and adds parking area where it is needed.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

A new car-top boat launch at the southern end of Quaker Lake will increase the area of the lake that is reachable with electric boat motors. Parking capacity around the lake will be increased with the new boat launch and improvements at the existing launch.

Deepening the launch area at the existing Quaker Lake launch will improve patron's ability to utilize the launch. Rehabilitating the concessions building at Red House Lake will improve efficiency and user experience.

Develop a boat rental facility near the Quaker Lake beach area built into the new bath house facility.

The improvement of sanitary facilities and accessibility at the Friends Boat Launch will increase the usability of this facility for park patrons.

13. Hunting

Background for Analysis

Hunting is recognized as a recreational opportunity in State parks. Hunting opportunities of one type or another are available in ASP for nearly six months of the year. Bear hunting is not allowed in the park. Small game hunting has been permitted in ASP since the creation of the park. Deer hunting has been permitted in portions of the park since 1944. The park deer seasons (shotgun, archery and muzzle loading) coincide with the rest of the Southern Tier. Deer hunting with rifles or handguns is prohibited. Hunters are required to get a park hunting permit and to comply with DEC regulations and license requirements. Park hunting regulations are more restrictive than statewide regulations. Hunters are informed of the regulations through information booklets and maps issued with the mandatory ASP Hunting Permit. Sunday hunting is prohibited in the park.

Deer hunting represents the largest type of hunting in ASP in terms of permits issued. Since 1964, the annual number of permits issued for deer hunting has ranged from 2,610 to 7,039. The park is the only extensive area of public hunting opportunity with abundant on site lodging facilities located in the Western New York area. The cabins are regularly rented to capacity for the first week of deer season.

Approximately 3,000 acres around the high use areas are closed to hunting. This includes the Osgood, Red Jacket, and Conservation hiking trails. No serious hunting accidents have occurred in over 25 years.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

The types of hunting opportunities would be maintained. The availability of game species will vary depending on habitat and other natural conditions. The restricted zone would be maintained and adjusted appropriately to maintain the health and safety of the park patrons. Sunday hunting would continue to be prohibited.

The current level of providing recreation opportunities for hunters and non-hunters would be maintained.

Alternative 2

Same as Alternative 1 but the habitats will be managed to meet the wildlife resource objectives that would increase the potential for maintaining or increasing the populations of existing game and non-game species.

Habitats would be maintained or increased for game and non-game species. This should increase the potential for such species occurring within the park. The number of hunters may increase.

Alternative 3

Same as Alternative 1 but also allow Sunday hunting.

This would increase the hunting opportunities and increase the use of overnight facilities by hunters. However, this would reduce the fall recreational use by other park patrons who prefer to avoid conflicts with hunters.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 1

The types of hunting opportunities will be maintained. The restricted zone will be maintained and adjusted appropriately to maintain the health and safety of the park patrons.

14. Fishing

Background for Analysis

Warm and cold water fishing opportunities are provided by the lakes and streams within the park. Ice fishing is permitted on Quaker Lake and Red House Lake. The Friends Boat Launch area provides access to the Allegheny River Reservoir System. DEC provides stocking for additional fishing opportunities in the lakes and streams. Quaker Run from Coon Run Road to Quaker Lake is designated for artificial lures only and as a Delayed Harvest area. Fish habitat improvements were conducted in as part of the 1999 Quaker Lake cleaning and inlet improvement project.

Accessible fishing platforms have been installed at various locations in the park.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

The current level of fishing opportunities would be maintained.

Continues coordination of stocking programs with DEC

Continue to provide Delayed Harvest and artificial only lure fishing designation on Quaker Run between Coon Run Road and Quaker Lake.

Provides for greater angler success and a different type of fishing opportunity.

Continue to allow ice fishing on Quaker Lake and Red House Lake

Continues existing fishing opportunities.

Alternative 2

Same as Alternative 1 with improved fishing access areas selected within the park

Improves public access to fishing opportunities.

Improves success of lake fish stocking efforts.

Consider habitat improvement projects when planning lake dredging.

Increases accessible fishing opportunities at Red House Lake

Develop an additional accessible fishing platform on Red House lake

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

Delayed harvest segments will continue and increase the probability of angling success. Other stream segments and the lakes will remain as "put and take" areas. ice fishing will continue to be allowed on both Red House and Quaker Lakes. Public access to all fishing areas will be improved to allow a greater segment of the population to take advantage of this activity. Habitat improvements will be considered as part of lake dredging projects.

15. Sledding

Background for Analysis

There have been informal undeveloped sledding areas utilized in the over the years. One of these is in the Summit cabin area and the other is across from Group Camp 10. Parking, comfort stations and other support facilities are available at the nearby Summit Cross Country Skiing Staging area.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Informal sledding will continue.

Alternative 2

Develop a formal designated sledding area in the Summit area This would provide improved area for sledding

Preferred Alternative - Alternative 2

This alternative combines services for two winter activity services into one area that is already being used for these activities.

16. Summit Warming Hut

Background for Analysis

The Summit Warming Hut services the Art Roscoe Ski Touring and Mountain Bike Area. Currently capacity of the building is 50. The Warming Hut also houses a concession operation which offers food and ski and snowshoe rentals. Cross-country skiing activity continues to increase. Off season the building is used as a training center and rented to groups for meetings and social gatherings. During special events held at the area, the building serves as the event headquarters. Increased activity of this area is causing the building to be used over capacity.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 Status Quo

Continue current operations in warming hut.

Alternative 2

Expansion of current building at existing site

Expansion of building would meet health and safety codes. Additional demands from the proposed sledding hill and outside trail connection will increase demand at this location. Expanded building would meet these needs.

Recommended Direction - Alternative 2

The increasing activity of the Summit Area would be served by the expansion of the current building. Expansion would solve any health and safety code issues as well as provide users a more functional facility.

17. Stargazing

Background for Analysis

Some areas of the park have been identified as having qualities that make them opportune areas for stargazing. These qualities include low amounts of ambient light in the sky, views un-interrupted by vegetation and views that include wide horizons. There is no designated stargazing area in the park. Groups do come to the park for sky viewing at night and the park's EE&I staff has organized stargazing activities. Special events of this sort are accommodated by permit.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

No area will be designated as a stargazing area, no overnight camping will be allowed outside of designated campgrounds.

Special events for stargazing will be allowed by permit.

EE&I staff will continue to organize special stargazing programs.

Alternative 2

Designate a suitable area of the park as a stargazing area.

Allow overnight camping in designated stargazing area for patrons participating in this activity.

There are safety concerns in allowing camping in areas of the park which are not dedicated for that purpose. Lack of sanitary facilities, washhouses, parking, campfire control, and staff would be a concern.

The need to provide dedicated staff to special areas for this purpose would tax other ongoing activities in the park.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 1

Stargazing activities will continue at the park as they currently do. Permits can be issued for special events but no overnight camping can be accommodated outside of the currently designated camping areas.

Cultural Resource Protection Strategies/Management

Archaeological Resources

A survey of archaeological resources at Allegany State Park was conducted in the early 1980's. The report from that survey was published in 1984. (Costello, 1984) OPRHP staff from the Field Services Bureau have reviewed this report and found it to meet the needs of the current planning process.

Any new construction which will result in ground disturbance will require a site specific survey and approval from the State Historic Preservation Office. Some specific categorical exclusions from this requirement are listed in Chapter 7.

Historic Resources

Staff members from the Field Services Bureau have visited Allegany State Park as part of this master plan process. These visits were conducted to assess the condition and historic significance of park structures. The results of this visit can be found in the Letter of Resolutin (LOR) which was developed in 2009 and which supersedes previous LORs, cabin plans and management plans. This LOR is Appendix H of this document.

Scenic Resource Protection

1. Fauna and Flora Observation

Background for Analysis

Fauna and flora observation is enjoyed by many of the park patrons. The park provides patrons with a variety of habitats and associated plant and wildlife species. This, combined with existing overnight and interpretative facilities, attracts various groups to the park to pursue their interests.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Continue to encourage this form of passive recreation. Maintain the current observation opportunities, including pull-off areas that are currently available.

Observation of the park's fauna and flora is enjoyed by many park patrons. Maintaining existing opportunities would continue to allow visitors to participate in this activity.

Alternative 2

Same as Alternative 1 plus select new, pull off areas for observing flora and fauna.

Provides new and enhanced observation opportunities reachable by vehicle.

Continue developing the interpretive meadow area across from Camp Allegany for education, interpretation and observation.

Adds an educational component to part of the area chosen for observation.

This ADA accessible, sensory meadow trail is an area planted with native vegetation designed to attract various species of butterflies and other wildlife. This area will allow patrons to experience the value and uniqueness of the

different plants and the species that utilize them as interpretative walks are guided through this meadow habitat.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 3

The recommended option is to continue to encourage observation of fauna and flora by maintaining existing opportunities and creating new ones. Development of the interpretive meadow will enhance the viewing experience through interpretation and education.

2. Vista Management

Background for Analysis

Vista point management is ongoing in the park. The agency's vegetation management policy allows for "*Pruning or removal of trees and other vegetation to maintain or restore important scenic overlooks and views.*" (OPRHP 2009b)

Scenic vista points are part of the important features of Allegany State Park. Several vista points have been identified and historically maintained within the park. Many of these can be accessed from roadside pull offs and are identified in Chapter 3 and later in this appendix under "*Flora and Fauna Observation*". The designated vista points are regularly maintained by park staff to keep the views open. Recent development and private land ownership near the Historic Fancher Point Vista pull off may impact its viewshed.

Other vista points are located at the towers in the park including:

Stone Tower – This is an historic and valuable vista. The full extent of the historic vista has not been maintained and would require considerable vegetation removal to restore historic views.

Fire Tower at Summit – The Fire Tower has been restored by a Friends group. The historic vista has not been maintained and would require considerable vegetation removal to restore.

Mt Tuscarora Fire Tower -. This fire tower needs complete renovation. The historic vista has not been maintained and would require considerable vegetation removal to restore.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Roadside vistas including Fancher Point would continue to be maintained.

Stone Tower and the Summit Fire Tower would remain limited in visibility of their historic vistas and may become more limited as vegetation matures. Roadside pull off view points would continue to be maintained.

Mt. Tuscarora fire tower would remain closed and unimproved

Alternative 2

Continue to maintain all roadside vista pull offs.

Roadside vistas including Fancher Point would continue to be maintained.

Develop and implement guidelines for vista point management (roadside and towers).
Develop conceptual plans for vegetation removal to improve vistas from Stone Tower and Summit Fire Towers

Scenic vista points would continue to be maintained. Some would be improved including Stone Tower and Summit Fire Towers increasing the availability of important scenic resources at the park.

The historic vistas from the towers would be interpreted.

Improvements to the tower vistas would include interpreting the vistas that historically were visible from these points. This can include

photos, panels, kiosks, etc.

Mt. Tuscarora fire tower would remain closed and be preserved to prevent any further deterioration until a restoration project is initiated.

The tower would be stabilized to protect from further deterioration. Park volunteers could be invited to participate in this and possible future restoration of the tower.

Alternative 3

Same as Alternative 2 but with improvements made to allow public access at Mt. Tuscarora fire tower.

The participation of park volunteers would be encouraged for the restoration of the tower.

Vista at Mt. Tuscarora would be assessed and improved.

The improvement of the vista would require a conceptual plan to assess the impacts to vegetation and interpretation of the historic vista.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

Developing a management guideline for the vistas will improve the consistency of their care and of park patron experience. Additionally, improvement of the vistas at Stone Tower and Summit Fire Tower, and interpretation of the historic vistas, will enhance patron appreciation of the park and provide expanded opportunity to enjoy the scenic value and quality of the park. The conceptual vegetation removal plans will be subject to appropriate environmental review. Mt. Tuscarora will remain closed to public access and its scenic vista will not be improved but the tower will be protected against further deterioration until a restoration can be accomplished.

Infrastructure Development

1. Regional Maintenance Center

Background for Analysis

The Regional Maintenance Center for the Allegany Region is located within the Quaker area of Allegany State Park.

Facilities at the maintenance complex include structures for warehousing, vehicular/equipment maintenance and repair, vehicular storage, material storage, and trade shops for carpenters, electricians, painters, plumbers and masons. Many of these functions occur in structures that were not designed for and which pre-date the park.

Located adjacent to ASP Route 3 (the main road through the Quaker area), the complex is not highly visible to the general public. Vehicular access for cabin campers staying at the Brow and Coon cabin areas is provided via Coon Run road which bisects the area containing the Maintenance Center. Quaker Run passes through the maintenance complex and has caused periodic flooding to portions of the facility over the years. Additionally, material storage and vehicle cleaning/maintenance activities may adversely impact the water quality downstream of the facility.

A recent survey of the buildings at this site was conducted by OPRHP Field Services Bureau. The complex was found to be contributing to the historic character of the park. This includes Warehouses 1, 2 and 3, the Electric Shop, Paint Shop, Garage, and Road Crew Barn. The recommended approach was to maintain and repair the buildings using appropriate materials and methods and that any new construction should reflect the area's historic character. (See Appendix H)

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

The existing regional maintenance complex would continue to function at its present location

Because of the age and condition of many of the buildings, programmed capital investments will be necessary in future years to maintain, modify and improve the facilities

Traffic concerns through the Quaker area, visibility of the site to the public, location in relation to Quaker Run, and distances from the Southern Tier Expressway and Red House area of Allegany State Park, and the other parks in the region would remain.

Existing facility requires no additional site work or utilities.

Little or no impact to contributing structures.

Alternative 2

Relocate the regional maintenance facility to the Cricks Run area of Allegany State Park. Re-use existing buildings for other park services such as

Requires extensive development in a currently undeveloped area with limited access and requires investment in buildings, site work,

education and interpretation.

roads, parking, and utilities.

Closer to Interstate 86 and other regional parks (off of Route 280 – exit 18) than current maintenance site.

Once on Route 280 there is easier access to Red House area of Allegany State Park.

Removes the maintenance function from the flood prone area.

Adaptive re-use of existing buildings would help preserve the historic character, is sustainable and conforms to the goals of the master plan.

Alternative 3

Continue to use current maintenance area but phase into area above the current Carpenter Shop west of Quaker Run with new facilities to replace functions in current buildings. When available current buildings would be re-used for new park services. Those buildings not in immediate use will be mothballed to protect from deterioration until a use is assigned.

Moves maintenance functions out of the flood prone area and to a less visible location.

Less new site work and utilities would be needed.

Allows for adaptive re-use of contributing structures.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 3

The elimination of problems associated with visibility and flooding of the current area, make this the preferred alternative. This will provide modern facilities for the maintenance operations that need to be performed and will help preserve the park's historic resources by re-using the current buildings for park services.

2. Sawmill

Background for Analysis

The sawmill located in the Red House area of Allegany State Park is unique to the New York State Park system. When it was operational, this historic steam-operated sawmill helped to supplement the lumber needs of the Region. It was operated on a limited basis by park personnel. The sawmill is not in operational condition at this time. The building surrounding the sawmill is in extremely poor condition, providing little or no protection for the machinery and apparatus housed within. Evidence of animal habitation and extensive water damage has been observed and is noted in the OPRHP FSB memo of resolution (Appendix H)

Currently the sawmill is located in a highly used maintenance area not available to the general public. The OPRHP Field Services Bureau evaluation recommended that the building be better secured against curiosity and artifact seekers and animal infestation.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Leave the sawmill and surrounding building in place at its current location and condition.

Building and sawmill will continue to deteriorate due to weather and animal infestations.

This resource will not be interpreted effectively, and a part of the story of the park's history will not be told.

Alternative 2

Implement the recommendation of FSB to stabilize and preserve the building and its contents

The condition of the building and the sawmill will not deteriorate or improve but will be stabilized.

The resource will still not be effectively interpreted.

Alternative 3

Same as Alternative 2 but also modify and improve the sawmill's current location, Improve site amenities to allow public access through scheduled tours for interpretive opportunities.

The building and sawmill would be improved and become an actively interpreted facility

The public would be permitted to see the sawmill on a guided tour basis.

Alternative 4

Move the sawmill to a new facility, possibly in conjunction with a new education/interpretive center.

A new location would not have the same site restrictions, however the move would be difficult and may result in further damage to the sawmill.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 3

Given the importance of the lumber industry in the growth of the area in and around Allegany State Park, interpretation of the sawmill serves an important function in the education about this history. Although the current condition and location of the sawmill is not ideal, improving the location around the sawmill and providing guided interpretive tours will enhance the educational and historic value of the resource.

3. Red House Maintenance Facility

Background for Analysis

Park maintenance facilities are currently located within the two developed areas of the Park and directly serve daily operations in each area.

The Red House Area Maintenance Center provides facilities for storage of vehicles, small equipment and supplies, employee work areas, Red House sewage treatment plant and fuel dispensing equipment. The present facility is in a floodplain and the buildings are in a deteriorated condition. The sewage treatment plant is functioning.

Two vehicle/equipment storage buildings and a firewood storage structure have been constructed at a site adjacent to the existing sawmill.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Leave Red House maintenance facilities at the current locations

The work center would continue within the floodplain below the Red House Dam and adjacent to the sawmill.

Alternative 2

Move the Red House maintenance facility to the area adjacent to the sawmill, eventually relocating all functions to the new location.

Close the current facility, remove the buildings and allow current area to revert to a natural state.

Maintain sewage treatment plant at its current location.

Interpret the history of the site.

One centralized maintenance area would improve efficiency of operations. New buildings and other resources would improve worker safety and efficiency.

Utilities and other site improvements would be necessary at new site.

Portions of the site would revert to natural state.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

The new location, near the current sawmill location and out of the flood plane, is better suited for the location of this maintenance function. Consolidating the entire Red House Maintenance Facility to the new location is most desirable.

4. Quaker Area Maintenance Facility

Background for Analysis

The Quaker Area maintenance facility, including two houses, is located behind the Rental Office area. This site is conveniently located in the central area of the Quaker Recreational Complex. The existing structures provide limited employee work areas and storage for small equipment and supplies. The site is highly visible to the public utilizing this area of the park and generates traffic (maintenance vehicles and employee vehicles) to this site.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Leave all maintenance functions and houses at the current location in Quaker Area with no new buildings.

Traffic, visibility and limitations to the function would continue.

Alternative 2

Expand the current facility at the current location with new buildings and other resources that would add functionality and reduce limitations.

Current limitations on the function of the facility would be addressed. Traffic and visibility concerns would remain.

Alternative 3

Same as alternative 2 but with site improvements such as screen plantings or fences, and a new, separate entrance.

Same as Alternative 2 but the visibility and traffic concerns would be mitigated

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 3

The site is adequate for the functions it serves. With additional storage buildings the functionality of this site would be improved. Traffic would continue to create some problems but would be reduced by having a new, separate entrance. The location of the facility is highly desirable because of its proximity to where maintenance services are needed in Quaker area.

5. Quaker Area Administration Building

Background for Analysis:

The existing administration building, located in the central Quaker recreation area, is an historic structure and functions as the headquarters for daily operations in this area of the park. This building contains offices for the Quaker area management and cabin/camping rental staff, and serves as the primary public contact/information center for park patrons in the Quaker area. There is also one rental apartment in the building. Although it is in generally good condition, it does not provide handicapped accessibility to the restrooms.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

No changes made to current administration building

All functions currently housed in the existing building would continue as is. There would be no improvements to provide accessible routes to the restrooms.

Alternative 2

Keep using current administration building but with improvements to provide for accessible restrooms and needed maintenance

Current limitations on the functionality and physical condition of the facility would be addressed

Alternative 3

Construct new administration facility with modern accommodations.

Would provide improved conditions and added office space.

Current building is serving adequately.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

It is recommended that the current location of the Quaker Area administration continue with future considerations given to providing for handicapped restroom accessibility.

6. Utilities: Electric

Background for Analysis

Electric energy service to Allegany State Park is provided to all of the Quaker area and most of the Red House area by National Grid. A limited section of the northern area (Summit area) of Red House receives electric service from the City of Salamanca Board of Public Utilities (BPU). The park owns all of the electric transmission lines and related equipment within the park boundaries. All maintenance, repair and upgrading of primary and secondary service are the responsibility of the park staff.

Currently, there are approximately 28 miles of primary 4800 volt electric lines and 306 miles of secondary electric lines within Allegany State Park. These services are a combination of aerial (overhead) and underground distribution systems. Major capital investments have been made, and will continue to be necessary, to maintain year-round electric service for both public and employee facilities throughout the park. Capital construction funds are scheduled to continue upgrading the current system throughout the park. This major investment will help to maintain the level of electric service presently provided at the park and will help to reduce maintenance costs in future years.

Additionally, there is an emphasis on providing an appropriate combination of aerial (overhead) and underground electric service distribution systems with sighting and aesthetic sensitivity considerations relating to the scenic value of the park environment.

Solar panels are used to power the toll booths at the Bradford and Quaker Lake entrances.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Maintain existing service from National Grid and Salamanca BPU.

Continue capital investments in the electrical system upgrades

Continue to locate overhead and underground distribution systems with sensitivity to scenic nature of the park.

Service would continue at present level.

System would continue to provide appropriate service to public and park staff. Future maintenance costs may be reduced.

Scenic values of lands would be taken into consideration when locating new electrical service. Scenic value of these resources would be preserved

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 1

It is recommended that the electric distribution system within the park be maintained and improved. Alternative suppliers will continue to be pursued.

7. Vehicular Entrance Control/Access

Background for Analysis

Five vehicular entrances are described in Chapter 2 – Park Background. They are three entrances from Interstate 86 (Southern Tier Expressway) and two from Pennsylvania in the southern portion of the park. A sixth, seasonal entrance, Limestone Run Road, is located in the Village of Limestone off of Route 219.

The five-mile Limestone Run road from the Village of Limestone to its intersection with ASP Route 2 near France Brook Road, provides secondary access to both the Red House and Quaker areas of the park. Only 2.84 miles of this road are under the jurisdiction of OPRHP. Currently the Limestone entrance is only open from Memorial Day to Labor Day.

The eastern side of the park is basically undeveloped for public recreational use at this time. Future improvements to Route 219 may increase demand for developed public recreational facilities accessible from this entrance.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Continue all entrances as currently configured
No improvements to the Limestone entrance or connecting road.

No changes would be made. Limestone entrance would continue to be seasonal and secondary.

Alternative 2

Continue all entrances as currently configured except the Limestone entrance.

This would improve access to the eastern portion of the park.

Improve Limestone entrance and connecting road system to a year-round entrance with control point.

There are no developed public recreation facilities in this part of the park so the major improvement would be access to Red House from Route 219.

Alternative 3

Monitor development and demand for recreation facilities along Route 219 and the eastern part of the park. Improve the entrance and road system if demand justifies such improvements.

Allows for future improvements to the Limestone entrance if demand justifies such improvements.

Consider Red House entrance for a premier entrance treatment.

See discussion below on Premier Entrance.

Maintain all other entrances as currently configured.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 3

The Preferred Alternative is to continue to maintain the existing primary entrances while monitoring development along Route 219 and improving the Limestone entrance if needed to satisfy demand. A new premier entrance is considered for the Red House entrance.

8. Premier Entrance on ASP 2

Background for Analysis

Existing contact stations at the park entrances collect vehicle use fees and give some park information but do not provide a sense of arrival commensurate with the scope and grandeur of the park.

Additionally, services for arriving park visitors such as registration for campers and detailed park information are now housed in the Administration Building causing traffic and parking problems, especially for cars with trailers and large RVs.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 – Status Quo

Continue all entrances as currently configured.

No changes would be made to entrances.

Traffic congestion issues would continue at the Administration Building.

Alternative 2

Build new premier entrance at the current contact station location on ASP 2 with facilities for temporary parking, camper/cabin registration, vehicle use fee collection, park information and visitor orientation (maps, kiosks, etc).

This would highlight the sense of entry into the park and improve visitor services.

Area is adequate for expanded facilities that would be needed and for accommodating cars with trailers and large RVs.

Proximity to I-86 interchange is desirable.

A conceptual site design would be needed.

This would reduce traffic congestion at the Administration Building and open up space for other park services.

Appropriate parking for cars, trailers and RV's will be provided for visitors while they are in the entrance building.

Parking provided would accommodate arriving visitors while registering or getting park information.

Permeable paving and other sustainable methods can be used to mitigate effects of runoff from this new parking area.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

A new “premier entrance” is appropriate because of the park’s size, scope, history, and unique natural and recreational resources. A new entrance will give visitors a sense of arrival that is appropriate to the park.

9. Regional Administration Headquarters

Background for Analysis

The existing administration building, an historic English-Tudor style structure built in 1927, is located in the Red House area of the park overlooking Red House Lake. It serves as the park and the regional headquarters and houses the regional park police offices. As originally planned it is also a public-use facility, with a museum, gift shop, lounge area, Red House cabin rentals, check in, restaurant, meeting rooms and public rest rooms.

Offices for business, nature interpretation and resource development staffs, engineering and capital facilities are also housed in the administration building. The building is a contributing structure for the National Register eligibility of the park.

Capital investments have been made to the structure over the years, and the basic original character of the building (both interior and exterior) has been maintained. Expansion of office space, including the conversion of the third floor attic area into offices/work areas, has occurred together with provisions for handicapped accessibility, and general maintenance/repair. Five bedrooms available for public rental were converted into office space approximately 25 years ago and there is currently no overnight lodging in the building.

The windows in the building are in need of replacing and it has been suggested that the building is in need of an historic structures report.

Alternatives:

Considerations:

Alternative 1 - Status Quo

Administration building will continue to function in its current arrangement. Capital improvements, such as window replacements and other projects already scheduled would continue. No historic structures report would be written.

Alternative 2

Alternative 1 plus write an historic structures report and implement its

The building would have a thorough analysis of its history and current condition and the actions required to restore the building.

Alternative 3

Relocate some or all of the administrative functions to another location, either within Allegany State Park or at a location outside of the park.

Convert vacated space to public uses such as overnight lodging rooms.

No existing building currently exists within the park to accommodate these functions.

Major capital investments would be necessary to relocate these functions and convert existing space to public-use areas.

Public and employee access could be improved at a new location and would serve as a major year-round public contact point for park visitors.

Relocate the park police headquarters to a new facility constructed within the Red House Area.

This facility would be specifically designed to serve as a police headquarters which would provide certain benefits including more appropriate building space for this function than the current setting.

Preferred Alternative – Alternative 2

The Regional Administration Headquarters will remain at its present location. With the development of the Red House entrance, cabin rentals and check in would be moved to that new facility. This will increase room in the Administration Building for program and concession areas to be redesigned and expanded. An Historic Structures Report for this building will be completed. Capital projects will continue as scheduled.

10. Roads/Bridges

Background for analysis

Allegany State Park has an extensive road system consisting of approximately 56 miles of paved roads and 40 miles of gravel roads. These roads provide access for the public and employees to the developed day-use recreation areas, overnight camping and cabin areas, maintenance facilities and other attractions within the park. The roads also provide very popular scenic travel routes throughout the park.

Maintenance of the park's road system, including traffic signs, is the responsibility of the park staff. Most of the paved roads are plowed by park staff during the winter season. However, a nine mile section of ASP Route No. 1 from Red House to Quaker forms a major link in the snowmobile trail system and is closed to vehicular traffic during the winter season. Repair and rehabilitation of the road is programmed under an annual capital/rehabilitation program. Major road construction is accomplished by a combination of park force account work, assistance by New York State Department of Transportation (DOT) crews, and public works contracts.

Bridges and culverts are another major component of the park's road system. As with the roads, maintenance of these structures is the responsibility of park staff. As a result of annual inspections of all bridges in the park, provided through DOT, a number of structures have been identified as having structural deficiencies and related concerns. Major capital investments are currently being made for the design and construction of bridge replacements or rehabilitation. Both vehicular and pedestrian bridges are included in this program, and it is anticipated that this work will need to continue for several years to address and correct all structures that require attention. Additional structures will be identified through the annual inspection process and design/construction work programmed into the Region's Capital Investment Program. Due to the historic significance and aesthetic value of many of the stone-faced bridges and culverts, special design considerations will be made in order to preserve or replicate the character of these structures as the need for rehabilitation or replacement occurs.

A continuing program of maintenance, repair and construction is vital to the existing road system within the park. Public and employee access to existing park facilities and recreational opportunities, security and public safety will continue to be dependent upon the park's internal road system.

Preferred Alternative – Status Quo

Continue existing program of maintenance, repair and reconstruction of roads, bridges and culverts.