

South Half W. Dover Plan Revision Meeting
March 24, 2004: Management Areas Allocations

Comments from Management Area (MA) mapping exercise

Yellow Group Comments on South Half of the GMNF:

Percentages: Wildlife 11%, Ski Area 1%, National Recreation Area 6%, Special Areas 10%, Remote Backcountry 3%, Backcountry Motorized 18%, Diverse Forest Uses 35%

Wilderness restricts Catamount Trail bridges

Remote Backcountry mapped around Stratton Pond to protect area-no motorized

Arlington area-Wildlife MA

Jamaica-Wildlife MA for bear corridor

Stratton Mountain-Wildlife MA for bear corridor from Jamaica

Expand Lye Brook Wilderness across east to Stratton Mountain.

Put Wildlife MA in Glastenbury Mountain., east of Somerset Reservoir, and MacIntyre

Map Diverse Forest Uses west of Glastenbury town line, east slope of Glastenbury

Map Diverse Forest Uses MA on newly acquired lands

Achieved balanced distribution of percentages based on givens, consideration of existing MA allocation, and compromise

Mapped every MA on this map

Concern for increased timber management and increased wilderness...some MAs were a compromise

Like the Remote Wildlife MA

Areas of agreement: Stratton Pond needs protected, increase Lye Brook Wilderness, protect bear corridor

Areas of disagreement: Vermont Wilderness Proposal

Pink Group Comments on South Half of the GMNF:

Consensus for pie chart: Ski Area 2%, Special Areas 6%

Non-consensus for pie chart: How much wildlife habitat to have? Wilderness advocates don't want a separate wildlife habitat...some wanted 2 pennies on Wildlife MA, some wanted 15 pennies on Wildlife MA

People who want early-successional forest, do not want additional non-logging areas

Consider marshes to SE of Lye Brook Wilderness

Area east of Shaftsbury Center in roadless criteria has been logged

Consensus of non-wilderness advocates: If wilderness is added, it should be added to existing wilderness, not new separate areas...but still do not want more wilderness

Proposal for wilderness in Glastenbury area in non-timber areas-not accepted by non-wilderness folks

Proposal for wilderness added to east side of Lye Brook Wilderness

Blue Group Comments on South Half of the GMNF:

Two pie chart attempts: Version 1: Percentages: Wildlife 1%, Ski Area %, National Recreation Area 6%, Wilderness 33%, Special Areas 7%, Remote Backcountry 11%, Backcountry Motorized 1%, Diverse Forest Uses 41% ** 3-4 people could not live with this

Two pie chart attempts: Version 2: Percentages: Wildlife 2%, Ski Area %, National Recreation Area 6%, Wilderness 21%, Special Areas 5%, Remote Backcountry 5%, Backcountry Motorized 19%, Diverse Forest Uses 41% ** 2 people could not live with this version

Agreement of entire group: no more ski areas

Disagreement over adding more wilderness

Once an area is declared wilderness, it will never come out

Need a balance: wilderness is a high priority because it can only be on National Forest land in Vermont

Diverse Forest Use MA-high priority with a diversified use

People who support wilderness could not live with adding more remote backcountry as a substitute for more wilderness but they could live with the percentage allocated to other Mass

Wilderness advocates in group did not support percent of Forest in wilderness

Focus on Glastenbury: suggestion to have wilderness in Glastenbury and Diverse Forest Use in Greendale area

Concerns about wilderness in Glastenbury: issues with maintenance of trail facilities, issues with good timber, issues with snowmobile trail access

Areas that are already roaded should go into the Diverse Forest Uses MA

Agreement on small portions of Glastenbury as wilderness

Some want to see a large block of land in Glastenbury as wilderness

Willing to see Greendale in Diverse Forest Use MA if can get a large block of land in Glastenbury designated as wilderness

Green Group Comments on South Half of the GMNF:

Group mapped and allocated a balanced distribution (and pie chart percentage) of MAs across the Forest: mapped Escarpment, Diverse Forest Uses, Remote Backcountry, Backcountry Motorized, Wildlife Habitat, and Wilderness

Don't want to take away things that people already have-lot of work goes into trail planning, trail maintenance, and trail organizations...should not take away existing trails and facilities (ex. Catamount and VAST trails)

Why would group increase Remote Backcountry so much (percentage-wise) and not increase Wilderness at all? Remote backcountry lacks federal constraints but allows for wilderness experience

One person wanted to increase wilderness but did not get to up the percentage on the pie chart (joined group late)

Leave snowmobile trails around Aiken Wilderness

Forest Service needs to put a management area that allows windmills in areas where they are proposed

Would like to see wilderness around the Appalachian Trail in Glastenbury (13 mile section)-group mapped it as remote backcountry but one person felt it should be wilderness instead

Stratton Pond should be in Remote Backcountry but not wilderness

How would Remote Backcountry or Wilderness in Glastenbury affect loggers and timber mills? Something to consider

Not convinced that Wildlife MA is better for wildlife than Remote Backcountry would be for wildlife

Lot of Wildlife MA areas that this group mapped are dependant on if Forest Service staff knows that wildlife could use these areas- concerned about bear areas and bear corridors-want them in Wildlife MA (Stratton-Jamaica and Dover area)

Red Group Comments on South Half of the GMNF:

Felt current allocations were not too far off what they should be in the revised Plan (except 9.2 areas)

Glastenbury snowmobile trails are the entire system for Shaftsbury

White Group Comments on South Half of the GMNF:

The group did a great job of looking at a multitude of uses. Group balanced uses with access and suitability.

Group provided a good balance of backcountry uses

Addressed Forest Plan issues by mapping a lot of the Diverse Forest Uses MA, considering wilderness (kept at status quo), and thinking about recreation

Areas of agreement: Consensus on Diverse Forest Uses and backcountry designations

Areas of disagreement: Even with consideration given to wilderness, some people would rather have added more wilderness

Black Group Comments on South Half of the GMNF:

Percentages: Wildlife 15%, Ski Area 1%, National Recreation Area 6%, Wilderness 16-17%, Special Areas 11%, Remote Backcountry 3%, Backcountry Motorized 13%, Diverse Forest Uses 35%

Not a real consensus in pie chart for 4 percent of the 100%

Have Special Area MA for areas over 3500' in elevation-current motorized recreation should stay

Escarpment will protect wildlife, preserve views, and preserve natural communities

Concerned about balance: wilderness

Areas of interest: wildlife habitat, access roads, diverse uses, and snowmobile

Worried that snowmobiles would lose a lot of back trails

Concerned about loss of snowmobile access in Glastenbury Mountain

Interested in multiple use and wildlife habitat-does not want a lot more wilderness

Interested in hunting and fishing (as a guide)-likes diversification-need to manage forests as people make a living using products

Managing Forest requires a little give and take

Keep access to Forest-not allowing motorized access (-towns)

Glastenbury has lots of human remnants

Orange Group Comments on South Half of the GMNF:

General Comments:

Please buffer wilderness, AT, LT, and remote backcountry areas from motorized recreational use. They are simply not compatible with solitude, good wildlife management, etc. Please minimize recreational motor trail corridors and do not open any of our Green Mountain National Forest to ATV use. Look to the future and current needs of our highly populated New England in protecting our remaining natural resources for non-motorized recreation

In strong support of lots more wilderness and very little logging. Vermont gets 98% of its wood from private lands, 100% would be Very important to protect the summit of Glastenbury Mountain and the Escarpment of the spine and the AT. A small amount of old growth would be desirable

Don't give the snowmobilers everything they want-Glastenbury is too much of a remote jewel to give it to ATVs and snowmobiles
Concerns regarding AT and half mile management area on each side of trail-will that affect existing snowmobile trails? For example, trails in the Glastenbury area?