

Londonderry Plan Revision Meeting June 9, 2004: Alternatives

Comments on Alternatives A-E

Alternative A

Add topo lines too. Catamount Trail not shown on maps. Makes it hard to assess impacts on this trail. PLEASE include it in any maps on Web or at offices.

150 year rotation creates "Defacto " wilderness. Might "suffice" for wilderness

Use of wilderness is low. How can we justify designation.

Would like to see escarpment area in our preferred alternative.

Don't like backcountry motorized behind Mt. Snow.

Don't like because too much backcountry motorized.

Consider maps @ Windham RPC as a place to have maps available. Another chance for towns to have closer

Like it because highest timber management & most backcountry motorized.

Put up ATV on private gate on Road 266 - Illegal ATV use.

Need horse trails

Don't like too much backcountry motorized.

Don't like: want more wilderness Aiken to Lye Brook, Glastenbury! Aiken backcountry motorized should be remote backcountry.

Alternative B

Include escarpment area - S 1/2 Dorset area - Parson's Orchard. No motor use on steep slope.

Moosalamoo deserves "Special Classification" not necessarily NRA.

Prefer Alternative B because, - no more wilderness

Too much open land for OHV use.

Not enough Wilderness!

Misses opportunity to have big wilderness/remote backcountry area around Glastenbury & Lye Brook (RT 7 - FR 71/ Rt 9 not Lye Brook. "Don't take out Kelly Stand Road".

Like flexibility of uses & FS with options to protect resources, or cut timber where most appropriate.

Like providing income for local people/communities/forest resource industries.

Clarify road closures - why. Also enforce closures with severe repercussions for transgressions

Don't like anything about Alternative B

Like B - timber harvest & biodiversity/habitat options. Sees little use of wilderness.

Alternative C

Seems to be a wilderness compromise as a mountain bike advocate.

Much of wilderness is surrounded by motorized areas in Alternative C - WHY???

Lambrook, why is a section hacked off????????

Aiken needs a buffer from motorized use.

Wilderness corridor between Lye Brook and Glastenbury Mtn..

No more wilderness. Forest should be harvested.

Likes the escarpment category.

Protect beech stands both sides of Rte. 8 Lamb Brook; important bear feeding area.

Alternative D

Like remote wilderness protecting East side of Somerset.

Only Alternative that is even close to desired alternative.

Green hole diverse forest use in Glastenbury wilderness special area, is ridiculous; should close roads.

Backcountry motorized along Kelly Stand should be wilderness or remote wildlife habitat; another hole in donut.

Area around George Aiken should also be Remote Wildlife Habitat or Remote Backcountry.

Plan B preferable to others, but could go further +documents to include more wilderness/ -eliminate BCM above Glastenbury and make Lye Brook & Glastenbury contiguous.

D is worst for Mtn bikes and windpower.

D is the best because of stronger protection for wildlife and limits to motorized use.

BCM area around Bingo Brook is another hole in donut.

Don't like Alternative D - too much wilderness

South Half maps for WRC

Too much BCM in D -especially around G. Aiken & Kelly Stand.

D has too much Backcountry motorized.

Liked description of remote wildlife area right to "ski" and "ski expansion"-this needs thought!

Wants an NRA east of Glastenbury wilderness

Range is not wide enough-does not offer enough wilderness and/or remote areas-there is a lot of room between 30 and 100%

Everything from George Aiken over to Harriman should be wilderness

Eliminate motorized use west of Aiken Wilderness

Eliminate all motorized use on the GMNF

Like the escarpment area-particularly the area in Dorset

Closest to what I would like to see-needs a few changes: 1) have RBF next to Aiken W. as a buffer, 2) have RBF surrounding Glastenbury, 3) connect Glastenbury and Lye Brook, 4) would like to see wilderness in Lamb Brook to protect bear habitat

Change area east of Somerset from DFU to RBF

Need more acres designated for Glastenbury and Lamb Brook

Wilderness is big draw for tourists visiting

Aiken should not be surrounded by BCM

Consider Lamb Brook as wilderness

Change backcountry motorized name!

Need more gradual zoning changes from wilderness and remote areas

Lamb Brook-windmill SUP is driving designations and vice-versa

D is worst Alternative for mountain bikes and wind power

D is the best because of stronger protection for wildlife and limits to motorized use.

BCM area around Bingo Brook is another hole in donut

Don't like Alternative D-too much wilderness

Too much BCM in D-especially around Aiken and Kelly Stand

Alternative E

Concern over losing existing trails in Glastenbury area.

Like Jamaica bear corridor area in Remote Wildlife Habitat.

MA's aren't contiguous; seem too patchy, same problem as 1987.

Good job on percentages - no extremes.

Approve of RWH near Mt. Snow. Need to be put off development.

Likes the escarpment MA

Mtn. Bike community could live with this Alternative. Like potential access through BCM to Glastenbury peak

Why Lamb Brook cut in half. (1/2 DFU; 1/2 BCM)

Mtn. Bike likes Alternative B & C the best.

More designated wilderness, especially Glastenbury & Lamb Brook.

More wilderness and less BCM around Aiken.

Not enough remote areas (be it wilderness, remote backcountry forest)

Less wilderness.

Would like wild corridor (not motorized RBF) be with Lye Brook & Glastenbury.

Peru Peak additions good.

The tiny diverse forest use dots (West of Lye Brook - escarpment) Why not something remote if so small and next to escarpment. What about the tiny dot next to Lye Brook???

Too much motorized access and timber harvesting.

Like E best. Good for timber and wildlife.

D is favorite, then E

D has too much backcountry motorized

Comments on OHV Options 1-4

Don't want option 4-too restrictive 1-too nebulous

Option I - 2 votes Option II - 4 votes Option III - 2 votes / Would like to see some leeway to allow all people access.

Option 4 - 9 votes / Any of the options are moot without enforcement.

Would like to limit use of OHV in steep areas

Not appropriate use of public land!

Trails should be "terrain appropriate" for OHV, mountain bikes and hikers.

Education and enforcement

Extremes dollars to repair resource damage,

Already have problems with enforcement.

Certain designated road (Sucker Pond) 325.

Needs to be very carefully considered.

If road or trails are designated, a "system" need to access in accordance with town laws.

Option 3 is very restrictive-need enforcement

More enforcement-FR 266 needs a gate

It is not possible to enforce any option but 4...even now!

The NF is for everybody's use

WMNF allows ATVs on all snowmobile trails

Shouldn't be limited to any specific MA (option 1)