Minutes of Regular Meeting of the Hogback Management Plan Update Committee
7:30 p.m. Wednesday, Sept 13, 2023
Town Office, Marlboro, Vermont and via Zoom

Minutes

Convene: 7:30 pm
Attendees: In person: Diana Todd. Via Zoom: Mike Purcell, Eric Slayton, Amanda Whiting.

1. Preliminaries
    a. choose a secretary to take minutes - Diana
    b. choose a Zoom host - Amanda
    c. start Zoom recording - Amanda
2. Minutes of previous meeting (Aug 23, 2023) were approved unanimously.
3. Discussed membership and attendance. Sarah Grant and Christine Colella have both decided to resign from the committee, but will continue to participate through their roles on the HPC (Hogback Preservation Commission). We are open to accepting new committee members, but due to the need to have a quorum, members must commit to attending the meetings, and should also contribute to the actual work of writing sections of the plan. We noted that interested people are welcome to participate and contribute without being official members of the committee. This approach may work well for people with interests in a specific topic who do not want to commit to attending all meetings.
4. New topics to add to the master list:
    a. Consider having a section on Prohibitions, where all prohibited activities are listed in one place, to make it easy for users to find.
    b. Should there be different limitations based on time of year or presence/absence of snow cover?
5. Continued work on the outline and assigned topics to be developed into first drafts.
    a. Discussed who the anticipated audience is for the Management Plan.
        i. It is not John Q. Public. Other sources of information, such as the HMCA website and the kiosks, are better suited to educating the public.
        ii. The primary users will be the decision makers and their advisors – i.e. the Select Board (SB), the HPC, and the HMCA.
            1. The Plan should reflect the choices made by the town (through public input to the update process, and through approval by the SB) of how to implement the conservation easement.
            2. The Plan should include enough "institutional memory" to help future decision makers understand why limitations and/or permissions exist.
        iii. Other key users will be new members of the SB, HPC, and HMCA, to help them understand the overall mission of the conservation area.
        iv. Agreed the Plan should be concise and not duplicate information found elsewhere. Refer to other documents, and even include them as appendices (e.g. Biodiversity Inventory) rather than repeat, paraphrase, or regurgitate info.
    b. Compared the two draft outlines.
        i. Draft based on VLT list of "Components of a Good Plan" (See Appendix A)
            1. Complete list of topics is appealing.

    2. Encyclopedia-like approach has advantages – easy to find the topic you are looking for. Could even re-arrange the topics alphabetically to make it that much easier to find a specific topic.

    3. Lacks logical flow from one topic to another. We could rearrange the topics so they are grouped in conceptually cohesive groups, such as administrative topics, forest management topics, etc.

  ii. Draft outline based on the four "purposes" listed in the conservation easement. (See Appendix B)

    1. Noted that this outline is inherently incomplete, because it is built out of the topics we think need to be added or changed, and doesn't include sections in the existing plan that do not need substantial revision.

    2. Administrative topics are collected in the first major section of the outline. Items referring to the actual use of the land, to achieve the four purposes, are in the second section.

  iii. Thoughts applicable to both drafts:

    1. We plan to create an index as well as a table of contents, so regardless of what organizing principal we use for the document, finding information on a specific topic should be easier in the updated plan than it is in the existing plan.

    2. Discussed whether outline topics such as "wildlife habitat" and "rare and uncommon species" are intended to be presentations about conditions as they exist in the conservation area, or about policy approaches to managing these topics. No clear decision was reached, but we re-noted that we shouldn't just repeat info that is available elsewhere. Decided to explore this question more by starting to write drafts and see what issues arise.

  iv. Decided to develop another draft outline, trying to incorporate positive attributes of each of the current drafts. Diana will draft this.

 c. Assigned writing tasks.

  i. Drafts should be used to explore writing styles (bullet points? narratives?) as well as explore the scope each topic should cover (describe existing conditions? or only describe policies?) Each writer should choose what they prefer. We'll deal with consistency of approach later.

  ii. Committee members should feel free to tackle additional topics that interest them, in addition to the assigned topics.

  iii. Mike: Management Roles, Trails

  iv. Eric: Parking, Access

  v. Amanda: Cultural Resources

  vi. Diana: Goals and Purpose, Legal constraints

  vii. Pieter, who was not at the meeting, will be asked to write about Invasives.

6. Planned next several meetings.

 a. Sept 27 - County Forester Sam Schneski will attend. Plan to devote the entire meeting to discussions with him. Use Front Porch Forum to invite the public to attend.

 b. Oct 11 – Review the draft sections written based on assignements from today's meeting.

7. Adjourned – 8:50 PM

Potential organization of the Plan 2023_08_23
(date is of the meeting at which the ideas reflected in this doc were discussed)

This document uses the bullet points listed in VLT's "Components of a good management plan" as the main topics for an outline. The specific items we have identified as "Topics to consider during Management Plan update" (list as of 2023_08_23) have been inserted into this framework. Topics from that list that did not seem to have an appropriate place in this framework are listed at the end.

First, here's just a transcription of VLT's list of Components of a good plan, to make it easier to see the big picture.

A. Cover page
B. Table of contents
C. Goals/purpose of plan
D. History of property and management planning process
E. Property description and landscape context
F. Legal constraints and interests
G. Current physical improvements
H. Proposed physical improvements
I. Recreation – unrestricted, restricted, and prohibited activities
J. Forest Management
K. Wildlife habitat
L. Rare and uncommon species
M. Invasive species
N. Natural communities, water features, and Ecological Protection Zones
O. Geology and soils
P. Cultural resources
Q. Education
R. Management roles and responsibilities
S. Policies and guidelines
T. Management recommendations and planned activities
U. Potential conflicts and recommendations
V. Parking
W. Access
X. Trails
Y. Management Plan Updates
Z. Schedule of management activities
AA. Appendices with maps

And starting on the next page will be this VLT "Components" structure with the topics plugged in to reasonable categories.

A. Cover page
B. Table of contents
C. Goals/purpose of plan
   a. is there, or should there be, a Vision Statement for the conservation area?
   b. identify objectives of the Management Plan (the plan, as opposed to the conservation area)
   c. Should we define goals for each asset/each "purpose" in the conservation easement? (similar to West Windsor/Ascutney)
      i. natural resources
      ii. recreation
      iii. scenic views
      iv. education
      v. cultural resources
      vi. timber
D. History of property and management planning process
   a. update history of the area – it's been 13 years
   b. Survey
      i. shouldn't be long
      ii. wait until we know what we're proposing before trying to draft a survey
   c. Public meetings
      i. on site meetings vs indoors meetings
      ii. have a first draft so that people have something to respond to
      iii. for some towns, open ended meetings (what are your ideas?) were too unfocused to be truly useful
E. Property description and landscape context
F. Legal constraints and interests
   a. summarize the conservation easement
   b. All higher order statutes/policies apply
      i. state rules (hunting, trapping, ATV's, what else?)
      ii. town policies
         1. alcohol on town land?
         2. metal detectors
         3. any others?
   c. should we be guided/refer to state-wide plans, like
      i. Vermont State Wildlife Action Plan
      ii. Species of Greatest Conservation Need
      iii. Wildlife Linkage Habitat ratings and Wildlife Crossing Values
   d. Liability
      i. Do we need to have signs saying "use at your own risk" at all kiosks and trail entry points?
      ii. Do we need a wildfire plan?
G. Current physical improvements
H. Proposed physical improvements
I. Recreation – unrestricted, restricted, and prohibited activities
   a. what types of recreation: what's allowed, what's not
      i. any changes needed to the current approach to hiking, birdwatching, XC-skiing, snowshoeing, etc?
      ii. bikes

1. what about ebikes?
                    2. what about winter use of fat bikes?
                    3. OK to "groom" trail for fat bike use? (pack down snow)
            iii. backcountry skiing – can we learn anything from West Windsor/Ascutney approach?
            iv. horseback riding
            v. drones
            vi. camping and campfires
            vii. target shooting (firearm and bow&arrow)
            viii. hunting
                    1. cover all types: rifle, muzzle loader, bow & arrow
                    2. tree stands? ground blinds?
                    3. specify that cutting veg to open shooting lanes is not allowed?
                    4. luring (salt licks, apples) allowed or not?
            ix. fishing – are there any fish-able streams? Should we mention it anyway?
            x. trapping – state law requires trappers to get permission of landowner
            xi. dogs
                    1. leashes?
                    2. poop?
            xii. Should there be any restrictions on off-trail use?
        b. where types of activities can and can't occur
        c. when types of activities can and can't occur
            i. should nighttime activities be allowed?
            ii. close trails during rifle season?
            iii. close trails during mud season?
                    1. close to bikes only?
                    2. or close to pedestrian, too?
    J. Forest Management
        a. climate change
        b. Timber harvesting
            i. who will decide when a timber harvest is appropriate?
            ii. what criteria will they use to decide?
            iii. what plans are needed before a harvest can occur?
                    1. what criteria must the plan meet? (defined in conservation easement – latest edition of state-wide best practices)
            iv. what non-timber things can/should be part of a harvest plan?
                    1. create ESH?
                    2. manage deer wintering areas?
                    3. "forestry with birds in mind" from Audubon
            v. Should harvests be designed as demonstration projects? Examples – best practices, or to benefit certain wildlife (beavers and snowshoe hares were examples given)
            vi. Should the Management Plan differentiate between commercial harvests (to generate income) and forest management cuts done to improve forest or wildlife health?
        c. Maple sugaring
        d. No unauthorized cutting – covers many topics – should it be dealt with here or in each affected area?

      i. no cutting to open ski lanes (except as part of authorized volunteer work days)

      ii. no cutting new trails without permission

         1. no cutting to widen or "improve" trails except as part of authorized volunteer work days

      iii. no cutting to open shooting lanes for hunting

      iv. no cutting firewood (not even fallen dead?)

      v. no cutting trees or poles (young trees) for woodworking or other projects

      vi. authorized cutting can include volunteer or contracted work

         1. invasives control

         2. trail building

         3. erosion control

         4. timber harvest

         5. other forest products harvest

  e. Foraging

      i. for personal use vs for commercial use

      ii. berries, fruit, fungi, flowers, ferns, leaves

      iii. boughs (balsam for wreaths), poles

K. Wildlife habitat

  a. wildlife corridors

  b. ESH project

      i. did it meet objectives?

      ii. should it be renewed?

L. Rare and uncommon species

  a. RTE species (rare, threatened, endangered)

  b. uncommon species

M. Invasive species

  a. plan for known invasives

  b. how to decide about newly discovered invasives

  c. any work done to control invasives should be documented

  d. are there any standard practices for invasives control that should be referenced?

N. Natural communities, water features, and Ecological Protection Zones

  a. rich hardwood forest areas (id'ed in Biodiversity Inventory)

  b. water quality

  c. vernal pools

  d. ecological protection zones

O. Geology and soils

  a. soil health

P. Cultural resources

  a. Should historic sites be given special protection similar to buffer zones for vernal pools and other sensitive areas?

  b. ski area artifacts

  c. Bishop farm site(s)

  d. scenic views

Q. Education

  a. Should recommendations for future studies from Biodiv Inv be included in the Management Plan?

R. Management roles and responsibilities

  a. Management Structure

     i. roles of SB, HPC, HMCA
      1. MOU already exists between HMCA and the town
      2. do HPC Rules of Procedure need to be included in the MP?
     ii. funding sources
      1. National Grid lease
      2. endowment held by HMCA
   b. Collaboration with other organizations
     i. HMCA – better define the roles of the two organizations
     ii. Molly Stark State Park
     iii. SVNHM
     iv. VAST
     v. require periodic review of collaborations?

S. Policies and guidelines
   a. should we adopt zones?
     i. recreation
     ii. special protection, non-harvest areas, very limited trails (foot traffic only)
      1. Should a no-harvest area have a goal of becoming "old growth"?
     iii. general use – timber harvest OK, light recreation OK
   b. What level of public awareness should be pursued?
     i. original plan feared overuse
      1. plan suggested NOT posting trails on statewide online trail resources
      2. didn't plan for a sign on Route 9 to let people know they had found the right place
     ii. has overuse been a problem?
     iii. Should there be a sign announcing the existence of the conservation area? There's nothing now. If you don't know it is there, you have nothing to clue you in.
     iv. Review the existing map and mapping data policy
   c. Enforcement
     i. how to get the word out about what's allowed and what's not
      1. kiosks
      2. website
      3. signs on trails
      4. signs at the boundaries
     ii. when there's an infringement
      1. who gets notified?
      2. who deals with the scofflaw?
   d. Permits
     i. use permits – incorporate existing system
      1. current MP doesn't give details of when permits are needed. Should it?
      2. need a clear explanation of when you need a permit
       a. should there be a max group size allowed?
        i. should large groups be required to develop a safety plan or have a safety officer, like is required for using some public buildings or public spaces? For example, ask Bob Milligan, HMCA Director
       b. should permits be given only for educational activities?

c. for non-educational activities (e.g. weddings mentioned in existing MP), should they be limited to specific locations?
            d. should nighttime activities be allowed?
        3. use by commercial organizations
            a. summer day camps
            b. tour groups
        4. use by non-profits
            a. schools
            b. nature orgs, etc
        5. Currently, HMCA and SVNHM are not required to get permits for activities they host except for a few circumstances (e.g. having open fires). Should this policy continue?
    e. Buildings
        i. uses allowed
        ii. how to decide on potential future uses of buildings
        iii. establish overall philosophy for all buildings – Repair and preserve them? Tear them down? Let them decay on their own?
        iv. Should there be specific plans in the Management Plan for some buildings? Benedict Cottage? First Aid building? The Castle?
T. Management recommendations and planned activities
    a. Should we have specific action items for the next ten years?
U. Potential conflicts and recommendations
V. Parking
W. Access
    a. access across commercial properties
X. Trails
    a. multi-purpose v. single purpose
    b. process for approving new trails
    c. Should MP define appropriate levels of maintenance for certain trails?
        i. Tower Trail must be accessible by trucks, because we lease access on that road to National Grid electric co.
        ii. Should the woods road from the Grant Road entrance to the Quonset Hut be maintained at a level able to support vehicles like maintenance trucks, tractors, or even heavy equipment? Should that level of maintenance be maintained along the Rim Run trail all the way up to Route 9 (now used as the VAST trail)?
Y. Management Plan Updates
Z. Schedule of management activities
AA. Appendices with maps
    a. Supplemental material - Everything? or just key pieces?
        i. full conservation easement
        ii. history of how the update was drafted
            1. copy of survey and all responses
            2. summary of comments from public presentations
        iii. biodiversity inventory
        iv. forest management plan

The following topics didn't have a place in the outline – they are more about how to organize the info than about the info itself.

I. Document-wide issues
    a. appropriate level of detail
        i. many plans we reviewed were too long
        ii. current plan is uneven, lots of detail some places, not much in others
    b. structure of the actual document
        i. should we emphasize bullet lists or narratives?
        ii. how to order all the material?
            1. emphasize Management?
            2. emphasize purposes of the easement?
        iii. create an index

Outline built out of master list of "Topics to Consider," organized around the four "purposes" of the conservation easement – i.e. Forestry Values, Recreation, Cultural History, Education.

2023_08_23 Topics to consider during Management Plan Update
The date above refers to the most recent past HMPUC meeting where new topics were brought up.
*Items that are new since the previous edition of this doc are shown in **bold italics**.*

Changes in this iteration: No new topics added. Format changed from bullet points to lettered/numbered outline. Below is a summary of the major headings, to make the general organization easier to see. NOTE – a potential drawback to using this organized list of topics as an outline for the Plan is that the list includes only topics that we felt needed to be reconsidered, or newly considered. It does not include topics in the existing Plan that we feel are suitable for inclusion in the new Plan as is or with only minor editing. We could add those topics to this list if we wanted to make it a more full outline of the Plan.

Topics in our master list are organized in two main sections:
- Work Process and general concepts (presented using Roman numerals as major topics identifiers)
- Topics for Inclusion in the Management Plan (presented using Capital Alphabet as major topic identifiers)

Work Process and general concepts:
I. Getting public input
    a. Survey
    b. Public meetings
II. Document-wide issues
    a. should we adopt zones?
    b. should we be guided/refer to state-wide plans
    c. Should we define goals for each asset/each "purpose" in the conservation easement? (similar to West Windsor/Ascutney)
    d. Should we have specific action items for the next ten years?
    e. What level of public awareness should be pursued?
    f. appropriate level of detail
    g. structure of the actual document

Topics for Inclusion in the Management Plan:
A. Administration
    a. Management Structure
    b. All higher order statutes/policies apply
    c. Permits
    d. Enforcement
    e. Liability
    f. Parking and access
    g. Buildings
    h. Collaboration with other organizations
    i. Review the existing map and mapping data policy

B. Achieving the Purposes of the Conservation Easement
   a. Forestry Values
   b. Recreation
   c. Cultural History/Resources
   d. Education

Below this line is the full list of discussion topics we've identified, slotted into the outline.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

II. Getting public input
   a. Survey
      i. shouldn't be long
      ii. wait until we know what we're proposing before trying to draft a survey
   b. Public meetings
      i. on site meetings vs indoors meetings
      ii. have a first draft so that people have something to respond to
      iii. for some towns, open ended meetings (what are your ideas?) were too unfocused to be truly useful

III. Document-wide issues
   a. should we adopt zones?
      i. recreation
      ii. special protection, non-harvest areas, very limited trails (foot traffic only)
         1. Should a no-harvest area have a goal of becoming "old growth"?
      iii. general use – timber harvest OK, light recreation OK
   b. should we be guided/refer to state-wide plans, like
      i. Vermont State Wildlife Action Plan
      ii. Species of Greatest Conservation Need
      iii. Wildlife Linkage Habitat ratings and Wildlife Crossing Values
   c. Should we define goals for each asset/each "purpose" in the conservation easement? (similar to West Windsor/Ascutney)
      i. natural resources
      ii. recreation
      iii. scenic views
      iv. education
      v. cultural resources
      vi. timber
   d. Should we have specific action items for the next ten years?
   e. What level of public awareness should be pursued?
      i. original plan feared overuse
         1. plan suggested NOT posting trails on statewide online trail resources
         2. didn't plan for a sign on Route 9 to let people know they had found the right place
      ii. has overuse been a problem?
   f. appropriate level of detail
      i. many plans we reviewed were too long
      ii. current plan is uneven, lots of detail some places, not much in others
   g. structure of the actual document
      i. should we emphasize bullet lists or narratives?
      ii. Intro material

1. is there, or should there be, a Vision Statement for the conservation area?
2. identify objectives of the Management Plan (the plan, as opposed to the conservation area)
3. update history of the area – it's been 13 years
4. summarize the conservation easement
   iii. how to order all the material?
       1. emphasize Management?
       2. emphasize purposes of the easement?
   iv. create an index
   v. Supplemental material
       1. Everything? or just key pieces?
          a. full conservation easement
          b. history of how the update was drafted
              i. copy of survey and all responses
              ii. summary of comments from public presentations
          c. biodiversity inventory
          d. forest management plan

A. Administration
   a. Management Structure
       i. roles of SB, HPC, HMCA
          1. MOU already exists between HMCA and the town
          2. do HPC Rules of Procedure need to be included in the MP?
       ii. funding sources
          1. National Grid lease
          2. endowment held by HMCA
   b. All higher order statutes/policies apply
       i. state rules (hunting, trapping, ATV's, what else?)
       ii. town policies
          1. alcohol on town land?
          2. metal detectors
          3. any others?
   c. Permits
       i. use permits – incorporate existing system
          1. current MP doesn't give details of when permits are needed. Should it?
          2. need a clear explanation of when you need a permit
             a. should there be a max group size allowed?
                 i. should large groups be required to develop a safety plan or have a safety officer, like is required for using some public buildings or public spaces? For example, ask Bob Milligan, HMCA Director
             b. should permits be given only for educational activities?
             c. for non-educational activities (e.g. weddings mentioned in existing MP), should they be limited to specific locations?
             d. should nighttime activities be allowed?

3. use by commercial organizations
                    a. summer day camps
                    b. tour groups
                4. use by non-profits
                    a. schools
                    b. nature orgs, etc
                5. Currently, HMCA and SVNHM are not required to get permits for activities they host except for a few circumstances (e.g. having open fires). Should this policy continue?
        d. Enforcement
            i. how to get the word out about what's allowed and what's not
                1. kiosks
                2. website
                3. signs on trails
                4. signs at the boundaries
            ii. when there's an infringement
                1. who gets notified?
                2. who deals with the scofflaw?
        e. Liability
            i. Do we need to have signs saying "use at your own risk" at all kiosks and trail entry points?
            ii. Do we need a wildfire plan?
        f. Parking and access
            i. Should there be a sign announcing the existence of the conservation area? There's nothing now. If you don't know it is there, you have nothing to clue you in.
            ii. access across commercial properties
        g. Buildings
            i. uses allowed
            ii. how to decide on potential future uses of buildings
            iii. establish overall philosophy for all buildings – Repair and preserve them? Tear them down? Let them decay on their own?
            iv. Should there be specific plans in the Management Plan for some buildings? Benedict Cottage? First Aid building? The Castle?
        h. Collaboration with other organizations
            i. HMCA – better define the roles of the two organizations
            ii. Molly Stark State Park
            iii. SVNHM
            iv. VAST
            v. require periodic review of collaborations?
        i. Review the existing map and mapping data policy
    B. Achieving the Purposes of the Conservation Easement
        a. Forestry Values
            i. water quality
            ii. soil health
            iii. climate change
            iv. vernal pools
            v. wildlife corridors

      vi.   RTE species (rare, threatened, endangered)
    vii.   uncommon species
   viii.   ecological protection zones
     ix.   rich hardwood forest areas (id'ed in Biodiversity Inventory)
      x.   ESH project
1. did it meet objectives?
2. should it be renewed?
     xi.   Invasives
1. plan for known invasives
2. how to decide about newly discovered invasives
3. any work done to control invasives should be documented
4. are there any standard practices for invasives control that should be referenced?
    xii.   Foraging
1. for personal use vs for commercial use
2. berries, fruit, fungi, flowers, ferns, leaves
3. boughs (balsam for wreaths), poles
   xiii.   No unauthorized cutting – covers many topics – should it be dealt with here or in each affected area?
1. no cutting to open ski lanes (except as part of authorized volunteer work days)
2. no cutting new trails without permission
   a. no cutting to widen or "improve" trails except as part of authorized volunteer work days
3. no cutting to open shooting lanes for hunting
4. no cutting firewood (not even fallen dead?)
5. no cutting trees or poles (young trees) for woodworking or other projects
6. authorized cutting can include volunteer or contracted work
   a. invasives control
   b. trail building
   c. erosion control
   d. timber harvest
   e. other forest products harvest
   xiv.   Timber harvesting
1. who will decide when a timber harvest is appropriate?
2. what criteria will they use to decide?
3. what plans are needed before a harvest can occur?
   a. what criteria must the plan meet? (defined in conservation easement – latest edition of state-wide best practices)
4. what non-timber things can/should be part of a harvest plan?
   a. create ESH?
   b. manage deer wintering areas?
   c. "forestry with birds in mind" from Audubon
5. Should harvests be designed as demonstration projects? Examples – best practices, or to benefit certain wildlife (beavers and snowshoe hares were examples given)

     6. Should the Management Plan differentiate between commercial harvests (to generate income) and forest management cuts done to improve forest or wildlife health?

   xv. Maple sugaring

 b. Recreation

   i. what types of recreation: what's allowed, what's not

     1. any changes needed to the current approach to hiking, birdwatching, XC-skiing, snowshoeing, etc?

     2. bikes

       a. what about ebikes?

       b. what about winter use of fat bikes?

       c. OK to "groom" trail for fat bike use? (pack down snow)

     3. backcountry skiing – can we learn anything from West Windsor/Ascutney approach?

     4. horseback riding

     5. drones

     6. camping and campfires

     7. target shooting (firearm and bow&arrow)

     8. hunting

       a. cover all types: rifle, muzzle loader, bow & arrow

       b. tree stands? ground blinds?

       c. specify that cutting veg to open shooting lanes is not allowed?

       d. luring (salt licks, apples) allowed or not?

     9. fishing – are there any fish-able streams? Should we mention it anyway?

     10. trapping – state law requires trappers to get permission of landowner

     11. dogs

       a. leashes?

       b. poop?

     12. Should there be any restrictions on off-trail use?

   ii. where types of activities can and can't occur

   iii. when types of activities can and can't occur

     1. should nighttime activities be allowed?

     2. close trails during rifle season?

     3. close trails during mud season?

       a. close to bikes only?

       b. or close to pedestrian, too?

   iv. trails

     1. multi-purpose v. single purpose

     2. process for approving new trails

     3. Should MP define appropriate levels of maintenance for certain trails?

       a. Tower Trail must be accessible by trucks, because we lease access on that road to National Grid electric co.

       b. Should the woods road from the Grant Road entrance to the Quonset Hut be maintained at a level able to support vehicles like maintenance trucks, tractors, or even heavy equipment? Should that level of maintenance be maintained along the Rim Run trail all the way up to Route 9 (now used as the VAST trail)?

---

    c.   Cultural History/Resources

          i.   Should historic sites be given special protection similar to buffer zones for vernal pools and other sensitive areas?

          ii.   ski area artifacts

         iii.   Bishop farm site(s)

         iv.   scenic views

    d.   Education

          i.   Should recommendations for future studies from Biodiv Inv be included in the Management Plan?