

# **Comments – Rutland Plan Revision Public Meeting October 9, 2001**

## **COMMENTS ON ISSUES**

1. Question: Old growth. What is definition. Diane read from plan. 1982 definition. There are new definitions plan needs to be updated.
2. Question: Are there websites where people can look stuff up.
3. Special Use management. Cell towers. Can they be placed in a National Forest. Are there any cell sites on the Forest presently. There are repeaters on the GMNF.
4. Land acquisition is now 63 percent. She felt that was good. Is on selectboard. Must be aware of towns like Chittenden who have a huge taxbase. Need to think about recreation that will help the town. Accessibility is a plus—wilderness wouldn't work – need roads for fires etc. Community relations important. Growth concern that can help promote this. Tax payers should have primarily say.
5. Acquisition different approach. Environmental Assessment should be done for each of the acquisitions. Then all the issues can be addressed such as accessibility. Have public input into each acquisition. Doesn't like that we can buy land without the public input.
6. Mountain bikes—needs to be addressed in new plan. Monitoring & Evaluation report—mentioned erosion but that hasn't happened in three years.
7. American Disabilities Act impact—confusion about it. Need to clarify.
8. ATV—needs to be addressed in the plan. Has it been brought up in the past. Are we looking at it?
9. Stakeholders—towns have a different stake as to what happens in the plan. We are all shared owners of the Forest. But the level of effect for some is different. How is the balance going to address this? Don't stack the decks with polarized groups.
10. Chittenden—did the FS give guarantees that there would be a certain level of timber sales? The way timber sales have been going, not many towns are getting very much money from timber sales. Wants to see no more land acquisition unless we get some way to generate the tax base the same as tax payers.
11. More discussion on Chittenden—talked about what transpired with the last land acquisition.
12. Wants an open public process so that three selectboard members aren't the only ones who have a say in what happens. More than a vote. There are more than towns that have a stake.
13. More discussion on Chittenden. Wants to see the town of Chittenden decide on what happens. It is their business. Doesn't want to see outsiders come in and say what should happen in towns.
14. Question: Moosehunt why do they do a lottery that all of New England can participate in? Melissa explained this was under State of Vermont jurisdiction.

15. Education is important, mentioned the different names for clearcutting. Needs to address this. Terms are value laden and they need to be defined – need to give people information on why we do what we do.

## NEW ISSUES

16. Gridlock in decision making process. Wants to know what causes it how to move it forward and resolve it.
17. Is the fee system going to be put into effect on GMNF.
18. Question: about smart certification – sustainable forestry
19. Watershed planning

## COMMENTS EDUCATIONAL FORUMS.

20. Topics for Education Forums: FS goes through plan and tells us what's wrong with it. Wants the opportunity to know what's wrong with the present plan.
21. Land Acquisition so we can learn more about how that works.
22. Gridlock—so we can eliminate it.
23. Question on format of forums. Will they be like the present meeting or different?
24. Welcomes forums. Suggests when look like issues like recreation, new forms of recreation, carrying capacity, instead of having panelists, get to the issues that are the crux of the situation and have agenda driven and not personality driven.
25. Interactive television—have you looked into this? It's great. Inexpensive. Number of people we reached with the same story. One meeting statewide.
26. Are the forums intermixed – for example timber management and wildlife management have some of the same features.

## COMMENTS ON PLANNING PROCESS

27. Question on the timeline. At the present time does the GMNF have the personnel on board to complete the process?
28. Local planning groups—interested in this.
29. Catchy phrase—cross-fertilization.
30. How diverse will the meetings be. Will they be like the present meeting?
31. Doesn't like the paperwork that comes from signing up at meetings. Doesn't like to feel that if don't absorb all the information can't come to public meetings.
32. Other ideas: Will meetings be facilitated? Will that cut down on some of the gridlock.
33. Once we have plan and it is signed and sealed. How will we know if it will followed? Will it change in 10-12 years. What is the recourse if people don't feel we are following the plan.
34. Question on Process: Thanks for convening this meeting. Ambitious process and wonders how will keep sanity throughout the process. Applause.
35. Question: Where did the meeting in Middlebury happen.
36. Practical advise. Make the addresses better. Street address.