

Rochester Plan Revision Meeting June 17, 2004: Alternatives

Comments on Alternatives A-E

Alternative A

150 years too long for backcountry motorized

Good there is no added Wilderness.

Range of Alternatives "good".

By allocating 9.2 the "no action" alternative, is not really a no-action. It's not the current situation. It's a new alternative that uses the new MA's.

Not enough diverse forest in this alternative.

Too much backcountry motorized.

Enough diversified forest to accommodate multiple use.

Puts breaks on "out of control train called Wilderness Designation.

38% Diverse for too little

More wilderness need in this Alternative.

Needs more wilderness and less diverse forest (less timber).

Not enough wilderness in any of the Alternatives.

Glastenbury should be in wilderness.

Shouldn't have backcountry motorized back up against wilderness.

Need more horse trails on National Forest. Be more specific about what's a road and what's a trail. Hard for horse people to tell.

More wilderness.

Blueberry Lake should not be backcountry motorized. Warren wants to keep motors out of that area.

Blueberry Lake should be "special" area as in other Alternatives.

Area between Lincoln & Stetsen Brook would be better as remote backcountry.

Too much emphasis on motorized recreation; change to remote backcountry.

Alternative B

Backcountry motorized - Granville/Hancock, head of the White River should be diverse forest uses (disturbed ground - logged - farmed)

Please decide on Austin Brook access in summer. Should be open.

Stetson Brook Wilderness study area should be motorized recreation or diverse forest uses.

Like backcountry for 1/2 diverse forest & not much more wilderness

Like remote wildlife habitat.

Like B for Diverse Forest Use & Wilderness balance. Access roads to Breadloaf; need maintenance & parking; Stetson Brook & Austin Brook roads.

Keep opportunities for volunteers to maintain trails at Blueberry Lake (x-c, snowshoe).

Obscene amount of I MA - poor balance.

All alternatives did not adequately address boundary concerns as previously identified by Forest Service.

A - E do not present an adequate range of alternatives.

Like B - truest to historic mission of forest service in producing growing timber.

Too much to digest all at once!!

More wilderness needed. Too much DFU in B (timbering).

Like boundary improvements to wilderness. Like decrease in backcountry motorized. Like large DFU.

B is best multiple use balance - no more wilderness.

Alternative B fails to buffer existing wilderness areas, with the exception of Granville/Breadloaf; ie, diverse forest use surrounding Federal Designated Areas is a tough management situation.

Like Plan B provided no additional wilderness, even small boundary fixes; they don't help biodiversity.

Alternative C

No logical progression in alternatives

Where are the buffer zones for Wilderness?

Need horse trail system.

Granville Gulf National Reservation.

Area next to Blueberry Lake should be remote backcountry.

Like wilderness study area between Stetson Brook and Lincoln.

Don't like how backcountry motorized butts up into wilderness; seems very disruptive. Where are the transition zones.

Wilderness provided in this alternative is inadequate.

Should not split the Glastenbury Roadless Area.

Don't agree with designating Moosalamoo special area. Not any more special than rest of the forest. Could take resources away.

Should be 77% Green.

Like DFU & BCM in Pittsfield & Rochester.

Like the additions to existing wilderness areas for boundary monitoring.

Don't like increase in backcountry motorized.

Good to see keeping multiple use this source.

Alternative D

Approve of recreation special area in Blueberry Lake.

Approve of remote backcountry North of Lincoln Brook.

Approve of remote backcountry extending Breadloaf.

Wilderness South of Lincoln Brook

Likes this the best, however, still lacks % of wilderness and remote backcountry.

Would like to see more NRA's remote wildlife habitat and less diverse forest use.

Likes additions to existing wilderness. Makes boundaries easier to monitor.

Likes the reduction of backcountry motorized recreation; there is enough of that.

Would like to see more wilderness added.

Likes this, maximum amount of wilderness.

Concerned about % of backcountry motorized. Needs to be monitored and kept at a low level.

Less wilderness and more diverse forest use.

Like remote wildlife.

This alternative is the most balanced alternative.

Allows for 60% timber harvesting. 10% more proposed wilderness, but there is room for more wilderness, and it would still be a balanced alternative.

Encourage Forest Service to make alternative D as a more progressive alternative for conservation.

Add more wilderness.

Needs to be an alternative that makes everything roadless (or VWA alternative).

This is a reasonable alternative to analyze.

VWA alternative seems to have been dismissed; need to be considered. Instead, have to go to Congress. VWA alternative was supported.

People were asked to use the planning process; don't push through Congress.

VWA proposal submitted 5 years ago and so it should at least be considered and analyzed, otherwise the message is don't trust the Forest Service.

Timber suitability analysis. Want to have an alternative that has more wilderness and backcountry, so you can look at alternatives that maximize various values. Need to solve for the opposite of max timber.

Likes that this alternative has most wilderness, but it needs more.

Expand Romance Mtn. To the West (make remote backcountry or wilderness) connect escarpment with wilderness area.

This is the most balanced of the alternatives.

Even though this has the most wilderness, it does not represent what public support has shown for wilderness.

Doesn't feel there is an adequate range of alternatives.

What about Lamb Brook??? Should be wilderness.

Way too much wilderness, not enough managed Forest Land, inconsistent with purpose of the Forest Service. Alternative D is good, but it needs more wilderness. Doesn't come close to VWA proposal, which is not an extreme one.

Can support alternative D, because Monastary Mtn. does not include the Bingo Road.

Alternitive E

Would like to see property boundry extended in Roxbury wilderness for conservation community purposes.

Like how backcountry is staying status quo.

Would like more wilderness in alternative E and less diverse forest use; more remote backcountry forest.

Need more approved horseback riding trails.

Wilderness areas are wonderful, educational and interesting.

OHV's at Sunset Crater are problematic; very destructive and noisy. National Forest land is for peace and quiet.

Need handicap/elderly access; peace and quiet.

Warren area should be remote backcountry forest, not backcountry motorized.

Would like more "Wilderness".

Monitor #'s of motorized users and possibly limit group sizes.

More diverse forest use.

Less wilderness.

Like remote wildlife habitat.

Too much wilderness, will have top predators.

Need more wilderness; would expand into Romance Mtn.

More diverse forest use.

Less intensive harvest in Upper Deeffield Area (H20 shed)

Warren area could be good for wilderness, remote backcountry forest.

Need more wilderness and less motorized vehicles.

Include Moosalamoo area.

Backcountry motorized areas should not be against "wilderness" boundaries.

Oppose any ATV's (OHV's) on forest.

Comments on OHV Options 1-4

General Comments

Forest Service has negatively effected animal species (fish, partridge). (Berry, nuts, & fruit are non-existent).

OHV should be allowed when the ground is dry. ATV's help keep the brush down.

We need designated areas for ATV's.

ATV's should learn to use the whole trail.

ATV user would help maintain trail.

ATV's should be monitored and maintained .

All motorized, wheeled vehicles are distructive to plant/ animal environment and should not be allowed.

Planner for Forest Service need to monitor there approach to expelling bandits/risk to NOT convey bias or play on peoples fears. (Be equitable)

OHV is one of the four major threats, by the Chief of the Forest Service.

ADA law folks are not being treated fairly. Access to the forest is too difficult.

OHV's should not be allowed on trails, destructive (erosion, tracks, ets.). Use private lands.

Option 1

OHV's have no place to go, so they must break some rules to recreate.

Suggest end of October (vs) December 1. (Avoid conflicts/hunting, etc.).

Option 2

Consider all OHV (Jeeps, Trucks, etc.).

Currently no registrations for ATV's.

Certain MA's should allow use where others may be . More restriction.

There is a tremendous public need/request for use and the Forest Service need to provide this.

OHV's should not be allowed off hardened surfaces (roads).

Option 4

Forest Service need to designate "lands" for OHV use.

Users are volunteering to maintain the roads and trails. I don't see hikers doing this.

Enforcement will be a problem. Ecological damage is a problem. Degrading area beach goups "promise" to "fix it". Not a reasonable alternative.

More horse use needed (designated)!

They should be multi-use.

This could be done on existing trails (no new trails needed).

In cases where you allow use, have sign-ins for monitoring purposes.

Option 5 (Suggested New Option)

Allow on specific roads

No trial use.

No way to enforce.

Support particular management areas.

Likes Option 4 best - no OHV's on Forest! Can't maintain trails we have now.

No OHV's on Forest; soils can't handle it. No maintenance.

There is currently private and state land, AVA lands.

Worried that as improvements in technology grows, the forest service will be expected to provide more & more land. (sets a precedent for new motorized vehicle use).