

Arlington Plan Revision Meeting January 13, 2004: Management Areas

Questions

current Forest Plan?

2.What changes would you like to see in management area descriptions?

**3.What uses are compatible, or incompatible, with the current Management Areas and the possible new Management Areas?
tonight?**

Public Comments

current Forest Plan?

Primitive is a title change

Wilderness is extreme so we created 6.1 to at least let people access area better

5.1 meets some animal requirements, 6.1 does too-but these requirements don't meet many wildlife needs-animals with vegetation management needs aren't met

Doesn't agree with previous comments-old growth becomes patchy in future

Information is available on pre-settlement with lots of wildlife

9.2 lands left things in limbo

9.2 limbo is fairly short lived in forest terms

Why don't we have an eastern definition of primitive-the one we have sounds western

Make the entire forest Wilderness-need for the future

Lack of early successional habitat is declining-implementation of 3.1 and too much area is in no cuts

2.What changes would you like to see in management area descriptions?

All management should be general forest-federal forest is paid for by tax payers-bottom line is forest should be management for deer yards, bring in revenue, snowmobiles also bring in money

Remote backcountry should not include mountain bikes...mountain bikes cover a lot of area and lessen the

Habitat for wildlife should be a higher priority-early successional

Design a MA around early successional or incorporate within 6.1

Design a MA around old growth-some meet this is 5.1 and 6.1

3.What uses are compatible, or incompatible, with the current Management Areas and the possible new Management Areas?

Hope ATVs are very controlled-afraid ATVs try to bypass easy roads

ATVs on roaded area might be appropriate-not in 5.1 or 6.1

Compatible: active management is good for the land and good for wildlife

Incompatible: Wilderness

Above 2500' is also managed for non-cutting

Don't know effects of Wilderness on wildlife

Compatible use of high elevations is water resource protection

MAs in current Plan pretty well define compatible and incompatible uses-need to digest changes

No cutting areas-6.1 is incompatible with wildlife needs-needs early succession

Early successional is compatible with all MAs

Downhill ski areas are compatible with most of the MAs except those designated for that use

Economic impacts-lands on private land are posted-moving into National Forest-hunters are an economic mainstay to Bennington County and Vermont. Have a right to hunt on federal lands-hunting contributes more economically than hiking-hunting licenses are down-manage lands so that hunting will be occurring because of

tonight?

No timber harvest in primitive

Clearings for wildlife should be allowed

Fishing native trout is dying out in Vermont, how does that reflect clean water?

National Forest, not National Park-look at it as a garden-needs harvest. Timber is some of the best in the State-needs to bring revenues to local communities