

1. Matt Breton, New England Chapter Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, contact: mattbreton@gmail.com
2. Not a member
3. No Challenges
4. No
5. To the lay person, jurisdictional triggers are not clear. This could be clarified by simply calculating by trail length per a set area, rather than calculate by including width for surface area. For example, a 100 foot long trail on one acre triggers, rather than worrying about 100 ft long x 2 feet wide not triggering, but 100 ft x 3 ft does.
6. Strengths of current regulations are that trail development can trigger act 250 review. Removing it will allow for willy-nilly trail building, with rapid degradation of soils, waters and natural areas.
7. It is. Beneficial for protecting environment by considering water, erosion, density, etc. It could go further to protect our diminishing resources.
8. While not extremely well versed in all criteria, we think that relevant criteria include looking at the big picture of trail development, remote character of the location, stream and soil requirements (knowing that trails WILL cause erosion).
9. Less relevant are the current footprint requirements, knowing that a trail has impacts 100m on each side, despite the relatively small size. Parcel size for triggers is also not particularly relevant, as large impacts could occur on small parcels and small impacts on large parcels.
10. No, trails should not be exempt, especially as pressure for more trails by a variety of user groups increases.
11. No, every project should be reviewed. Even small projects have the potential to be part of a larger collective network and this needs wise oversight.
12. Trail Act 250 permits should be issued case by case, with oversight provided by ANR to manage the state-wide development according to a plan. Density and location of trails needs to be monitored, especially encroachment into remote areas of VT. There should be an established maximum- when will there be enough trails? What is the goal of trails? The answers are important. Enforcement should be via tax disincentives for improper development, penalties for illegal development and tax incentives for proper development. Organizations that profit from trails, but who are not landowners, must also be held accountable, financially or otherwise, for trail planning and enforcement within their region (ie Kingdom Trails, VAST). Rogue trails will need to be handled carefully, as these are not often landowner built.