

Londonderry Plan Revision Meeting January 14, 2004: Management Areas

Questions

1.What is working, or not working, with the existing Management Areas (MAs) in the 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?

4.Do you have any suggestions to improve any of the Management Areas presented tonight?

Public Comments

1.What is working, or not working, with the existing Management Areas (MAs) in the current Forest Plan?

Go back to 9.2 as an unassigned zone-small piece of land that is purchased and isolated-keep it as 9.2 until further land is acquired to make a sensible block to designate-50 acres is too small to assign an MA but 640 acres may be enough-keep 9.2 available as an option for these small isolated boundaries

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

In summaries of the descriptions-include more information on what recreational uses are allowed/prohibited both in existing and proposed MAs

Are there other areas that fit (or closely fit) the subalpine descriptions (i.e. Stratton and Mt Snow have Bicknell's habitat)

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

Fold ROS recreation into uses and MA designations and how adjacent MAs relate to one another-make sure uses are compatible when one MA is located next to another

Depends on how the plan is implemented-with skill you can have a lot of uses but if folks do not behave as they should-then you have incompatibilities and conflicts will occur

Compartmentalizing will make it easier to manage

High intensity of recreation on east side of Deerfiled Ridge-not compatible with west side of the ridge-Somerset. Also, Cold Brook Class A watershed habitats are along ridge.

Roadless areas that are inventoried, we are concerned that cross country trail management and maintenance (or hiking trails) is not allowing those needs

Mountain bikes conflict with remote backcountry forest goals (6.1)

Question if ATVs should be allowed in 6.2-this is more appropriate in General Forest MA

4.Do you have any suggestions to improve any of the Management Areas presented tonight?

The General Forest Proposal (combining 2,3, and 4) increases flexibility

The General Forest Proposal (combining 2,3, and 4) needs a clear process for making management decisions when management emphases conflict. For example, management of deer yard for deer or saw timber
The General Forest Proposal (combining 2,3, and 4) might lower Forest Service accountability
USFS says "we are doing what Forest Plan proposes, so it is consistent"-afraid the wording is mixed or flexible or vague and gives citizens less of an ability to contest
Alpine/sub-alpine: clarify distinction between downhill and cross country skiing...also what about snowshoeing?
Alpine/sub-alpine: winter use of summer trails
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: speeding up management decisions (for management designation) is a major step forward
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: might combine options 1 and 2
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: option 2 may have unwanted political, social, and economic implications and might add time to the planning process
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: option 2-what about urban areas?
Proposed 6.1: Need to clarify how fire and bug infestations would be treated
Proposed 6.1: Emphasize allowing natural forces to play out
Proposed 6.1: Native/non-native infestations-including plants
Backcountry Motorized 6.2: Clarify that there is no off-trail recreation except pedestrians
Backcountry Motorized 6.2: Provide access via ATVs for those who need to use them
Backcountry Motorized 6.2: Enforcement issue-don't let bad actors preclude ATV access
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Makes sense to assign inholdings that are acquired to an MA right away-same as areas surrounding the inholding
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Option 1 makes more sense in terms of flexibility
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Option 2 is setting up expectations and people might get upset if we go to change it
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Option 2 is unwieldy at best and we are concerned about expectations-also time and expense delaying the plan-political and social implications
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Need to do some analysis for large parcels to be put into MAs
General Forest Area makes sense-how do you determine what the tools and desired conditions are for specific areas? The proof is in the details
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Option 1-the second statement makes best sense if there are multiple adjacent designations
9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Don't like Option 2-balance of allocation may be looked at when pre-assigned, but can't control what will actually be purchased so could end up with an imbalance
6.1 is too much like Wilderness-this should be looked at, is it the right one to use, especially Glastenbury?