Comments Public Meeting
Granville
October 17, 2001

COMMENTS ON ISSUES

1. Questions about issues: Are the issues already addressed in the current plan? Are people saying that these issues are not addressed now?
2. What is the current capability of the staff to enact management in all these issues and areas—within the management scheme.
3. Do you intend to prioritize issues so that some float to the top. Twenty three issues seems like too many to management.
4. How do you see the GMNF interacting with other initiatives—i.e. EPA, WRP. Would you share resources.
5. Will you involve other environmental organizations?
6. Biodiversity issue—cutting eliminates some types of birds. Need to manage to get this.
7. Wildlife management—large quantity of old orchards. FS used to clear them but for the past several years nothing has happened. What are the plans for those orchards?
8. Funding is one of the problems. If you can't get it, what is the purpose of having a plan?
9. Good logging practices are critical and should be continued. If logging is not continued, upset the food chain – benefits to wildlife, is important to continue logging.
10. Group to oversee waste on the GMNF—orchards good example. Another is vast amount of timber that is rotting to the ground.
11. Land Acquisition—money for management is diverted to land acquisition. Senator Leahy's aide said acquisition is a higher priority than management. She thought getting adequate funding to manage the forest you already have was much more important. Need to be good conservers.
12. Why do you need to manage if you are not going to cut?
13. Don't let the threat of lawsuits keep you from writing a good plan.
14. Demonstration project that would show how good management practices are good for biodiversity.
15. Forest is laboratory—do you work with the NE Experimental Station? Thinks we should work with research and academics and have silviculture demonstration sites
16. Site specific management – appealed a project—had to handle under FPR. Objectives were overriding goals. Primitive forest area—managing for aspen—in conflict.
17. Recreation—bikers—would like to have more access. Open except for specific areas on WMNF and is the opposite here. Here focuses all bikers to one or two areas.
18. Trails, has bypassed current plans because the technology has been changing so fast. Original plan seems restrictive – does not allow for mountain bikes or OHVs.
19. Can we try to get mountain biking before the FPR process is finished in five years. Takes a lot of work to build the trails.
20. Trails—partner with logging access—look at the big picture where a logger can help a skier or biker.
21. Timber management—basis for silviculture. Prescriptions besides maximizing timber growth with the value of what timber harvest can bring—not boilerplate forestry. Forest management rather than industrial forestry.
22. Streamlining the process. Looking at new issues—have you looked at whether you can eliminate any, or which in this go around can you handle and which can you put into other documents.
23. Shouldn't these discussions prioritize things?

NEW ISSUES

24. New Issues: Timber harvesting is different than timber management. Demonstrations are more education.
25. Timber programs have been virtually shut down. Needs to be an issue on the gridlock and how it can be changed.
26. Issue is the process itself. When there are ideas and groups of people who want things in the Forest, we get into gridlock. The gridlock is an issue.
27. Rather than speeding up process, broadening them. Deal with the issues when they arise and not by the calendar---every 15 years.
28. Engaging in more partnership to make public and private work together toward common solutions.
29. Natural dynamic silviculture—new issue, managing for natural communities.

COMMENTS ON EDUCATIONAL FORUMS

30. Other topics for forums? Biodiversity. What is it, how are you going to know how much you have?
31. Another vote for biodiversity, invasive species
32. Timber management and timber harvesting—would it make sense to have a forum on this? Management of timber resources is broader that harvesting.
33. Pressure groups. Juggling competing interest—why it takes so long and why things don't get done. You have to put it together.
34. Do watershed fit into the ecosystem category – should have forum on watershed management
35. Land Acquisition and social/economic

COMMENTS ON PROCESS

36. Question about process. When you look at the issues it comes out that several could be quantified with science. Others are subjective in nature. In the process is there a way to handle the differences?
37. You can quantify roadless vs species (I didn't get this one—couldn't hear).
38. Comment about socio-economist—did we have an economist on staff? Not doing too well on this – need to do better socio/economic analysis
39. When was existing plan adopted? Have there been revisions? Seems overwhelming. Needs to be easier to do amendment. We need public meetings every year, and to amend as it needs to be done. Commented on the question previous about the mountain biking.
40. Should run the forest like a business. If you were to run a business with a goal orientation of five years, it is difficult to obtain. Big turnout here to state run it like a business. Things should be done and not just looked at. Seems like the brakes are always on.
41. Lost in why we can't just amend plan everything. Why can't analysis be done along with the amendment.
42. Plan revision is a big picture. How do all the pieces fall together. Difference between revision and amendment.
43. Additional comments, suggestions, reaction. How do you participate in local planning groups? Going to find it difficult in bad weather.
44. It's difficult to go to Middlebury and Rutland—northern half of Forest. Would like to have more local meetings to be able to attend. Route 100 corridor. Difficult to go over the mountain to Middlebury and Rutland. Need to have other meetings on this side of mountain. All the educational forums should be on this side of the mountain. Our issues as a working community are different that they are on the other side. Lot of conflict.
45. How many different planning groups can you afford. Are you looking at five, thirteen? Answer 5 or 6 – more because expensive.
46. How are you going to keep people coming for three years.

47. Educational forums are not public comments. No comments, no speeches, etc. They are to understand the issues. Next question. Need to have clear ground rules as to what is acceptable and use people's times efficiently.
48. Question on process—if we reach agreement on what policy would be—would it be overturned in Washington? Cited Quincy group in California. Senator Leahy was part of this. Had some concerns about someone in Burlington that can overturn what the local community wants. In creating plan—what significance will it have.
49. What issues do you think are sticky.
50. Forum that town select boards would be invited. Have you considered this? There may be some issues that the public may not be aware of.
51. Are the issues that have come up here similar to what has come up in other meetings?
52. In the other meetings were there more special interest groups? Are they local people?
53. Hope Melissa's optimism continues. Nice compliment. People should recognize hard work.
54. Question about the planning commission should be involved in the process.