

## Rutland Plan Revision Meeting January 27, 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?

Be more aggressive with designation of RNAs-more so than the FS was under the 1987 Plan

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

What happens to inventoried roadless areas if they are not recommended for Wilderness? Would they retain roadless characteristics? If they needed to be put into an MA to retain those characteristics-which one would it be? Be clear for February meetings.

Change "Backcountry Motorized" to "Backcountry Recreation"

MAs 6.1 and 6.2 are both backcountry and should be consistent in saying "1/2 mile from high standard roads and 2500 acres in size" or not saying this at all. I prefer to remove this language-especially because 2500 acres is very large for Vermont scale-limits our options to have minimum sizes and distances set.

Remote Backcountry Forest 6.1-spell out compatible uses that are different than Wilderness (make it clear): mechanized equipment for trails maintenance, allow control of NNIS, active management of cultural heritage sites

General Forest: not clear what you can do where in this MA-can you harvest timber and have motorized recreation everywhere? Not clear what is allowed or not allowed

What is happening to 9.3??

Backcountry Motorized 6.2: Last sentence under DFCs needs clarification

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

Escarment MA: is this in a rock climbing area (Bristol Cliffs)? Need to include as a compatible or incompatible use in the description

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

Escarment: concern that if this was a continuous linear MA it would be a barrier for future trails

Escarment MA: Do not allow this MA to halt new trail connections from Route 7 to existing trails (snowmobile trails and other trails)

B Lands: Why does the FS care about "economic conditions" in the B Land MAs?

B lands: Difference between "not economically feasible" and "no commercial timber harvest will occur"

9.2 Lands: Would removing 9.2 current MA process remove public involvement and ability of the public to comment on which uses could continue?

Clarify this in the 2 options-need more detail than the 2 paragraphs in the Proposed MA descriptions-need more rules and protocols. For example, how can you say newly acquired lands will take same MA as adjacent parcel when there may be more than 1 adjacent parcel-which MA would you choose?

Need protocols for public to understand and make educated comments

9.2 Lands: Option 2-lot of work, is it logistically possible given the GMNF resources? Would it be an interactive process with local governments? Make this clearing the description

9.2 Lands: Option 2-what impact would this have on June 2005 target date?

9.2 Lands: Option 2- any assessments done now to put all land into MAs would assume the land conditions would be static until they may or may not be purchased.

9.2 Lands: Prefer Option #1 with the rule that management classification should not preclude existing uses

9.2 Lands: Anything is better than now, favor Option 1 with public input-Option 2 is undoable

9.2 Lands: What about an annual basis for assigning new lands (new lands may be in a holding pattern for up to that one year post-purchase)

9.2 Lands: Need public input and open criteria: How do you make a decision? What is "unique" to require more of an evaluation?

9.2 Lands: Do Plan Objectives dovetail into these new MA options? How to best manage to reach goals (not an objective to purchase land because it meets a specific objective)

9.2 Lands: Clarify how we would allocate land if we didn't use Options 1 or 2

9.2 Lands: If Option 1 or 2 were approved-the public review would be part of the planning process (DEIS public meetings)-no public input on a parcel-by-parcel basis unless unique features existed

9.2 Lands: Why would you not expect public input following the purchase of large parcels? You need it. Need to distinguish a process between large parcels and small parcels

9.2 Lands: Still have to do a process in the future to assign lands into an MA under Option 1-why wouldn't that process include public involvement?

9.2 Lands: Object to grandfathering trails onto newly purchased lands-should just be a consideration to keep existing uses

9.2 Lands: As an exercise: look at the newly acquired lands we have now (85,000 acres) and apply Option 1 to see how it would work out

General Forest: is extra monitoring minimal and doable?

General Forest: good plan-provide a large segment of land with consistent management-and it is easier for the public to understand what is happening

General Forest: Concern with the loss of the existing MAs that General Forest would replace...there would be no MA with "no commercial timber harvest" except remote backcountry...concerned that this is limiting restrictions that should be in place on the National Forest

General Forest: Is the purpose to allow more timber management?

Remote Backcountry 6.1: If biking is a compatible use-need money for trail maintenance and need to clarify where they would be allowed

Remote Backcountry 6.1: Very good alternative to adding more Wilderness (prefer 6.1 over Wilderness)

Backcountry Motorized 6.2 and Remote Backcountry 6.1: need a category between the two that has backcountry that is not remote but that does not allow motorized recreation

Backcountry Motorized 6.2: Why do we specify 150+ year rotations in this MA and then say in General Forest MA that managers should use their knowledge to decide best silvicultural practices -seems a dichotomy between the 2 MAs concern: Aspen stands in 150+

### **5.General Questions**

Where would Chittenden Reservoir fit into these MAs? Should there be Special Areas for shorelines?

Will RNAs be part of special areas? YES