

Rutland Local Planning Group Meeting Notes 4-22-03

Land Adjustment Comments

The more land in the Green Mountain National Forest the better

What percent of Appalachian Trail is on the Green Mountain National Forest?

There are portions of the Long Trail north of Route 4 which are not protected (approximately through 6 parcels)...Long Trail is not a priority? Should be a high priority until 100% of a 1000 foot corridor is secured-

1000 acre+ land acquisitions-do not have to go through third party trusts...advantage: landowners get money upfront

Trusts are known wilderness advocates

Personal experience with advantages (i.e.. Wildlife) of land being properly harvested within land acquisition goals

Newly acquired lands not needed for wilderness

Still active in conservation easement acquisitions?

Explain "limbo" of 9.2 lands...should expedite transfer of 9.2s to multiple use

Current trail/road uses allowed to continue on 9.2s

Protect streams and ponds (local use)

"Wilderness" does exist on private land

38 significant streams (on stream list) has been extended to new proclamation boundary...may be necessary to extend beyond in conjunction with other agencies/jurisdictions. Middlebury River for example...

How many acres will we be satisfied with? We should set a limit and stop

No more wilderness-higher restrictions are detrimental to abutting parcels because higher use concentration on the abutting land

Some disagreement with statement "No more wilderness-higher restrictions are detrimental to abutting parcels"

Land abutting lands with restricted uses have higher values

1800s there was <20% forested...there is 75% now-logging has continued: Pollution isn't bad now because we have gone from a 43 to a 74 year life expectancy

Land acquisition process "irks" me-future inhabitants will not be able to afford land of their own-fears that 80% of state will be privately owned-"communist comparison"

How much has the Green Mountain National Forest increased in percent in the last 25 years? Have acquired 85,000 acres since 1982-we own approximately 45% of land within proclamation boundary

"Aggressively acquire" should not include condemnation

Concern: under current goals and criteria, Green Mountain National Forest could buy almost anything-too broad and inclusive

Within proclamation boundary, Green Mountain National Forest should still consider acquisition

More lands should be acquired with wilderness in mind

Average life expectancy is increasing so we must be protecting natural lands to a greater degree

What percent of land is in multiple use (now and 25 years ago)?

Any lands acquired should reflect traditional use and access (as before)

Skied Catamount-increase ownership or easements

Keep at acquisition as a goal

When defining goals, identify clearly when the acquisition goals are met

Consider acquisition goals that would consider other trail system needs (other than Appalachian Trail and Long Trail)

Any lands that are acquired should go into multiple use

Newly acquired lands should go into a status that isn't available on private lands

Complete Land Resource Management Plan designations much faster on newly acquired lands

Throw out the holding pattern (9.2 management area code)

Keep priority for protecting wildlife habitat

Recreation Comments

More money to law enforcement to enforce restrictions on trails/roads

Concentrated use areas not addressed by old plan

Enforcement should go with any newly developed/expanded areas (Goshen, Silver Lake)

Educational information for people with disabilities

Encourage ski area development: out of state money is very important

Original emphasis: White Mountain National Forest: developed recreation, Green Mountain National Forest: undeveloped recreation-(this was not a coordinated approach between the two forests)

We only keep 15% of campground fees

Expenses? Appropriated from Regional Office for maintenance/administration

If Boston wants more highly developed sites, we should do it

Consider general forest use fee, including for primitive use

Provide greater flexibility in the new plan so that we can consider new development or other changes

Enforce laws in concentrated use areas and don't necessarily add new development

Develop more access to new areas to disperse use around the forest

Increase educational component-especially "Leave no Trace"

Don't encourage development of new alpine ski areas

Continue emphasis on the lower end of development

Do we have use numbers on who uses our primitive sites?

Consider use numbers to help determine what to do with sites

Need to promote our recreation program more-work with the state

Snowmobilers need to know if their trails are categorized as developed or undeveloped recreation

Appalachian Trail to the Connecticut River is protected all the way-Rutland meeting map is wrong-should be green