

## Bennington Plan Revision Meeting June 8, 2004: Alternatives

### Comments on Alternatives A-E

#### Alternative A

Have everything at our disposal to do a good job.

Of all, like this one the best.

Backcountry motorized - 150 rotation too long. Maybe 75 years instead.

Like this Alternative - maintains current snowmobile trail system.

Not enough wilderness protection. This is way out of balance with Forest harvesting and motorized access.

I urge extreme caution before suggesting that our generation can best plan for the yet unknown needs of future generations. The GMNF should be managed for the needs of today; not designated (or cemented) for the restriction of future generations.

Newly acquired lands should not go to Timber Management. Concern, rare plant communities/animals are not protected. Our map showed these concerns within 9.2 lands.

Wilderness corridor protected-Glastenbury to N. Lye Brook- Brandon Gap - Middlebury Gap.

Greater clarification on how ONRW will be protected.

Maintain motorized trails on top of Glastenbury Mountain.

If this reflects the current plan, why are snowmobile trails on top of Glastenbury not open (put in Remote Backcountry)???

Too much motorized access. Not balanced with wilderness.

Shouldn't be buying lands on speculation of what we might do with it - (9.2) related). Short term gain, long term ATV's should be managed like snowmobiles (VAST system).

#### Alternative B

Full wilderness corridor protected between Glastenbury and Lye Brook.

Full wilderness corridor protected between Brandon Gap and Middlebury Gap.

Outstanding water petition (LONRW) before GMNF....How will these proposal (Alternatives) affect this petition???

Would like to see Lamb Brook protected as wilderness.

Area South of Rt. 125 (N 1/2) in remote back country protected as wilderness.

Less satisfactory alternative because of less proposed wilderness.

Would like to see Glastenbury protected as wilderness.

Re: Aiken Wilderness --- currently there is "back country motorized". Would like to see "remote wildlife" would be better.

Too much "diverse forest use";non predictable for management.

Not enough emphasis on remote wilderness (I.e., solitude, non-development).

Most preferred because least amount of wilderness designation and the best balance of proposed uses.

Most preferred because it is the least economically devastating. This allows us to showcase what Vermont has to offer (I.e., access to outdoors, wood products and service-based economy.

#### Missing:

Rt. 9 through Lye Brook to Forest Road 71 & Rt. 7. The only place in Vermont where there could be unfragmented remote back country. Extraordinary high elevation wetlands East of Lye Brook and extensive wetlands East of Glastenbury/LT. Nowhere else in Vermont is there the opportunity for such a big wilderness/protected area. This is a missed opportunity. Same issue in connecting Breadloaf, Romona Mtn. and Mooselamoo NRA - another great opportunity for large remote, eventually old growth landscape.

Good Alternative - allows for future resource (wood product) use, and is the most diverse. More people would On Forest Road 71 & Forest Road 325, would like to see more "Diverse Forest Use".

In the Glastenbury area currently proposed as "Backcountry Motorized", there is a large occurrence of rare plants/communities (sensitive or vulnerable). Strongly request that it be downgraded to non-motorized.

Too much "Backcountry Motorized".

Glastenbury should be wilderness.

All need more Government funding.

### **Alternative C**

Glastenbury Peak: is motorized access allowed? Prefer no motorized at summit in other than "D".  
Wants wilderness corridor complete from Southern Glastenbury through Lye Brook, and between Brandon Gap & Middlebury Gap.  
Need to specify how "outstanding natural resource waters" will be managed.  
Moosalamoo recreation area is good! Should be added to all Alternatives.  
Existing & (proposed) wilderness areas have too much motorized borders. Need more buffers of remote back country.  
Glastenbury wilderness should be larger.  
Likes remote back country on East side of Glastenbury & Long Trail.  
Want solid block of wilderness/back country from Lye Brook to Glastenbury; special wetlands complex, including low elevation.  
Wilderness restricts uses. Want other types of access to areas.  
More diverse uses for more diverse habitats.  
National recreation area between Glastenbury and Somerset.  
More buffer area (non motorized) around Aiken Wilderness  
Looks like compromise between preservation/protection and multiple uses. Wants to promote habitat.  
Likes C & E because of mix of areas.  
Likes balance in "C", but wants more wilderness and remote back country.  
Special place: Lamb Brook - all east of Rt. 8 more protected.  
Already too much motorized use; not enough control of illegal use.  
Proposed Glastenbury wilderness special area has existing roads and trails and good timber. Should be in diverse use area.  
Need more Glastenbury Wilderness (on East side of A.T.).  
Want wilderness on large roadless area South of Rt. 125.  
Alternative "C" has too much motorized access area.

### **Alternative D**

Is my preferred alternative.  
In all alternatives, is too little remote back country.  
Desire for areas south of Rte. 125, designated as Wilderness.  
More Wilderness around Glastenbury Mountain.  
Provide a link between Lyebrook W. & Glastenbury.  
Proposal Brandon Gap & Middlebury Gap for Wilderness.  
Likes the Glastenbury proposal for Wilderness.  
FS Road 278 should be in Backcountry Motorized, to provide watershed protection.  
Alternative D going in right direction. Would like to see more in Wilderness due to rare occurrence of Wilderness in East and large number of acres of newly acquired lands, 90,000 on the Green Mtn. National Forest.  
Renew Stamford Meadows as potential Wilderness back country of new acquisition.  
Expand Lyebrook to include Stratton Pond and South to near the Appalachian Trail.  
Would like remote back country buffer surrounding G. Aiken Wilderness.  
Area to S.W. G. Aiken would make excellent wilderness, due to lack of roads, high elevation, lack of snowmobile trails, yet areas around are compatible to motorized use.  
In other Alternatives, the Glastenbury Mtn. Area should be in either remote back country or wilderness. (In at least one more Alternative!)  
Alternative D way too restrictive, doesn't allow for flexibility for future generations.  
Too much additional wilderness in the Alternative.  
This Alternative prevents management for Forest product now & into future. Need for this will only increase with increased population.  
Glastenbury area can provide these type products that won't be available in the Alternative.

Lamb Brook should be Wilderness

Area directly North of G. Aiken should be a Natural Resource Area.

No new Wilderness, because existing wilderness get low use.

Alternative is good. Favors more flexibility for future use. Now wild & future wild allows more change in the future.

Alternative a favorite. Good allocation of remote backcountry east of Lyebrook

Would prefer VWA wilderness proposal

Need better Mgmt. Area allocation emphasizing large contiguous area with remote backcountry wilderness combo from Lyebrook Rt 9 - Rt 7 /FR71.

Likes this because it protects summit of Glastenbury.

Good Mgmt. Area allocation of remote wildlife between Glastenbury & Somerset. (no more motorized) - but keeps West open to Wind Tower development - diverse Forest use.

Doesn't adequately address access to aging population.

Doesn't address Socia Economic Impacts from reducing motorized use.

No ATV's ever. They are more destructive than clear-cut.

No even age management. We need our topsoil.

Need more wilderness, especially in high elevation (but to mid and low elevation areas) We cannot make large undisturbed wild areas on private land

Consider acid deposition. In 80% of GMNF exceeds levels that the forest can absorb without suffering disease, insect infestation, etc..

This is the only proposal that begins to address the data from your rare communities map. If you were to be more protective, we would have lasting rare areas for the future.

Of the plans proposed, I support this one the most because of it's emphasis on habitat protection, biodiversity and non-motorized "low impact" activities. Would like to see more of the rare plant and animal communities protected with buffer zones and connecting corridors protected.

### **Alternative E**

How are you planning for large scale insect damage in the future, "e" h.w. edelgid?

Additions to Wilderness freezes out future generations.

Like diversification of Alternatives

Not hearing about high altitude acid deposition - so more cutting (logging) would exacerbate the situation. Forest will be weakened - open to disease, insects, etc..

I want no even-age management.

Timber harvesting only in areas already roaded.

Glastenbury Wilderness enlarged and larger buffer around exisiting and proposed wilderness.

Greater economic benefit to be realized by using existing snowmobile trails for mountain biking.

No provision for access by an ageing population.

In Alternative E, there is not enough Wilderness Study designation.

Alternative E has too much Diverse Forest

### **Comments on OHV Options 1-4**

#### **Option 1**

Forest Service must designate the trails.

Existing roads are currently being maintained and this increases the probability of a successful rescue.

Wilderness designation on the Eastern side will increase recreation in the Western Forest (Taconic range).

Concern about rescue access.

General comment - Timber suitability is incorrect if it is changing by Alternative. (Access, MA restrictions).

Funding increase is the net result.

Current examples where ATV use is an Economic benefit.

More wilderness - leave things, nature will allow more change later.

#### **Option 2**

Allow ATV's on designated trails.  
ATV's should be allowed. Follow your Plan!

### **Option 3**

### **Option 4**

Only propose ATV if funding is secure!

ATV more destructive than logging - Devastate the land - Back mottoring to restricted area's

Funding requirements for any ATV initiatives.

ATV's destroy the resources they need for trails.

Where's the access (Road, Truck (fire) & Helicopter

Wilderness designation would preclude the moterized access for Search & Rescue. (This must be done within the

### **"Golden Hour"**

IC engines should use the Interstate/cross roads.

No even-age timber management. Soil gravity is very slow. Erosion is a significant factor.

With increased funding for enforcement to stop illegal ATV use.

Encourage proactive ATV program

Lacking enforcement and lawbreaker; you must strengthen enforcement.

For protection

Need more alternatives which prohibit ATV

Enforcement is currently not sufficient for ATV on the forest.

ATV's are causing too much damage & enforcement is impossible.

Need Assessment

Change Fund Requirements: 1) Enforcement & Equipment & Manpower, 2) Monitoring, 3) Degradation/

Partnership opportunities