

## Hector Plan Revision Meeting Notes 7-01-03: Trails Discussion Part II

### Questions Addressed at the Meeting:

1. Review Comments from last meeting
2. Is trail plan consistent with range of interests reflected in comments?
3. How could the trails be adapted to address interests not being met?

**\*\*Trail numbers are in reference to the Friends of the Finger Lakes Trail Proposal\*\***

### **1. Review Comments from last meeting**

Review of past meeting comments needs to reflect that 1 statement may have been agreed upon by many others, even though stated once in notes

Yes

Will ATV trails that are not properly maintained on federal land make U.S. government open to a lawsuit? Town of Lodi has banned them

### **2. Is trail plan consistent with range of interests reflected in comments?**

Differences in people's desire to either mix uses or separate

Desire to have some areas of Forest trail free...keep noise free areas.

Not interested in sharing Finger Lakes National Forest with motorized uses

Less signs-discover more for yourself

Forest is important to hikers-more intimate experience public land opportunity-multiple use may not be appropriate

Multiple use trails may not be appropriate due to experience, speed...concern about ATV users-lack of judgment...where can they do this activity (where can the FS accommodate ATVs?)

Need to move quietly through forest-concern about regulating ATV use-disabled user for slow ATV use

Snowmobile at night in field-negative experience

horse use may be appropriate, heavy motorized use is not

ATV use desires are not addressed

Does the FS have hard information on uses now?

Family use areas not included in goals

Yes-with the exception of ATVs-but many were not in favor of ATVs

Yes

Proposed trail uses old rail bed that ATVs and snowmobiles use-it is on private land

Requires days of evaluation

Plan was not made with ATVs in mind

### **3. How could the trails be adapted to address interests not being met?**

Motorized use and Hector Grazing Association may not be appropriate

Some horses have different tolerances to motorized use (ATV)-Amish horses are trained for noise, recreation horses may not be trained

Once ATVs are allowed on trails-go off trails and cause natural resource issues

ATVs have mud events and organized events

ATV use could be travel in Forest and park and picnic

State sponsored enforcement in counties that allow ATV use-Lewis Co., now NYS funding problems

If designate ATV area-cannot limit ATV use to that area...enforcement. ATV=all terrain vehicle

Democracy would be inspired to allow use but not appropriate

7 million ATVs-NYS markets ATV use-if allowed at Hector-the floodgates would open and in such a small area the use would be overwhelming-ATV behavior would suggest that the use could not be restricted

Sign to show legal use areas

Forest has quiet areas-if advertise use then change maybe selfish...maybe too many proposed trails

Create new trails rather than sharing trails

Allow ATV use during specified periods on specified trails

Separate motorized and non-motorized trails

Work with ATV groups, etc.

Some areas may not appeal to all uses-example: railroad bed

Would hate to see ATVs coming down the center of the Forest

Use old roads and railbeds for ATVs rather than dirt trails to minimize erosion and damage to vegetation

Trail widening due to wet areas is an issue with hiking and other uses

Erosion can be addressed by laying out proper trail systems

Preserving the sounds of nature is important-some areas are very special

Trail etiquette is important-work with clubs

Improve enforcement to prevent problems

Friend of the Finger Lakes did a good job with the proposal

## General Comments on Trails

Multiple use trails should be shared by all uses including ATVs, snowmobiles, horses, bikes, etc

Provide isolated section of Forest land exclusively for ATV motorized use...could reduce noise conflicts. A small area would satisfy local motorized demand without drawing in large crowds from outside groups. So current trail proposal has some areas with new trails proposed, consider those blocks of lands

Would want vast majority of trails on Finger lakes to be hiking/ skiing only-reason: other uses are degrading to the trails and to wildlife and to serene experience of the Forest

Adjacent land owners: Trail #5 thoughts/concerns: 1) 1/4 mile is on private driveway-with 400' of private land on both sides of the driveway, 2) private ownership borders this trail for 1/2 mile, 3) never been officially a trail however has been used by ATVs, snowmobiles, bikes, a jeep and horses-has experienced trespass onto yard area already, 4) private owners have been in ownership over 100 years (example: In an isolated home because allows 6 dogs to be free-trespassers may encounter dogs, not the dogs fault-worry about liability concerns, 5) this private ownership is an example that is repeated in this proposal several (many) times, 6) Need a clear definition of what uses are meant in each proposed trail

Do not want any motorized or mechanized uses mixed with hiking and skiing

Would rather not have motorized use allowed on NF land

Against 20' clearing for trails-would actually create access for exploration and exploitation of natural resources

20' trails not necessary

Haven't been able to adequately enforce the rules on the trails now-have asked for enforcement help before and didn't get help

Motorized users know that they are hard to catch so continue use anyhow

Once motorized users get into Forest, they leave the trails-maybe accessing illegal pot plantations