

http://forestlands.mtu.edu/

		Corporate Land Area within Buffered Feature		
County	Sampling Date	Rivers and Lakes Only	Shoreline Only	Rivers, L Shoreline and Urbar
Alger	2004	59,538	608	108,6
Baraga	2002	101,583	184	128,1
Chippewa	2003	11,411	431	15,02
Delta	2005	18,681	31	26,68
Dickinson	2006	9,162	0	22,80
Gogebic	2003	59,033	995	88,8
Houghton	2006	46,842	1,540	92,32
Iron	2002	62,515	0	98,3
Keweenaw	2006	55,772	2,912	58,14
Luce	2005	34,158	83	47,98
Mackinac	2006	4,302	108	7,01
Marquette	2006	158,946	508	264,2
Menominee	2003	26,828	0	47,89
Ontonagon	2003	64,811	185	77,07
Schoolcraft	2005	20,724	43	30,68

To highlight corporate lands that might have a relatively high potential for alternative use, buffers were created around landscape features that might affect this value, including lakes, rivers, shoreline, roads and urban areas. These features follow Michigan Geographic Framework definitions. In the case of roads, those included were state and federal highways, major and minor arterials, general non-certified roads, and U.S. Forest Service roads. For lakes, those bodies of water greater than or equal to 10 acres in size were buffered. Rivers, including creeks and streams, are those bodies that may be intermittently dry, but are large enough to be identifiable without vegetation covering the water body from bank-to-bank.

Once constructed, these buffers were merged and intersected with corporate land that fell within the buffered regions. Regions were defined as lands that fell within 5 miles of urban areas and 0.25 miles of other features. While the most recent sampling dates vary across counties from 2002 to 2006, the percentage of corporate land falling within the buffered regions is quite pronounced, ranging from 37% in Mackinac County to 75% in Marquette County.

Note that this process was not designed to predict which areas might be divested in the near future, nor to quantify the probability of any given acre or parcel being divested and converted to another land use within a given period of time. The approach taken here was to use simple definitions that might help quantify and visualize where corporate forest lands lie relative to landscape features and to stimulate further discussion.



June, 2007