

Bristol Plan Revision Meeting June 15, 2004: Alternatives

Comments on Alternatives A-E

Alternative A

Can't tell what was newly acquired and designated in this alternative. An overlay would be good
Glasterbury remote needs to connect to other similar areas. Now it's surrounded by backcountry motorized.
Result is habitat fragmentation.

If you can reach an area in 1/2 hr. it's not really backcountry. Call it "Big Tree - Motorized" or something that is better description.

Not enough wilderness in this Alternative.

Like Alt.-follows historical use, working landscape remains working.

Would like to see an alternative that reflects the State House Resolution. Either Alt. - A. or B. adjusted to meet
No wilderness - maximum diverse forest use.

Create 15-20% of continuous early successional forest. Patch CC for Ruffed Grouse & Songbird habitat.

An overlay of current situation to used over the other alternatives.

This Alternative does the least to ensure quiet backcountry recreation, and to ensure wild ecologically intact

Alternative B

Only alternative that addresses early successional habitat. This is a positive comment.

Need to manage only continuous basis with shorter rotations.

Need to manage for ruffed grouse to benefit northern goshawk.

Like to see forest having 15-20% early successional habitat (growth).

Goshen town forest is adjacent to backcountry motorized MA - what type of enforcement is planned???? This use could spill over into Goshen town forest (the motorized use).

Sustainable forestry with wildlife habitat enhancement really important.

Alternative B provides the best chance for balancing the age class distribution. Thus it is the only one that meet the biodiversity guidelines.

This alternative utilizes the most biomass for wood products then any other alternative; that is important!!!

Would like to see this alternative adjusted to meet the terms of the Vermont House Resolution for no more wilderness and maximum diverse use.

Would like to see the eastern section next to Bread Loaf Wilderness to become part of the wilderness, and expand South of 125 to what is now proposed as remote back country (the orange area).

Alternative C

Motorized backcountry can be renamed "Motorized Big Trees"; an area that one can access in 1/2 hour isn't true
This alternative seems to focus more on recreation than on ecologically significant issues.

I would like to see "escarpment" areas included within their adjacent management areas rather than bearing their
I like the Moosalamoo recreation MA, but there aren't enough new Wilderness Study Areas in the North 1/2. Also too much motorized access in the South 1/2, particularly adjacent to wilderness.

Why is, e.g., Grout Pond designated a special area in some alternatives but not in this one?? Seems that if it's special, it's special.

In designing areas for motorized use, enforcement capacity should be considered.

I like the idea of widening the Breadloaf Wilderness.

Why isn't the area South of Rte. 125 & the Middlebury Snow Bowl designated a "Wilderness study area" rather than "remote backcountry"? It should be Wilderness.

Alternative D

Need to include Lamb Brook as Wilderness Special Area.

Focus should be on ecological processes for all Alternatives, not on uses of the land

Need to emphasize resource uses not provided by private lands.

All alternatives should focus on biodiversity/maintenance & enhancement.

Like that there is more wilderness, but would like to see remote back country management area buffer wilderness & wilderness special area.

Would like to see wilderness management area extended South from existing down to proposed remote backcountry management area. This allows very large contiguous area not available in the Vermont landscape.

Agree with backcountry motorized in Bingo Brook area.

Need an alternative that includes all feasible inventoried roadless areas as wilderness special area/management Close FS road within Glastenbury wilderness special area and include area as wilderness special area.

Consider closing any roads that constrain current wilderness consideration.

Need to consider maintaining apple orchards & alder region. Why is the Cape NRA extended to South and what is the value we are protecting??????????

Biases age class distribution due to wilderness designation; too much old forest.

Makes it nearly impossible to meet biodiversity objectives for the forest.

Makes it impossible to provide proper wildlife habitat, because of too much wilderness (ie) old age forests.

Need more balance of wildlife habitat. Not enough early successional habitat opportunities in this alternative.

In this alternative you should connect the RBC area South of the Monastery/Philly Peak WSA and not have it fragmented by DFU & BCM.

% of wilderness special area & wilderness allocation should at least equal diverse forest use.

This alternative should have significantly more WSA than it currently shows. Similar to VWA proposal.

Alternative E

Seems balanced between Bristol Wilderness and Bristol Wildlife, access for other uses.

Backcountry motorized should be renamed because if you can ride to it in a short time it is not backcountry.

Some of backcountry motorized fragment the continuity or connectivity of remote backcountry & wilderness,(Romance Mtn. Area in North 1/2, between Lyebrook & Glastenbury) recommend greater connectivity with remote

Bingo Brook area is a significant watershed area and should not have motorized backcountry there. Also in Diverse Forest upper elevations should be remote backcountry or wilderness.

Would like to see a more clearcut identification of need to restore and maintain early successional habitat in all

Comments on OHV Options 1-4

Option 1

With exception of management, plan that prohibits use.

Can provide access to remote backcountry for disabled veterans, seniors, (backcountry is non-existent currently,

Option 3

OHV must be carefully monitored; should be included, diversity, environment is very sensitive ATV damage Enforceable, Specialist judgement.

Minimize all motorized vehicle use (including snowmobiles).

Option 4

Noise issue.

Allowing ATV (legal use) would enhance enforcement and illegal use (off trail); paid for by the users (similar to Existing plan (which prohibits legal ATV use) is the underpinning of the current problem. Management plans the prohibit use DO NOT WORK!

Enforcement problems. Once allowed it will/may creep out and create additional enforcement issues.

Need ATV trails in use and approved. Need a good "viable" system, not a token system.

Noise/pollution, wildlife disturbance, air pollution (not contained on legal trails).

Additional use (designated trails) should be designed to reduce impacts on private land owners.

Create a few designated areas and then carefully monitor for compliance, erosion, active partnerships (clubs); perhaps as a demonstration project.