

Hancock Plan Revision Meeting January 15, 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?

Not working: too many MAs-too confusing and hard to understand-like the simplification headed toward

Existing MAs enable the direction to be in the Plan-works-new simplification just shifts planning to project level and could be more confusing

Not working: new MAs not working out

New techniques facilitate building in new flexibility

Working: Sugarbush MA has been working-the FS oversight and monitoring: enable Sugarbush to plan activities that are compatible with public interests

Not working: newly acquired lands being in limbo

Newly acquired lands MA works in theory-it is the implementation that has gone wrong-the concept is still good

Working: MAs do a good job in delineating the emphasis in each area

Some may be too restrictive

Could be more confusing at project level

General Forest and elimination of 9.2 are significant changes

It is hard to interpret present MAs to the public

Newly acquired land I not assigned a final MA

Forest never used authority to assign an MA to 9.2 lands

Present MA better define priorities

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

Proposals for change are workable-there are concerns to change things to make the MAs more easily defined on the ground

Delineate MAs with natural features or roads so public can better identify

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

Concerns about where mountain bikes are allowed, but not horses...example, remote backcountry-amenable to seasonal and site specific restrictions for horses-but concerned about wholesale restrictions. There are examples where horse use is compatible-would like to see more discussion on this compatibility issue, concern that only places horses are allowed is where ATVs would be allowed

Equine use is less likely of an impact on NNIS than native species

Incorporate historic site maintenance in each area-should be compatible with most MAs

Need to eliminate ATV use in backcountry MA-too damaging, not like snowmobiles

Horse use in more MAs-more compatible

Clarify use of roads and horse use

More description on historic sites compatible-historic farm site-maintain as open

ATV use may not be compatible-more illegal use, noise, enforcement issue-if no ATV use, no enforcement issue

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

Combining 2, 3, and 4 into General Forest Area: Improves flexibility for land managers-public uses seem to stay the same

Combining 2, 3, and 4 into General Forest Area: How will it change the percent of land managed in even-aged versus uneven-aged management-possible concern

Combining 2, 3, and 4 into General Forest Area: Would like to see same percentage of land managed like in 2, 3, and 4-brought into this combined MA-maintaining percent rather than allocating percent

Combining 2, 3, and 4 into General Forest Area: Level of detail on 3000+ acres should be at right scale-simplification is a good thing-existing break-outs create too much of a puzzle for managers to effectively manage

Combining 2, 3, and 4 into General Forest Area: Concern over where managers get direction for management in a combined MA

"B" Lands: Flexibility: allows markets to drive what is economically suitable

"B" Lands: No more in-between at end of plan, lands are either suitable or non-suitable

Remote backcountry: Horse use: there are ways to manage introduction of NNIS from horses (ways that are done in other areas) -work with horse community

Remote backcountry: Mountain bikes versus horse are compatible

Remote backcountry: Remote wildlife habitat and species that need management (T&E)

Remote backcountry: NNIS introduction and animal movement on and off forest

Backcountry motorized: Concern: biodiversity-what are you giving up by going to long rotations

Backcountry motorized: concern: potential ATV use-seems incompatible with other semi-primitive goals

Alpine: overlay of existing MA? Maybe include in S&Gs.

9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Need to clarify if NEPA is involved

9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Need a procedure to turn these areas around more quickly

9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Questions: statutory authority to do first part of Option 1

9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Clarify what attributes are used to first ID half of Option 1

9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Do Forests who use these options have smaller or similar size acquisition programs? Size of program may affect the effectiveness of these tools or public concerns

9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: 3rd option-no more acquisitions during life of this new plan

More comfortable with restrictions developed through public involvement (like these meetings) than through Congressional designation

Mountain bikes create grooves and leads to erosion-suggest this activity be limited to hard surfaced trails that resist erosion, places designed for them

Have to be careful where mountain bikes go-but it seems that with some experiments, mountain bike use can work out (example, Contest Trail)

Support mountain bike trail in remote backcountry

Build Plan that is realistic with budget and staff, etc.

6.1 remote backcountry-not compatible with this MA

Create more biodiversity work with the state and forest product industry-help deer habitat

ATVs are not compatible with MA 6.1 and MA 6.2

Use has to be compatible with MA and site

ATVs and mountain bikes need areas on National Forests-S&Gs will control use-assume use will be responsible

Like General Forest MA as written and presented tonight

Remove MA 2.2 from General Forest Area-some qualities would be lost

9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: deal with pre-existing easements on trails-need to factor into defining MAs

9.2 Newly Acquired Lands: Option 1-first half, include a list of criteria for classifying, second half-clarify public involvement

Forest plan should be something that can be implemented-encourage FS to consider this in definition and allocation of MAs

MA 2.2 should not move into General Forest

Chittenden lands existing entitlements were accepted with purchase

List criteria for adding on to an existing or adjacent MA

Opposed to proposed 9.2 changes-use existing NEPA authority