

## Hector Plan Revision Meeting Notes 11-6-03

### Small Group Work

#### Questions:

1. What is working, or not working, with the existing Management Areas in the current Forest Plan?
2. What uses are compatible, or incompatible, with the current Management Areas and the possible new Management Areas?
3. Do you have any suggestions to improve any of the Management Areas presented tonight?

#### **1. What is working, or not working, with the existing Management Areas in the current Forest Plan?**

Grazing is working-besides revenue and livestock, grazing helps tourism (adds a scenic landscape) and provides viable agriculture

Would like to bring in buses of tourists (especially senior citizens)-need a visitor center-would like it in Schuyler County

Proportion is off for grazed and ungrazed grasslands-need to increase ungrazed grasslands for wildlife benefit

Understory diversity is not working-large trees with very few species

Working: Potomac Campground Road has a wonderful diversity of trees

Isn't working: use accurate eco-terminology in MA descriptions so we now what kind of landscape is the goal-keep management objective clear

Ration of even and un-even is too high

Not working: diversity within definition of an MA (ex. 3.1-both forests form natural reproduction and non-native conifer plantations-should separate these 2 groups...could have 2 different continuous forests where trees die of old age and where they are cut-both meet definition

Not working: don't reflect ELTs, differences in soils, forest-wide problems like acid rain-ex. highland soils on top are much more susceptible to acid rain (due to thinner soils)

Current MAs lack constructive spatial arrangement-ex. grazing next to even-aged management-set up for invasives to come into forest via pastures-need buffers

Not working-3.1: definition of high quality is not necessarily the same as fast-growing...best oak is grown with heavy competition-produces minimal sapwood and minimal knots and therefore high quality sawtimber-incompatible with management for maximum growth rates

#### **2. What uses are compatible, or incompatible, with the current Management Areas and the possible new Management Areas?**

Grazing is incompatible in 9.2-don't expand grazing

ATVs not compatible

Shoed horses should not be allowed on wet areas all year round as they ruin trails

Hunting is an allowed use-compatible with managing for species...it is incompatible with hiking and camping. Need more signage and education during hunting season (including the value of hunting for preserving species)

Res. and education is compatible with almost all Managements Areas

Oil and gas drilling are incompatible with recreation, tourism and ecological balance-also timber harvest is incompatible with some

ATVs are incompatible with all MAs (compatible with private property)

Anything that carries mud is incompatible with any area you want to keep invasives out-especially. garlic mustard

Anything to stop garlic mustard is ok

Some area that is unmanaged would be good (no timber harvesting, hiking ok, no motorized, limited trails, management for non-natives ok, no wheeled vehicles, managed for wilderness characteristics)

MA 2.1 is compatible with letting trees dies of old age instead of harvesting-could girdle the trees instead of disrupting soil conditions

Girdling, feeling and leaving are acceptable management tools

Firewood permits not compatible in MA 2.1-better in 3.1

In any MA where harvesting is ok-it should be done in a way to mimic natural disturbance

MA 2.1-improve by excluding mechanical harvesting of timber and developing a comprehensive plan to control spread of non-native species, and to consider non-timber species of plants that are being impacted by deer

Excluding mechanical harvests is compatible with pre-1800 conditions

Big areas like 8.1D or 2.1 without harvest activity-big chunk of land (could be 1-5 square miles)

Mowing in 1.2s-need to mow a lot to control multiflora rose-early in season and lots of mowing for several seasons

Disturbance in areas with invasive seed stock is incompatible with any management without a comprehensive invasives control program

Oil and gas leasing incompatible with all MAs

Pipelines and telecommunications are incompatible with special areas, sensitive areas, scenic areas, pre-1800 conditions, steep slopes, and wetlands

Incompatible to manage for pre-1800 conditions without Seneca's and Cayuga's on the backbone

Management for pre-1400 and pre-1600 conditions should be considered as alternatives to pre-1800 conditions regardless of historical data-seems silly to manage for pre-1800 just because we have the data

### **3. Do you have any suggestions to improve any of the Management Areas presented tonight?**

Need to improve grasslands for bird species (Henslow Sparrow)

Historically mark trees that are special (old, rare, etc.)

Protect old apple trees, may be the last of the species

Need to further promote education opportunities for young children

Include an indefinite amount of interior forest for future old growth

Acquired lands should be connected by a trail-manage to connect with current forest ASAP

Caywood point has a historical marker-excellent tourist attraction

When land was Hector Land Use-timber was managed

Need association here to do timber harvests to keep money here (corollary to grazing association-have "Hector Logging Association"-should have logging credits to allow some of the 75% government money to go to Finger Lakes National Forest

Grazing fee credits keeps work on the forest

Inefficient to export timber revenues-better just to keep the trees

Keep money here-once it goes to Washington, it is gone

Concern: local economy

Manage abandoned roads as historical sites (northern part of Burnt Hill Rd-up around Potomac Pond)

Have ravine areas as interior forest

There is snowmobiling in 2.1 along Interloken Trail (FS said no snowmobiling in 2.1)

Could the percent of uneven-aged areas still be specified under the "General Forest" MA?...to avoid uneven-aged along roadsides (for visuals) with tons of even-aged clearcuts elsewhere...

Restoration MA sounds good to help rid of invasive species

Invasives all over the forest-not just pastures

Need MA for "research cultural area"-special area for cultural/historical research and education

Need to clarify "General Forest Area" MA

General forest definition will not meet needs (lacking ELTs-allows too much FS interpretation)

Pre-1800 restoration management area managing for sugar maple, oak, hickory, beech-will not work-let it naturally restore, do not use management...trust forest to adapt to future conditions

Let oldest forest grow in Finger Lakes National Forest

Environmental conditions have changed, why waste time, money, energy to restore to pre-1800, instead go to interior forest MA

Doesn't like hiking through even-aged management (due to scenery and visuals)-but not all uneven-aged is good either

More ecologically sound uneven-aged stands

ORV use is incompatible in all MAs

Oil and gas use is incompatible in all MAs-especially in pasture

Interior forest description-change to "protection/maintenance" of closed canopy conditions (instead of "create interior closed canopy")

Shrub openings-inventory adjacent private property before spending lots of money (consider partnerships/land trusts)

Adjacent land can change with changing economics (if not profitable to keep land open for grazing-will convert to forest)

Shrub maintenance is costly

Grazing benefits small farms

Wouldn't use FS land to hay (equipment too expensive to take on FS land)

Newly acquired land=mostly failed farms

With climate change, shade-tolerant species may be better adapted species-be careful of soil temperatures as you open canopy

Add something about soil restoration across all MAs and consider effect of removing calcium when removing biomass (timber/oak) and selecting against beech-which holds calcium

To what extent could you reduce economic incentive to use even-aged management

Base future desired future conditions on ecological land types-not on marketability of tree species

How do you decide "desired outcome"-ex. oak/hickory...if it is for wildlife habitat, shouldn't we call the MA "Turkey/Squirrel" if the point is to protect habitat for those species

Don't manage for deer

Why aren't we addressing 8.1 E in the plan revision (Answer: Got pushed along faster due to public interest)

FS needs to spend 2/3 of income on-the-ground instead of on planning and assessments

Grazing Association social experiment-originally who planted lots of the FINGER LAKES NATIONAL FOREST trees