

Rutland Local Planning Group Meeting Notes 1-30-03

Question #1: What kind of place should the forest be and is that different than what it is now?

Multiple Use Comments

Forest is and should remain for multiple use

Traditional uses should remain

Less multiple-use conflict

Protect some special ecological areas: do not allow multiple uses in those places

Greater parity of multiple use

Multiple use=something for everyone

Recreation Comments

Better hunting

Provide recreation opportunities not available on private lands (ex. old growth with solitude, water recreation, backcountry opportunities)

Less noise pollution (ex. snowmobiles)

More recreation uses (ex. snowmobiling)

Designate some mountain bike trails

ATV use needs to be considered

Free cross country skiing and other recreational uses

Less motorized vehicle use

Law enforcement of illegal motorized vehicle use

Forest should lack ATVs-they should not be on forest land

Enforcement of ATV/snowmobile use

No ATV use

More emphasis should be on recreation and more trails

Balance activities in certain places: challenge, how to continue diverse activities considering public sentiment?

More emphasis to create habitats for recreational hunting opportunities

Forest Activity Management Comments

More active management (ex. deer habitat)

A sustainable forest (with ecological integrity)

Look at the whole forest instead of one region

Increase forest vegetation management

More intensive wildlife habitat management

Look at international management practices

Visuals and scenery management

Management areas-how do we mesh maps of different activities (ex. heavy timber cutting area should not back up to wilderness)

Special Uses/Special Use Area Comments

Unique role in providing special areas (ex. wilderness)
New concept of wilderness (a combined definition to satisfy the various interests)
Leave the high elevation land to wilderness
Support additional wilderness
Some wilderness areas but other areas too
More wilderness
Have enough wilderness for now for the size of Green Mountain National Forest
No more wilderness areas needed
Wilderness-needs definitions, goals, and desires determined

Special values of wilderness (ex. habitat, wildlife corridors for bears and all animals, decrease fragmentation)
Be visionary-preserve as much as possible (ex. wilderness areas)

Social/Economic Comments

Provide relationship with Vermont economy
Community sustainability (local economy linked to forest)
Maintain traditional Vermont
Economic opportunities
Vermont should be a model for other places
Zero Population Growth
Wind power (that stays in the state of Vermont) versus aesthetics
Relatively "self-contained" forest should not just provide what private land does not
Forest for areas of quiet and nice smells
Place to forget job

Have the forest monitored and "policed" by people from Vermont who know the land and are informed
Area nearby that provides opportunities for solitude and peace and quiet

Land Acquisition Comments

Land acquisition is basically a good idea-but don't want to see it "locked up" and not managed
Land is going fast-buy it regardless of use...put it into a Management Area quickly

Forest Service Activity Comments

Additional Forest Service personnel hired as additional land is acquired
Better information for public about community involvement (ex. volunteers)
Less red tape
More cooperative management with other agencies and private land
More cooperation with state (ex. Fish and Wildlife) for hiking and scenery possibilities
Predictability in executing the management plan

More attention to local/ cooperative responsibility/management (ex. Picking up trash, protecting from over-use)
More Forest Service staff needs hired

Less restrictive-an activity that is currently allowed should be easier to do (ex. creating trails with volunteers)
Bureaucratic process now-harder to get things done
Forest is under-staffed-how could the public help change this?
Need more signs: how do we know what we can do where?
"Promote" the forest more-but don't turn it into a theme park
Provide information of what is available
More educational programs
More local involvement with towns and communities within the forest boundaries
Help citizens become better informed about issues, proposed activities, etc.
Forest Service help provide information and better clarify things for local citizens (ex. How is data used to reach an alternative, rationale, etc.)

Use amendment process more to keep plan updated and not put as much emphasis on the 15 year revision
Provide research opportunities

Access Comments

Handicapped accessibility
More handicapped and disabled access (ex. trails for access)
Lack of roads is a good thing
Access to all needed in every season
Quiet places accessible to everybody: young and old
Handicap accessibility
Maintain accessibility-keep roads
There should be areas that are not accessible
Access, peace and quiet
Public lands-provide access to everyone
Maintain accessibility and maintain roads

Forest Health and Wildlife Comments

Protect integrity of the forest
Let some trees remain in their natural state
Maintain healthy forest
Need a firm idea of how much use is enough-monitoring-what are the limits of use?
Habitat diversity
Need more open areas
Maintenance of soil productivity
Increase in old-growth areas for genetic repository
Maintain biodiversity
Mix of landscape and landscape diversity provided
More renewable energy
More of a "working forest"
Concern over future power sources
Salmon
Habitat linkages and corridors

Timber Comments

More logging
Clarified timber program-reserved for long-range timber planning
Incorporate timber products industry with timber management

Forest should join Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) or Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Program
Should be a forest we can all use-multiple use-should manage for timber, already have wilderness, recreation, mountain biking, areas for solitude
Timber management greater than it is currently
Do not waste fallen timber (salvage)
What's creating a better economic yield/stability right now? (ex. Tourism, timber...)
Timber: how and where are more important questions than just to log or not
Management for higher production
Good timber management
Remain multiple use-should do some logging and take advantage of resources
Take a hard look at trade-offs between uses (ex. How much recreation do we allow before we forego active timber management-where it no longer seems feasible)
Concern about closing off forest areas-need areas for timber management
Timber management for timber and wildlife
Keep traditional uses (all motorized recreation and timber management)
Needs to remain an "active" forest

Question #2: What is unique, special, or important about the Green Mountain National Forest?

Social Importance

My backyard

It is Vermont

Public involvement

Never be developed

People live here, not just plants and animals

Close to large population base (VT, NY..)

Proximity to large population

Can find solitude-except for plane noise

Escape from urban environment...allowing peacefulness, renewal of spirit

Remoteness

Largest single landholder in US-need more land!

Economic resource done sustainably where private land may not

Low and high elevations, 4 seasons

Habitable for many years prior to becoming a National Forest-long history of management manipulation of the landscape

Recreation Importance

Hunting, fishing, hiking

Multiple Use Importance

Smaller National Forest-maybe we don't need every possible use on the GM-work in collaboration with other forests (state and White Mt. For example) so uses are spread out

Diverse use and diverse interests are supported and need to continue to be supported

Accessibility Importance

Accessible

24 hour access

Land Acquisition Importance

Small forest but still growing-"young" in a sense

Focus on Taconics land acquisition to provide good connections

Forest Health Importance

Diversity: needs preserved

Diverse ecological areas