

Bristol Local Planning Group Meeting Notes 4-15-03

Lands Comments

Less emphasis on acquisition and more on management of what we have

Divestment of land we are not using

Focus on right-of-ways to string together trailhead for multiple use trails

No lands acquired without management plan and roads included in our management inventory at time of acquisition

I disagree that less emphasis should be placed on acquisition

I disagree that we should divest of land we are not using

Land divested could serve purpose without having a formal use

Supports land acquisition that meets an unmet need... foolish to acquire lands that have needs we already have

Land acquisition should also be driven by wildlife habitat and other things... not just recreation

Any lands acquired should take into account Adirondack park agency-as this agency is helping meet similar goals

No town services are provided when purchased by the National forest (such as law enforcement and sewage/sanitation)

Expenditures for woodlots when connected to National Forests land-woodlots would pay higher over long-term

Focus land acquisition on consolidation, especially along the Green Mountain spine

Need timely issuance of special use permits (it should not take years)

Need mechanism in PILT (purchase in lieu of taxes) to keep up with inflation... as private property taxes go up so should government payments to towns via PILT

Question: what does 'protection of AT/LT' mean? Do we have to protect everything within visual range (and thus want to buy up all land visible from the trails)... or protect the 500 foot buffer on either side of the trail?

Does protection of AT/LT create conflict with motorized uses? Easements are great unless they prevent desirable uses (such as motorized recreation)

Rules for acquisition should be the same as all other Forest Service rules-should have to have public input, appeals, and impact statements

If the Forest Service cannot meet the management goals of the present 15 year Plan, why should any more land be acquired?

Add as a priority for land acquisition (or conservation easement): land along Rte. 7-Brandon area or Pittsford area (near monument for old fort)... buy land to allow for wildlife crossings on major roads

Add as a priority for land acquisition (or conservation easement): land near Dead Creek, Snake Mountain to Green Mountain-North or South of Vergennes... buy land to allow for wildlife crossings on major roads and hold as woods or undeveloped land

Recreation Comments

Current recreation uses are the only ones reflected in the 2000 study

Prefer less emphasis on highly developed facilities such as alpine skiing with more emphasis on developed and undeveloped recreation when considering the mix

Consider more than 1% of the ski area use to get more revenue

Population getting older-would like more emphasis on accessibility for older people... such as more pull off spots and parking for vistas

Backcountry recreation should be available to the disabled-such as ATV use

Would like primitive camping to continue-most important issue

Alpine skiing not a growth industry-would not anticipate expansion

Benefits to habitat from active forest management-results in recreation opportunities like hunting

Need to provide a type of "roaded natural" recreation that results from timber harvest

Developed recreation needs more proactive policy for handicapped people

2000 National Visitor Use Monitoring Study-statistics should include percentages on developed versus undeveloped recreation-should be looked at in future and planning should reflect the results (for example: if there is a high percent of developed recreation happening-then there should be a high percent of developed recreation opportunities)

Question: is there any special use permit holder interesting ski area expansion?

In light of the income taken in from ski areas versus the amount of acreage they lease, the ski areas are getting a bargain and the Forest Service should get more money from them

Use cross country ski areas as a model to allow greater concentration of use...they allow people to know what is available...the Forest Service needs to give more attention to campgrounds and trails

Question: are you considering hard surfaces and hookups for RVs? Lot of places for RV use in other areas-do we need on Forest Service land?

Need RV accessible areas and RV use areas

Do not want RV facilities on Green Mountain National Forest-even if not provided elsewhere

Wants primitive camping in places like Chittenden Reservoir

Need elderly accessibility via ATVs

Need less discrimination to recreation users

Not in favor of more ATVs/motorized recreation...need alternatives

Highlight benefits to undeveloped recreation provided by vegetation management (example road access provided by timber sales, better signage, demonstration projects)...example: Province of Ontario

For undeveloped recreation-the best bet is to meet the 1987 Plan goals for clearing/timber harvest to promote early successional species

Forest fragmentation to wildlife due to maturing of the forest

Permit system for camping and location

Develop more picnic areas

Increase early successional for wildlife

I do not want to see any RVs (the newer ones) on National Forest land

There is no mention of motorized recreation in the study in 2000. Was anyone sampled snowmobiling in Green Mountain National Forest in 2000? What about other motorized recreation?

Since Mt. Snow is not interested in expansion and is prime habitat for bears, take it out of expansion management area

Good example of toilets in Adirondacks-compost toilets that run off a photo panel for heat to compost

Look at Huron-Manistee National Forest and Pilsbury State Park (NH) solutions for minimizing impacts of heavy use in the backcountry-Long

Trail also does a good job for mitigating impacts in a concentrated use area

I feel quite strongly that the GMNF's main priority should be to expand and protect our natural (emphasis: natural) heritage. What makes

Vermont's forests, lakes, streams unique is their undeveloped qualities. People seeking motorized recreation can find it elsewhere. The forest is, and should remain, a forest.