Turning it over to Nancy Walters, many of you know who's great facilitator, that's helped us in the past with facilitation and Nancy will go over some of the tech details before we jump in.

OK, so I know that teams and other video platforms are not new to us after the last couple years, but it may be to some. So I just wanna quickly cover the teams features so that we're all on the same level here, noting 1st that the that the.

Bar, whether it's at the bottom or at the top of your screen, has a number of different icons on it. The two little people, if you press on that, it gets it allows you to see all the names of all of the participants down the line, which is going to be really helpful to me as a facilitator because when you raise your hand, your name goes to the top of the list and I get to see it loud and clear. So that participant list is 1 feature.

All the other features except for raised hands are not an option in this meeting, so that little hand next to the participants is how you raise your hand, and we're gonna use that protocol to the best of our ability today.

There won't be a chat box, so if you don't have the microphone access on your computer and you wanna have a voice, you'll need to stay on teams but also call use the call in number so that we can hear your voice.

If you need closed caption, or if you just want it, you have that option with the three little dots. That ellipsis in the middle of the of the bar, it goes to more actions and it allows you right in the middle to turn on live captions.

That's the feature you have available to you.

We are recording all three days of this meeting and by attending this meeting you're agreeing to being recorded kind of standard procedure here. Just wanted you to know.
And we're also going to provide a transcript of this meeting at the end, a couple probably next week or week after after it gets downloaded and uploaded again. So that transcript will be available to you on the four service website.

0:2:19.840 --> 0:2:27.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So we are committed to making this technology work for us and we know that sometimes there are glitches, but you.

0:2:27.890 --> 0:2:33.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Can always call the Quincy Gordon. That and his phone number was.

0:2:55.870 --> 0:2:56.880
30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
So just remove that.

0:2:35.360 --> 0:2:57.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
In the imitation it was, it is on the bottom of the each page of the agenda. It's been available all along. It's also on the wall that James is showing you says. Need help, call 770-823-6866. That's sequency Gordon. And he will do the best that he can do to help you with it. Whatever.

0:2:58.490 --> 0:3:0.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Technology issues he has.

0:3:1.120 --> 0:3:2.10
30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
You're against somebody.

0:3:1.460 --> 0:3:2.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
When is it?

0:3:3.210 --> 0:3:3.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alan Smith.

0:3:6.80 --> 0:3:7.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You send him off again.

0:3:8.540 --> 0:3:8.920
30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
Here.
So.

Finally, if you drop off.

Which sometimes happens. Try clicking on the link to log back again into teams first or dial the phone number to listen in.

Any questions on technology?

So somebody's got their hand. There's a good test.

Hey there quick question.

A quick question on tech are we will will the screen sharing be enabled during this during this meeting so that we can share a visual or two during our discussions?

It's not. It's not the feature right now, but if we have time for for that and we can give you that privilege.

Do you have intention to use it today?
At most likely yes.

Thank you.

Well, we'll see how we can work that out. I we are still trying to make sure we've got the time to hear from everybody and we'll see how this works out. It's gonna evolve. Thank you.

Anyone else?

Alright.

So I'd like to turn it back to James.

Thanks Nancy.

Well, thanks everyone for being here today.

Again, I'm James Malone's for supervisor here for the national force in North Carolina.

The net hail and Pisgah special places, and I'm honored to steward alongside our Amazing Employees, partners, volunteers and all of you for future generations these lands.

The work that the Forest Service is done with partners to manage these lands over the past century turn turning these cutover lands into a beautiful landscape that looks like it's always been this way. As one of the greatest conservation stories.
In the last century, we appreciate how much people love these for us and we love them too, and that's why we devote our careers to managing them.

So a lot of you all have been with us for the past 10 years as we've been developing this plan, working side by side with people from all different interests.

That's been an extraordinary collaboration, with incredible dedications on the part of so many. I'm grateful for all.

You have contributed and humbled by how much we've been contributed by so many people.

You know, we know that there's a diverse set of values and interest on the forest.

Sustaining biodiversity and wildlife habitat, spiritual connections to nature, food for families through hunting and fishing, access to special places, jobs that support the local economy and locally grown forest products.

I believe there's room for all of that within the million acres of the Nantahala Pisgah.

And we're also proud that these are the birthplace of scientific forestry in America and the home of the first tractive land purchase under the Weeks Act to create the National Forest in the Eastern US.

And we know we need to continue to do a good job as we look forward with the, with the new plan in the next generation and the challenges that we're facing are getting more complex, especially with climate change and the spread of insects and disease and basis species, impacts of development on
private lands and what that does for access and management of the forest growth of the wildland urban interface and the huge amount of visitor use that we've all seen that's only increased with COVID.

And how to provide sustainable recreation overtime?

So in this time of accelerated change and ensuring our forest ecosystems are healthy and resilient is critical to long, stern sustainability of all those habitats these forests provide, and for supplying the ecosex ecosystem benefits that we all depend on.

So that's why we made sure the revised plan and emphasizes sustaining healthy ecosystems, clean and abundant water, connecting people to the land and doing that all through the lens of partnering with others.

You know, of course, with all these different multiple uses. Not everyone agrees on exactly how to do that. What is the best way to achieve that healthy forest? There's no easy answers.

It's OK to disagree, because reasonable people can disagree and respect each other's differences and still continue working together. Our job is to ensure we have listened to all the values and demands and balance those with the needs of nature.

What we promise when we began working together on the plan was that no one would see their interest given greater regard over another. Instead, all will see their interest given fair consideration.

And their values, visibly represented in the final plan.

The purpose of this week's meetings is to hear additional thoughts and what you think the final plan still needs and to discuss the remedies provided in your objections. Specifically, deputy regional Forester Rick Lint.

We'll listen and ask you questions that will help them clearly understand your interest. Rick is the
reviewing officer in this process and he will take a few minutes to talk about the objection resolution process.

0:8:40.900 --> 0:8:48.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then reintroduce Nancy, our facilitator, who will review the the agenda and layouts and ground rules for the week. Thanks.

0:8:49.220 --> 0:9:5.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right. Yeah. Thanks, James, and thank you all for for being here. Thanks for your time and know your time is valuable. And thank you for participating in the injection process. I'm Rick Lint, deputy regional forester and I'll be serving as the reviewing officer for the objections.

0:9:6.260 --> 0:9:22.380
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Realize that many of you will be with us the entire three days. And to those of you I say thank you. Others may be coming and going and wanna thank you all as you listen, work through the topics. We're gonna try to accommodate.

0:9:23.140 --> 0:9:32.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All of your schedules, we have a really, really packed agenda and we'll stick to our our timelines with them, with all your help.

0:9:33.340 --> 0:9:52.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But before we get into this too far, I wanted to say that I do have some experience with this. I've been just down the road from James I served as the floor supervisor for the parents of marrying Sumter National Forest in South Carolina for about 8 1/2 years and last fall moved into the deputy regional forester position.

0:9:53.510 --> 0:9:59.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And so I also worked on the 1st force plan to be signed under the 2012 Planning Rule.

0:10:0.910 --> 0:10:12.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And uh, have some amount of familiarity with the pizza and Nantahala National Forest. I've come here often with my family and with our scout troop, with my son over the years.

0:10:12.960 --> 0:10:15.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And we've made several trips hiking.

0:10:16.340 --> 0:10:16.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.
Camping here so I love. I love this these lands and.

Home.

Is mentioned and I wanted to to state again. The purpose of this meeting is to really help me fully understand some more of the complex issues raised in your objections and to really hear your potential remedies.

Been a lot.

Provide.

Got all those gone through all those?

And.

Having said that, it's not possible over the next three days to go through every, each and every issue.

Therefore, in the next three days, I've selected a broad array of issues covering multiple topics that I felt warranted.

Additional clarification for for me.

In my understanding.
And so this approach will allow us to focus on the proposed remedies that you've offered on your some of your specific issues.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So there's no need for you to restate your objections. We have those. We've gone through each one and we have an entire review team of subject matter experts. It's looking in to those issues.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So my review of the objections of an anti hello in Pisgah Forest Plan considered objection submitted by 819 objectors on a very wide range of issues.

By in addition, 40 individuals.

Were eligible as interested persons, which is a category of people who've commented before.

And are interested in being part of the conversations regarding specific objections.

I'll be inviting both the objectors and the interested persons to speak at this meeting.

When your topic comes up.

It's important for me that I have a full understanding of the issues, including the perspectives of others with a stake in this decision.

Along with my review, my objections review team comprised of interdisciplinary subject matter experts from across the country are reviewing the objections and your proposed remedies to the revised Land Management plan.

They're evaluating their revised plan, the final EIS, the draft recorded decision, and they're looking at the project recorded and ensure that all current laws, regulations and policies have been met.
And then they'll provide me with their recommendations for weather changes or warranted to improve the analysis, the plan itself and the final decision.

The process of thoroughly reviewing the objections and assessing opportunities for resolution takes a considerable amount of time, which is why I already decided to exercise my discretion to extend the 90 day review period.

Given the importance of this plan and its complexity.

I believe the additional time was necessary to fully consider the issues raised.

After this meeting, after the three days of meetings, I'll prepare a written response to the objectors. The response will reflect my findings.

Uh front end. The my review of the objections, including the current laws, regulations and policies, agency directions, the remedies that you've proposed, and the discussions that we have here this week.

That response may include instructions that I have to to James to address changes that I find necessary.

To address your objection issues.

Well, at the same time improving the final planned decision, the final plan and the supporting documentation.

This week's discussion will help inform my response.
But Please note that I won’t be making any final decisions today. I wanna be taking in all this information, getting together with my team, and then then I'll issue my written response.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Through my through my final written response will address all the issues raised as permitted by our regulations.

How is you one response to all the objectors and interested persons combining like issues under general topic areas?

My response will be the final decision of the US Department of Agriculture regarding your objection.

I want to acknowledge that you have the deep passion and a strong attachment to these forests.

They matter to you and your family.

And your community.

I want you to know that I care about them too.

And I want you to know that I care about this forest, the health and sustainability of the forest, and I'm looking forward to our time together.

So please share your thoughts with me in the days ahead. I wanna hear your solutions and especially the details about your remedies so we can continue to work together and managing these lands that belong to all of us.

So thank you again for your time today to help deepen my understanding.
And before we get started, I'm gonna invite Nancy Walters back our facilitator to talk about how will conduct the meeting. Thank you. Thank you very much.

This is Nancy Walters, I again, I'm glad to be here and really appreciate all of you being here as well. I'm the neutral party here to serve all of you on the call and in the room. And I have a goal to create an environment that's safe for all of you who want to have a voice to have one on this call and that is and that has enough structure so that it will be conducive to a productive discussion.

I'll I'll be helping to manage the dialogue between you and Rick largely, but also among those of you on the line. If if you have a conversation that engages each of you together well, this virtual platform is not new to most of us. It is the first time the forest has ever done an objections resolution meeting of this size virtually. So it's a big switch and we're gonna do the best we can to create that same.

So in addition to the three people you see here, Rick James and myself, we have a few other folks in this conference room and we wanted to just PAN scan the room and do a couple of introductions. So you can see who's here. And Shelly's gonna help with that.

Shelly, you wanna start?

Sure. Good morning, everyone. I'm Shelly Kelly. I'm executive assistant. So work directly with James Malones and Kevin Fitzsimmons, our Deputy Forest supervisor. Can you hear Shelly from a distance?
Morning, everyone. Kether lutak. I'm the poorest Napa coordinator and forest objection coordinator here in Asheville.

Been around the room around the table.

Good morning everyone. I'm Michelle Aldridge on the planning team leader.

Good morning, everyone. Debbie Anderson at Jacksons coordinator.

Good morning, everybody. Good. Quincy Gordon, Regional objections coordinator from Southern area.

And that's it. And the currency is the face behind the phone number if you need. If you need it. And folks too, you can see the screen. That's where we can see you. So if you kind of see us looking up, that's what we're looking at. So we can see all.

Great.

OK, so this meeting as you know is open to the public and when we understand that a few members of the public are here today, but only formal objectors and interested persons are going to be asked to speak.

Members of the public and the Forest Service folks that are online are here as observers today and this week.

I want to be real clear that this is not a formal hearing where all of you have come prepared with two
minutes of remarks to have your time at the MIC. If we did it that way, we'd have a one way
conversation. We just and that's not really our intent. Our intent is to create the space for our
meaningful dialogue, focusing on your resolutions that add value to the objections that you've already
submitted.

0:19:26.800 --> 0:19:48.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We we went when I got the agenda and saw all those names under each topic. I thought, Oh my gosh,
how is that going to happen in the amount of time we have here? But if and clearly if we heard from all
40 to 60 people under each topic, it would be like a hearing and we wouldn't be having a conversation.

0:19:49.360 --> 0:19:58.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So ideally, if one person offers a perspective that represents your viewpoint, there's no need for another
one to offer the same viewpoint.

0:19:59.930 --> 0:20:29.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We hope that this again will be a conversation where, in addition to dialoguing with Rick, you are
engaging with each other and it's my role as facilitator. And I'm gonna do the best I can to allow you to
follow a thread of conversation within a topic so that we we are not jerking from one perspective to
another, but we're having a conversational thread and at the same time, I'm gonna be trying to keep
things moving so we can hear.

0:20:29.900 --> 0:20:44.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All the different perspectives in the room, so it'll be an art. I'm thinking that that it will, it'll work and
we'll do the best we can. But I ask each of you to manage your own time with that awareness.

0:20:44.930 --> 0:20:45.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So it's not just me.

0:20:45.980 --> 0:20:48.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Me responsible for that.

0:20:49.10 --> 0:20:51.270
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We'll see how it works. We'll adjust as needed.

0:20:52.240 --> 0:21:22.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Rick, Rick is gonna introduce each topic or subtopic. Then what we're gonna do is ask you to if you
are a formal objector or an interested person who has weighed in on that topic for you to turn your
cameras on. So we can see you and make it more like you're in the room with us rather than just a
bunch of initials. So. So at the beginning of each topic or subtopic, we'll ask you to turn your cameras on.
We can see you. Then we'll ask you to turn your cameras on.
Talk if you want, and then begin the dialogue using the raise hand feature.

Try to keep your comments specific to the topic you've all of you have received agendas. The one in July 1 yesterday that's been updated mostly just with names and not not much with the the content, but you can see where the.

They.

Bucket is for the topic that you're interested in, and we're gonna ask us to try to keep focused on that as much as we know a lot of these topics will overlap.

And then always please keep your line on muting your self after you've spoken and.

We'll do the best we can to help you with that. If you don't do it, we can do it for you.

So I wanted to just offer a couple rules of engagement that well, I believe be important to the success of this meeting and that I like all of you to agree to.

And we've got a slide coming up that shows them.

OK, first one rule rule of engagement also called also known as ground rules. Here's where we'd like to ask you to focus on the issue, not the person, and to not have not attack people personally, it's the issues we wanna be addressing here. And along with that, we know all the passion is a big part of what's behind what we're gonna be talking about today. But only one passionate person at a time is allowed.

These, and I think the raise hand feature will help with that. It's pretty hard to interrupt on.
If you're being called on.

And then third, I'd like you to think about balancing advocacy with inquiry or curiosity. And we know that you've come with your own perspective that you wanna make sure it gets shared. But we also hope that you will hold a spirit of curiosity for what those on this call are offering as well.

And then lastly and I, I think Rick and James mentioned this, we want to concentrate on new dimensions of the issue and remedies today, not so much repeating the comments that or the objections that you've submitted before today. And I think that'll be our biggest challenge.

So lastly, there's a quote that just took me as I read a book by Steven Charleston a couple a couple weeks ago.

It says our journeys are varied. Our experiences unique, but the home we seek is the same, a place of trust, a place of welcome.

A place of respect.

So I just wanna ask, is there anyone here in this meeting that can't live with this set of rules of engagement?

If there's something that you feel you can't live with, please raise your hand and we'll ask you why or what we can do about that.

OK, thanks. So now that's permission for me to hold you to these rules of engagement and I appreciate that.

OK, quickly to the agenda. And I think we have a couple slides here.
If you're a member of the public and did not receive an agenda, it's available on the force website, but this high level version of what you have in front of you.

Is.

Is what I'm gonna run through here today. We're gonna spend all morning on recreation a number of different subtopics within recreation.

Take an hour for lunch. Well, let me just back up and say each.

Ohh morning and afternoon of each day we plan to take breaks, maybe 1, maybe more. Depends on how it's going OK.

But after lunch then today we will talk about national scenic areas that country recommended wilderness, special interest areas, especially the natural heritage areas and wild and scenic rivers. That's what's on dock for this afternoon. Tomorrow we'll come back at 8:30.

And cover soil and water and roads in the morning.

Break at 11:30.

And then come back and cover force management and ecological integrity.

With a focus on natural range of variability, which includes early seral habitat, old growth, timber suitability and harvest and fire and fuels.

Again, will adjourn it 5, and then on the third day we'll come back.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Cover wildlife, plant and aquatic species. Tier one and two objectives.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Break for an hour.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then conclude by covering climate change monitoring and a journey at three that day.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So so as Rick mentioned, we're gonna try really hard to keep to those blocks of time on that agenda, mostly because we expect people to be coming in and out of this meeting depending on what they're interested in talking about. And so we need to honor that by sticking to what we've advertised as as the time blocks for this agenda.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then one last thing I just wanted to note that you if you're an objector or an interested person, you also in addition to the agenda received a document called at a glance. And in that at a glance document are listed. All the suggested resolutions. And Rick is gonna be referring to those. So you can follow along if you want to. They're not going to be posted anywhere or.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Online, where we don't plan to share screen, we would really like to be making this conversational.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So any questions for me on how we hope to make this work?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Great. OK. So we we.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, recognize that we will have some folks dialing in. In fact, what do we have here?
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We already have a 5 or so people dial in.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You will. We won't be able to be on teams at all, right? It's just the phone you're talking about, Sam.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So.

I don't have. I'm in process of moving. I don't have access to Wi-Fi. I'm sorry, but that's the case.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. So we won't be able to see you raise a hand, right? But but.

Correct.

You have a mute button on your phone, your star 6 on off so so you could control that when you're calling in.

Correct.

On the phone, just the phone. Right. You just they just have their meetings work. Ohh. You have the ability to mute and unmute. So I guess and it's.

Help me out at there's a better solution, but I'm guessing that when you wanna enter into the dialogue, you're just gonna have to use your voice and interrupt, and that way I will know your.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You're ready, and I'll recognize that.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That fair enough.

e1de695f-89ca-4652-8b44-f9ddb9c5a0b7
And I also understand, yeah. And also understand that the individual lead objectors for the various issues here will be specifically identified and invited to speak by you or Mr Arnett, is that correct?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Correct.

OK, so when.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And we'll probably start with.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We'll probably start with the lead objectors.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Since we know who those are, and so we'll we know where you're plugged in, I believe, Sam, so that I can be sort of thinking about making sure you're called on.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Fair enough.

e1de695f-89ca-4652-8b44-f9ddb9c5a0b7
OK. Yes. Just want to make sure I have an opportunity to participate.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It great. Thank you for bringing that up.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
What can you tell us what your phone number is going to be when you call in?
You want the phone number that you're seeing is area code 781-883-6938 and it will. I'm not listed by an individual name and the objectors list. I'm listed by an organization.

And I'm listed as Carolina Mountain club. But this is Michael Fisher, and that is the telephone number that you would see.

OK, got it.

Anybody else? Thank you, Sam.

That was Michael, Sam says this.

Yeah.

OK, family.

OK, the backup fam.

Sam Evans
Hey I had a quick question and follow up to Rick's explanation of how this will work. Rick, we hear you loud and clear that this isn't the time to rehash or restate or objections. And is the author of a pretty lengthy objection. I'm glad to hear that. I think my question is.

Yeah. Can it related to that though we we I'm not sure exactly. You know we'll have to repeat some of the you know some of the issues that we've raised in our objection because we haven't really gotten anything concrete from the Forest Service to react to since we filed our objection. I think that's been sort of a kind of a consistent complaint throughout the process for for many of us is that you know we've provided a lot of detailed input. We haven't gotten a lot of explanation back as to why you know the poor service thinks about it.
And so, you know, I think carrying that over into today, it would be great to hear from y'all exactly sort of what you think will be new on your end or or at least it as a framework for how we can think about how to narrow in on those on those issues that we need to.

Yeah. Thank you. Thank and like we've talked about is this is a.

Conversational type setting so.

If you need to refer to some amount of background, that's fine, but you know we we've got all your we've got all the documents that you submitted. We've got all we've got everything we've been going through it and it takes time. It takes time to do that. We've had a team of people from across the country.

Combining through those and this, this is that part of the process where we've set-up these resolution meetings where app selected the the objections that I felt like needed more discussion from my understanding. So yeah, again the focus is on the remedy because that's the business end of this as what's what's the remedy? Is there a resolution out there yet to be found. So of course if you need to provide some context to that.

But please don't feel like you need to go back and read your objection letter or make blankly.

Uh, likely explanation of that. We've we've got that does that, does that help?

Worse.

It does, yeah. I think some of the issues that we talking about over the three days are are complicated
enough that some background will be necessary, just As for clarification to make sure that we're on the same page.

0:33:13.70 --> 0:33:13.320
Sam Evans
Yes.

0:33:12.140 --> 0:33:13.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Worse, yes. Good.

0:33:14.160 --> 0:33:14.560
Sam Evans
Thank you.

0:33:15.330 --> 0:33:16.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The question thank you.

0:33:17.510 --> 0:33:19.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Other questions?

0:33:22.400 --> 0:33:24.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Rick or James or I.

0:33:27.520 --> 0:33:34.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right, one last thing, James, gonna offer a couple comments about how we've gotten to where we are today and then we'll begin.

0:33:35.270 --> 0:33:49.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks, Nancy. So we're almost there. I know a lot of you have been been on this process every step of the way, but I just for everyone's background, wanted to quickly go over kind of where we got to where we are today.

0:33:50.580 --> 0:34:18.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Course this revised plan is is really our master plan intended to help us address the challenges that we anticipate in the next 20 years. Our current plan was written in 1987 and significantly amended in 1994. We were still watching movies on VHS and probably couldn't dream of how we're meeting today, didn't anticipate the current amount of recreation and mountain bike use, for example, or hemlock woolly adelgid.

0:34:19.370 --> 0:34:33.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The the repeated intense storms that were currently facing. So as we move into the years ahead, the
revised plan needs to be flexible enough for us to adapt to those changes that are coming our way socially and ecologically over the years ahead.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We know that those challenges are more interconnected and complex than ever before. As I mentioned around impacts of development pressure.

Increase in recreation the growth of the wildland urban interface spread of insects and disease, and and how climate change is going to affect all those things.

So we began revision in late 2012 using the new planning role, I guess is not too new. Nowadays. We have a new process and we were at the first in the East to put in place some of the elements of that new process.

Uh, it's been an intensive effort. As you all know, with incredible amounts of public involvement over many years wasted more than 50 public meetings and attended dozens of meetings hosted by others, including multiple collaborative groups. We asked for input all along the way that the different steps of the process, and we heard from thousands of people whose input has been as diverse as the people who love these for us.

We heard that places matter and heard from individuals all across the country who have special connections to these lands.

So building on all that input.

We built the revised plan and environmental impact statement. We published the the draft EIS on Valentine's Day at 2020.

Of course, one month later, Kovid hit and we extended the 90 day comment period for an additional 45 days. As we transition into virtual public engagement and we received thousands of comments for consideration and response to those comments we add, we added an alternative between draft and final and made modifications that were within the range of alternatives already analyzed in the draft EIS.
The final EIS and revised Land Management plan was published earlier this year in January and we have the 60 day objection filing period and that's kind of where we got to where we are today and this is another step of that collaborative process to ensure we have considered all the needs before this plan is signed.

We've always believed that we can come to a broad consensus on 80 to 90% of the issues and that's where.

We believe we landed at this stage of the process. The force teams steps back and the national team, led by the deputy regional Forester Rick, remain reviews remaining concerns to see if changes need to be made.

For this process, but Rick is the reviewing officer.

I led the planning process as the responsible official and will sign the final record record of decision on the plan after incorporating any instructions.

Rick is looking forward to hearing from you today. Our job is to ensure we have listened to all the interests alongside the needs of the ecosystems as we establish a framework that can carry us into the future before I pass it back to Nancy, I wanna make sure folks know Kevin Fitzsimmons is on the line cabin. Can you come on and say hi?

Hey, more than everybody, cabinets in his deputy forest supervisor, National Forest, North Carolina. It's good seeing everyone and thanks for joining us for the next few days.

Thanks, Kevin. OK, we'll turn it back over to Nancy and Rick, OK. Sorry about that, Kevin. I was gonna include you in the mix. So one more thing before we begin. We've got a few phone numbers. We'd love
to identify if we could. We’ve got David Whitmer on the phone. We heard from Michael Fisher on the phone. There's two other phone numbers, 7853646. Who's that?

0:38:14.90 --> 0:38:15.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Could you identify yourself?

0:38:17.700 --> 0:38:19.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
785-3646.

0:38:23.930 --> 0:38:24.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Nobody.

0:38:26.360 --> 0:38:28.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right then we've got.

0:38:29.870 --> 0:38:32.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
479-6486.

0:38:33.730 --> 0:38:34.990
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Who's coming in on that line?

0:38:41.370 --> 0:38:46.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Well, we don't know and I guess we'll just go with that. Thank you.

0:38:47.270 --> 0:38:49.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, so I think we're ready to begin.

0:38:51.620 --> 0:38:56.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. First up, where we're gonna talk. We'll spend the morning talking about recreation.

0:38:58.70 --> 0:39:1.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We heard it from a lot of individuals on recreation topics.

0:39:2.430 --> 0:39:5.190
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So we're gonna start with the national scenic trails.

0:39:7.260 --> 0:39:10.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Again, we wanna focus on some of your proposed resolutions.
And.

But you can you can. You hear me?

I'll I'll have some questions as we do, yes.

I'm sorry. I wanna I'm sorry to interrupt, but I wanted to let you know the 479 number is Graham County. We have. We're using a Polycom along with the teams to to be able to hear broadly in the room.

OK. Thank you.

Yep.

Thank you.

The number I'm going to want to ask them to show their faces before you start asking the question, OK?

OK. And you can refer to your at a glance document that was provided in the meeting invitation, which lists some of the proposed resolutions.

So for the National Scenic Trail, some of the suggested resolutions from the objectors.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The modify the Appalachian National Scenic Trail management corridor.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Provide not only for scenery, but for semiprimitive nonmotorized Ros class condition.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, established and display a forest plan map.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Of the Appalachian Trail management area that is discernible within an extent of at least 1/2 mile of both sides of the travel route. Put the Appalachian Trail management area and Group 3 to better reflect the desired primitive and semiprimitive nonmotorized RLS setting that's represented recreation opportunity spectrum setting.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Appalachian Trail standards and guidelines should clearly provide for a semi primitive nonmotorized Ros setting and high scenic integrity objective and then prohibit logging within the view shed of the Appalachian Trail and other major trail corridors.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Fancy one? Yeah. So I just wanted to again try to make this as personal as we can. If you are an objector or an interested person that's listed that offered an objection related to multiple use scenic trails, would you put your camera on?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So we can see you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We'll see how this works and if it's worthwhile.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But wanted to.
At least give it a try.

OK.

And it's up to you whether you want to keep your your camera on or not.

But let's start with one of the lead objectors for this national scenic trails.

Who would like to start?

This is Morgan Summerville, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy. Greg Warren was the objector to providing many of these comments, and I don't see him on the call or on the.

Morgan Sommerville
On this meeting.

So.

Anybody can speak?

For him, Morgan.

Yeah. No, no. OK.
All right.

Morgan Sommerville
I can provide one comment which is that Greg is a former far service employee. He was the Trail administrator for the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail and has a great deal of technical expertise and passion about.

Morgan Sommerville
The national trail system.

Morgan Sommerville
Other than that, I don't know what else to say for him.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, thanks. That's alright. We've got his objection. And and we're clear on what it is he's interested in.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Others.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I'm I feel like I'm offering enough time for raised hands and I don't wanna.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I don't want to hold us up, so let's just move to the second subtopic, Rick, OK.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Next up is multiple use multi use trails.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And I suggest suggested resolutions from injectors.
Address multi use trail planning in the Land Management plan by articulating policy principles, factors and decision criteria concerning multi use trail planning.

Preferably as outlined by CMC and Land Management plans, desired conditions, objectives, standards and guidelines and explain the forest services evaluations and decisions relative to CMC's comment.

All right, so let's see on camera. As many of you as want to share.

Objectors and interested persons and multi use trails.

Get a sense for this.

And Nancy was reminder that I can't be on camera. This is Michael Fisher for the CMC.

Hey, Michael, that's great.

And Michael, do you want to just start?

Sure, I can talk briefly and I understand we're not repeating the objection. I think a couple points though are relevant here that come out of our objection. One is we in our objection are not advocating for a particular policy decision outcome relative to multi use trails. Our what what Mr Arnie stated is exactly what we are looking for. Our objection is based on what we view.

Is an insufficient response by the Forest Service to our public comment relative to multi use trails. So we want the Forest Service to respond to our comment and as part of that comment, we are looking for and we proposed in our public comment a framework of thinking for how to make decisions relative to multi use trails, whether there are existing hike only trails or trails that in the future could be developed as new multi use trails and that's the purpose.
That is the content of our objection, and it is not to advocate for a specific policy outcome relative to that. We understand that is the discretion of the Forest Service to make decisions on these kinds of matters and to reject, for example, we, we have our preferences, but the Forest Service could reject all our preferences, but we we believe the Forest Service is required by NEPA and by the Administrative Procedure Act to respond to our public comment.

And as I said, the key point we're making today is to emphasize and it was stated exactly in your proposed solutions to include the framework and structure of thinking for decisions relative to multi use trails in the Land Management plan. Now as opposed to waiting to do that in the course specifically of the individual project management plans.

12 polls.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks. Thanks Michael and.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Two main things required to respond and to include the framework now that you've you've offered.

Correct that we think the these matters are obviously a very high importance to the Carolina Mountain Club and we would prefer that the framework, the rules if you want to call it that for how these decisions will be thought about in the future as pertains to individual projects we we want the Forest Service to articulate that framework now and we we gave a framework in our comment we we reiterated part of that and our objection, I'm not going to repeat that, but that is what we are looking for as the outcome of the objection process to go back to the Land Management.

Plan and include a framework of thinking, policy concepts, considerations, factors and criteria for how decisions will be made relative to multi use trails.
OK. Thank you. Thank you.

All right.

Another lead objector.

Go ahead, Deidra.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)

And I'm listed as interested party Nancy. Do you wanna go ahead with objectors first?

OK.

Julie white.

Also interested.

Julie White

I'm in the same boat as Deirdre. I'm just an interested party.

Let's hear from you, Julie. I'm not seeing any other raised hands.

OK, so I totally get what Michaels saying and I just would like to say that.

Julie White

If if the four service goes down this road to make it multi use discussion and not just input from one group, we've heard what the Carolina Mountain club thinks should be.
Julie White
Uh said they're done, but I think that you need input from other user groups when you're making those decisions.

Julie White
Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks, Julie. So yeah, getting other input from the other users as well.

Julie White
Correct.

Julie White
Correct.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And diedre now.

e1de695f-89ca-4652-8b44-f9ddb9c5a0b7
In the back and add something to that. I agree that this is Michael Fisher again. We are not opposing the collaborative decision making process. We are wanting the framework to be put there for collaborative decision making as it applies to individual projects and we would.

e1de695f-89ca-4652-8b44-f9ddb9c5a0b7
We would love to participate in the collaborative process to develop this framework now, but it is important we think that this be in the Land Management plan as opposed to pushed into the future. The Lands Management plan will apply for 10:15 and we know what happened with the previous one. How many years is it applies it applied for decades. We want that rule framework to be articulated carefully and thoughtfully now as opposed to waiting for it to develop overtime.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, Michael, how about Megan? Another objector?

Megan N. Sutton
Heather, can you hear me?
My name is Megan Sutton, and I'm speaking on behalf of the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership, which is a collaborative group of diverse interests that really reflects the broadest zone of agreement possible.

On a bunch of controversial topics, so this particular objection, the concerns that are raised by the girl and Mountain Club were not explicitly discussed by the partnership. However, we feel strongly that supporting the creation of a recreation user council or something to that effect would enable these decisions to be made going forward as they arise, and that would consist of a broad spectrum of recreation users, and we can't possibly foresee all the decisions that would need to be made now so that from the partnerships perspective, we support creating a council of some sort of a diverse group of recreation users to be able to weigh in on these types of decisions going forward.

Yeah.

Thanks mate. I was making a note here.

So appreciate that you're talking about a recreation user council to weigh in on those decisions from diverse users. So the Council's made-up of diverse users and address help address decisions as they arise.

OK.

So back to Deidre.
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Deirdre here and back. Country horseman does feel that the sustainable recreation parameters that were offered in recreation standard 11 due.

OK.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Adequately discuss.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Reasons of sustainability and help to put them in the parameter of the geographic areas versus the entire forest as there are so many different.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Areas and protocols that need to.

He.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Taken into effect.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Deidre. So standard 11.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Adequately, it does addresses the reasons of sustainability that that need to be addressed.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So then, Julie, do you have your hand up like? No, no. You took it down.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Oh no, you do. Do you? Do you still have your hand up for another comment?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No. Would you please lower your hand?
That's right. I could do it. You're confusing me.

Alright. Anybody else speaking on this topic and multi use trails?

That good, good set of voices there.

Alright, ready to move?

Yeah. Thank you for for putting your thoughts in into our virtual room here. Appreciate that.

In Next up scuse me.

Talk about.

Restrictions on.

Mountain biking and equestrian use.

And.

Welcome to make sure I didn't miss one. I don't think I did proposed resolutions on that.

Uh, sorba.
And I, MBA, suggest adjusting the language of REC. Ohh 07 and Rec S 11, which is collaborative planning to address bikes and equestrians, and standard of restricting use.

And the Back Country Horsemen of North Carolina suggest requiring advance notice of special events in the plan to monitor impacts of those events that impact multi-use trails.

OK. So again, can we see the faces of the folks that submitted objective objections or interested persons in this category?

You're pretty much up there. Great. OK.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsemen (Guest)
Sure. And Rick, the what you just said was in reference to a different objection from the back country horsemen.

On this topic of restricting horses and bikes to designated trails, we concur exactly with IMBA and Sorba. On the objection, it's mostly an edit and what we feel is that there would just needed to be a clarification for that. That became a trigger on the objection 07.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsemen (Guest)
It just.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsemen (Guest)
The the word begin. Was problematic for us and the the verbiage that IMBA, Sorba and Backcountry horsemen put together has been discussed with the recreation team. With the US Forest Service, North Carolina, and we all feel
that that more adequately represents what the forest was trying to do back country horsemen
understands the need for going being restricted on.

0:55:35.720 --> 0:55:45.970
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Designated trails. However, it's it's the timing of such and we want to make sure that we can do
collaborative trails planning in order to address that.

0:55:51.530 --> 0:55:58.900
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, thank you. So yeah, offered clarifying language on that and really really.

0:55:59.780 --> 0:56:4.190
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Centered around that word begin, but yeah, but thank you, Deidre.

0:56:5.690 --> 0:56:7.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Pitari palmeri next.

0:56:8.790 --> 0:56:20.500
Terry Palmeri (Guest)
Yes, thank you. I'm Terry palmary. I represent on the Executive director of the Southern Author Bicycle
Association, represent Kimba the National Mountain Bicycling Association Southeast.

0:56:21.130 --> 0:56:34.520
Terry Palmeri (Guest)
And I concur with deidra that we like to make sure that we adjust the language to from begins
collaborative trail planning to upon completion of complex collaborative trail planning.

0:56:35.810 --> 0:56:44.260
Terry Palmeri (Guest)
That way we can work through issues and make sure that we have a good plan before any trails are
closed.

0:56:45.490 --> 0:56:45.940
Terry Palmeri (Guest)
Thank you.

0:56:48.230 --> 0:56:52.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Terry. So that upon completion of collaborative trail planning.

0:56:54.840 --> 0:56:55.260
Terry Palmeri (Guest)
Correct.
Here's the key phrase excellent. Thank you.

OK. On to Megan.

Megan N. Sutton
Want to be respectful of time, but I just want to make sure that it's known that the nanny with Pisgah Forest Partnership.

Very much supports this. This change that was discussed here today.

OK.

Very good. Thank you, Megan.

And Julie, your hand is up.

It is just a quick comment. I just wanted to say that.

We are very appreciative of what the four service did with this issue because we had both on with Sorba, by the way, sorry both Sorba and IMBA, and the back country horsemen had requested some changes in the original language and they responded in a very positive way. So kudos to you guys. Thanks.

Yeah, and the problem. What? What we're here.

If we could, if I could hear a little bit more about.
Umm the the the How how these changes?

Make a difference and what? What is it that's important about them?

In response to that, Jason or Deidre, in response to that question.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
In response to that question.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
If Deirdre.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
The the in. Why is that important? It is important to be able to give time for the planning process for all of the diverse user groups.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Especially in the geographic areas that are noted on our edit slash objection, those areas, especially the eastern escarpment, have very few designated trails on them. However, they have a lot of use by horses and mountain bikers.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
On currently social trails, if there isn't time to go through this collaborative process, my fear is that it is going to create some hostility with people who are currently.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Highly valuing those social or undesignated trails who are just gonna go out there and use them anyway. You having time for a collaborative process gives those people the ability to sit down at the table and to
discuss where those high value trails and corridors are, and to be able to come together and give the Forest Service the ability to look at how sustainable those.

0:59:56.110 -- 1:0:21.370
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Undesignated or currently social trails are and to be able to make those folks understand the way that those trails are going to be able to be kept sustainable if it is in fact feasible to do or not. So without having the time to do this trail planning, I fear that we're putting a big roadblock in bringing people into understanding the way that trails can be sustainable and to be able to address working on them. Volunteering.

1:0:22.380 -- 1:0:36.440
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
And keeping them up.

1:0:37.280 -- 1:0:38.500
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Umm roadblock in bringing people into understanding the way that trails can be sustainable and to be able to address working on them. Volunteering.

1:0:42.130 -- 1:0:42.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
A clear.

1:0:45.220 -- 1:1:8.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
Get thank you. So you had to give time for the planning process to for the user groups, especially on that eastern escarpment. Sounds like there's a you called social trails, trails that aren't on our system, I imagine. And you don't have the time to go through the collaborative process. There won't be time to meet with those folks.

1:1:5.180 -- 1:1:8.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
And find out and we'll work with them. And then.

Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
Then find out what is sustainable with within those trails that are out there.

1:1:15.350 -- 1:1:21.760
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Yes, and understanding that enforcement is extremely difficult with.

1:1:22.540 -- 1:1:52.690
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
The few people that we've got in enforcement, so why not bring your user group to the table to get their buy in on sustainability? You're going to bring a whole set of people of user groups into the idea and the understanding of why trails need to be sustainable and you can sell them to that concept versus making them enemies and.
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Just telling them they can’t do something anymore.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Fair enough.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
So you’ve got the ability here to really.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Bring these people together in a positive way with this collaborative trail planning versus making them the enemy and the bad guy.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, so as far as the why behind this, anybody have something different to add to what you're just offered?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

Terry Palmeri (Guest)
Yeah, yes, this is very palmary representing Sorba and.

Terry Palmeri (Guest)
There is a lot more demand for mountain bike trails and there is supply currently and some of these undesignated trails offer connections to other mountain bike trails and it's important to have that collaborative process to assess these trails to see if they are sustainable. If not reroutes created.

Terry Palmeri (Guest)
But instead of having them shut down, it would cause interruption in mountain bike travel and cause more impact on other designated mountain bike trails. More folks going there instead. So we do have a really good example of how this process works with the Mortimer project, where they're actually looking at these undesignated trails, evaluating them and seeing how they fit into the rest.

Terry Palmeri (Guest)
Of the mountain bike trails, creating loop opportunities or long distance travel.
Nicholas Holshouser
Yes.

Terry Palmeri (Guest)
Umm, so I feel that the collaborative process and evaluating the trails for sustainability and we're very much in support of creating stability.

Terry Palmeri (Guest)
Umm yeah to have that time to find that process. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, ohthere. Thanks, Terry. Sorry anything else, just to answer the question of the the why behind this before we move on to other perspectives.

Sam Evans
Ohh tag on to what Terry just explained and this as a you know as a participant in the partnership that we've been involved in conversations about this issue for a long time and check out what others have said. Grateful for what the Forest Service is done so far to to improve the planned language just to kind of clarify like why this matters. I think everyone at this point agrees that in the future non biking Western Union needs to be on a managed trail system.

Sam Evans
I think the question is whether that is the system that we have today or a different system and you know some of the trails that we've talked about, social or undesignated, will we hope come on to the system. Some of them will come on to the system with reroutes for problematic portions. Some of them hopefully will come under the system with local commitments to maintain those trails in the long term, all of those things happen sort during a collaborative process. And if you close at the outset, which I don't think is the intent, then you would.

Sam Evans
Yeah. Then you foreclose all those possibilities that would sort of enable you to find sustainable consensus around the trail system. And again, I think this is what the Forest Service had in mind. You're said this too. We've seen this in action on current trails projects. So we know the form service knows how to do this and we just want to make sure that the language is right. So the future staff and line officers know what the intent was.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. So let's shift to Grand County, Jason.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Marino.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Jason, you wanna take care?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You need but not. There we go.

30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
You should be worried about that. We're we're practicing. You got. Can you hear me now?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes, we can. Good.

30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
OK, good. Dale Wiggins, I'm Graham County commissioner. I'm also chairman of our Travel and Tourism authority and and my comment made may not fit right here, but I think it does.

30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
Uh we're we're very interested here in developing an old logging roads into multi use trails and the question keeps coming up about electric mountain bikes and I think it would be a good opportunity to hear for this plan to address that set. Some guidelines for electric bike use so that people elderly people, people with physical challenges could access these trails and.

30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
Enjoy the same things that people do that that don't have those physical challenges, but they're certainly needs to be guidelines, but we we hear that in other areas it's permitted. And then here it's not permitted. So there, there needs to be like at least a level field if we were, we were people can enjoy the those trails with electric bikes. So we'd like to see that included as part of this process.

30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
Thank you.

30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
Thanks, Dale. So yeah, you'd like to.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And revision to address E bikes and you mentioned about the developing old logging roads into trails. Thank you.

1:7:25.500 --> 1:7:27.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, how about Julie?

1:7:28.600 --> 1:7:30.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There's a new thread here. Or is it?

1:7:29.930 --> 1:7:48.580
Julie White
Yeah. So it is. Well, it's, it's the, it's on the same thread. So I just wanted to make a clarification, you know Deirdre talked about social trails, but some of these trails were talking about are what we kind of call legacy trails, they were trails at one time on the forest and then they were either decommissioned or there are no longer on the.

1:7:50.160 --> 1:7:52.340
Julie White
List of designated trails so.

1:7:53.260 --> 1:8:10.270
Julie White
Those are are some of the ones that are very important to both the mountain bikers and the equestrians. And I just wanna make a comment that when we first started this whole process many, many years ago, the mountain bikers up in the Boone area were pretty adamantly against.

1:8:11.410 --> 1:8:15.420
Julie White
Recommending or approving or going along with two.

1:8:15.710 --> 1:8:27.340
Julie White
A study areas wilderness study areas in that area becoming wilderness simply because there was not enough mountain bike access in that area.

1:8:27.950 --> 1:8:54.750
Julie White
But they've kind of changed their stance on that over the last 10 years because of the progress that has been made with things like the Mortimer project, where more trails are becoming available for mountain bike use. And I just think when the overall scheme of things, when you're looking at collaboration and different diverse groups working together, that having adequate trail use for the various users is a big step in that direction.

1:8:56.480 --> 1:8:56.860
Julie White
Thank you.
OK. Thanks Julie.

And now to Nicholas whole whole whole shower whole shower, sorry.

Nicholas Holshouser
Holzhauser I'm just interested interested party on this topic.

My only comment here is is I I completely, you know, support the the the premise that the mountain bike community, any question community are really interested in upfront establishing.

That there's a there's a process right to work with these social undesignated trails.

My concern is that all parties in this, especially the Forest Service, need up front a firm commitment to.

To.

Public notification that that what you're you know, some of these trails are undesignated are social are not to be used in the use that they are currently used at and that subsequently once decisions are made, those decisions will be rigorously enforced. Because what I partly saw in this objection that I sort of philosophically disagreed with even though I understand where it's coming from was that there can be a an idea in the user community.

And we we get thousands of users, especially in the mountain bike side, who are not from here and who come here very rarely. So they are not part of our community, right.

And they get the notion that if you wanna trail, you just start riding a trail and it will become a trail.
Nicholas Holshouser

OK. And so I think there's a real delicate balance there and the planning process that's gonna be we need accountability for the mountain bike community and the equestrian community, and substantially from the Forest Service that these decisions once made will be rigorously enforced and that this is not an opportunity to ride more places that are you're not designated to ride right now because one day the Forest Service will open up those places.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

OK. Thank you, Nicholas.

Right. And then Julia, do you are you, do you have another comment? No. OK.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

So any more probing you'd like to do on this topic, Rick. Yeah. I wanted to check in with James and see if you had anything you wanted to add.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

No, thank thanks for the dialogue. I I think it's been said since Sam kind of characterized that I you know.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

The collaborative trail planning and and identifying those particular landscapes where we know we need to to to, to kind of have that supply demand as Terry, I think you said is exactly what folks are saying. I think this is more about clarifying language. I could write a closure order tomorrow and saying no more, but we know it's not manageable or enforceable and it's not going to meet the needs. And so I think the intention is what's been said, I think it's just.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Clarifying that language and and and then working together and prioritizing those places we wanna do. I think, Julie, you mentioned Mortimer of those places that we've really seen a benefit to the user and to the resource. And so that's really the learning from some of those is really what the intent in the plan to do. And we know that takes time and capacity. So we'll need everyone to help with that and then really be clear on we're going to go here 1st and then here next because we can't.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Tackle it all at the same time, but appreciate the the dialogue.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank. Thank you, Jane.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You got? Yeah. If we could move to a a different issue with.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The advanced notice of special use events and.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The address with the back running back country horsemen of North Carolina wanted to to bring up that advanced notice, especially use events.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
That was specifically asking that that we get some advance notice of special events.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
That are gonna impact our use of an area and that the four service should.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Ask uh should put some monitoring for the resource impact of those special events in their monitoring, monitoring questions at the end of the plan.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Did did you have specific questions, Rick?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You have one of The Wanted to hear more about that, so the.
We have advanced notice, especially use events when those events could impact.

The other recreational use, your recreational use, and to have some monitoring about the.

Monitoring of the resource impacts in those special use event agreements.

Yes.

Alright. Anything else on this issue? This sub issue of?

Restrictions on mountain biking and equestrian news before we move.

Yeah.

Well, that was. It's actually a completely separate issue. It's about the LSU SO3 and O 5.

Versus.

You just added it.

Yeah, it's not even in the recreation area, but.

OK, great, right.
So let's.

Shift now to the next subtopic.

All right. Here within the recreation, a quest, training, camping and group camping.

Yeah, for the equestrian and group camping proposed resolutions have add new goals for developed recreation that mirrors the rec. G 06 that references camps.

And that.

That is a mixed-use. Campgrounds are acceptable, but should be accompanied by educational efforts to reduce user conflicts. Also have a modified rec S 07 to include campgrounds and roadside campsites where a horse pack stock are restricted to designated equestrian camping areas. To prioritize those areas where horse campers.

Also, uh Graham County requested the Forest Service developed more sites for primitive and group camping.

And again, if you turn your camera on, if you've ohh.

If you're an objector interesting person in this area.

That would be.
And we'll start with.

Let's start with you, dear. Yeah.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
You are going to get tired of me.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Umm specifically.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
That it was said in the responses that for service did not.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Recognize that horse equestrian camping was being displaced by not prioritizing horses in horse camps. However, since this the four services come out with a white paper from the from Washington office that does understand and specifies that it is a problem nationwide.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
And that it would be great if.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Forests could develop policies around ways to prioritize horses in horse camps. We totally understand that the the resource needs to be used and we know that there is a great resource drain on developed campers and a lot of people do want to camp.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Out and these horse camps have been.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Popular, but if the equestrians can't make reservations in advance, then we're basically kind of displaced on that. And I guess our request would be to develop a process to let us prioritize those.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
And a lot of those ways to do that are in that national White paper from the US Forest Service.
So it's been the case where.

Load everything up, come out to the forest, pull into the campground.

Well and.

Yeah.

And it's full. There's, there's and have to have to either head home or or find find some other place that that there's other other people in there.

It will, effectively, the Forest Service has said there is no other place by the specific specifying that horses can only camp in horse cams.

So the only place we can camp is in a horse camp. So if it is full, yes, we have to turn around and go home. We have no other option generally that is that's the problem with camps that are not on the reservation, but camps that are are on the reservation list.

Umm, obviously we'll know if they're full or not, but when we go to the forest generally.

We want to make sure that we're not impacting resources, so we don't want to go.

After there's been three days of rain, so a lot of times we will have to make more short term plans it if we get. If we had a a window of opportunity to reserve those spots in advance of.

Them other folks.
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
And then open it up after say 2 weeks out. If I wanted to go January 1st I could. I would have the opportunity until December 31st or 15th to book it and then after December 15th, everyone else could book it just to make sure that it got full.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
That, that's just. But again, I don't want to take up time. It's in the white paper. I just ask that the Nantahala Pisgah Forest.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Recognize that there needs to be a policy and and I and I think that the forest could work with.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
The user groups to develop whatever policy that might seem the best for us.

OK, very good. Thank thank you, Deidre. Yeah, I know you're not talking time at all. I appreciate you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Provides more explanation there. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So any other voices on?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That questioning camping.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Subtopic.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So let's move to rock climbing, no?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Did I miss you? I'm sorry I missed Graham County. They wanted the camp.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So is that the Dale? Are you?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There to speak about glucan camping.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I didn't see his hand raised.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm, I'm confused. There was not specifically about equestrian camping, but I think more generally
Graham County was looking at economic opportunities for group camping and other types of camping
opportunities and I think was the kind of related issue.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You can raise the issue to help them.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Opportunities of recreation to help the local economies.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So is there a voice around that here?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Here we go. Here we go.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
They I'm actually paying attention but.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
As far as as far as group camping is concerned.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.
I think what Graham Piani wants there is to find more opportunities and.

To develop group campsites and I would tag on to the lady talking about the equestrian camping.

Uh, we would also like to see.

More equestrian camping here in Graham County, and we believe there's opportunities in multiple areas to do that without a lot of disturbance. And I think if the four service would be collaborative with other groups and like the trails that we try to develop where you are, tourism authority agrees to maintain those things. And I think if you could collaborate with different groups.

That you could take the same approach to develop requester you camping and thank you. That's.

Alright, thanks. Yeah, thank you. And do you see where?

The forest plan.

The implementation of the forest plan.

Is supportive of that effort or is there something you see that would halt or prevent that?

Now you're on mute, Dale.

Can we help?
Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
There we go.

Apologize technology, isn't it? Technology is not my friend. So could you repeat the question please? I'm very sorry.

Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
Far as finding more opportunity for group camping and you also said, you know, Graham County would like to see more opportunity for equestrian camps.

Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
I asked.

Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
Is there do you see the the forest plan? What's what's been prepared for the revised force plan? Do you see that as supportive of that effort?

Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
In the implementation of the plan, or do you see things in the plan that are preventing that from happening?

Well, I I think it's kind of some of both if that makes sense.

But I also understand that it's it's a budgetary issue as far as if we're service you know providing revenue and participating.

In that respect, with development of these.

But we we would just like to, I think this is the time in the process to to get commitments not just from the Forest Service, but from the interested parties.
And and start that collaborative process and if it's gonna be of hard of future planning.

That it that it does need to be a part of this plan instead of, you know, a year down the road we get surprised.

By not being able to have these collaborative efforts for some reason or another.

That's that's all I have. Thank you.

Then thank you. Yeah, and I think.

And where where we’re at is we very much need the the Community to be part of and and the the the users of the trail and the Community be part of the not just well everybody likes to build things.
Yeah, I think so.

OK, not not as glamorous, but absolutely necessary. So yeah. And thank you, Deidre. See your head going up and down.

Do you drive? If you wanna take?

Excellent.

Yeah, I think so. I think you're right.

Yes, I wanted to tell Rick that I think the sustainability of the trails portion of the plan.

I always think about trails and trail assets as trailheads and camps and such like that. So I think that that portion if it could be acknowledged that we are looking at sustainability socially, economically and ecologically for camping as well as trails and trail facilities that I do believe if we can think about the plan and the recreation portion to include.

Camping and trail heads as a matter of fact in that particular vein of sustainability, then we will be able to bring folks in, like the economic team of Graham County and back country horsemen and IMBA and Sorba and CMC, and be able to discuss where the high value areas are for camping as well as trail heads and trails.

When we when we talk about sustainability and that brings the unglamorous maintenance.

And and.
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Uh, advocating for those places to to keep them up and to keep them going.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Go home. More holistic conversation than just the trails, but all the infrastructure that is connected with that and supportive of that, like the camping and the trail heads.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Very good. Thank you, Yoda.

Julie White
Yeah. Julie White with Sorba. So this kind of bleeds into another area, but and it's already mentioned in the forest plan, but they the forest, the Forest Service did recommend that during the planning process of projects that that be a multi.

Julie White
Group effort and so we have emphasized within various partnerships I'm in that recreation needs to be included.

Julie White
In that early planning so that.

Julie White
You know, if there's an opportunity to improve a trail or a trail head or maybe a camp that that could be included in the plan of that project, it could make it more efficient in the long run.

Julie White
So I just wanted to emphasize that.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, yeah, think, think everything through from beginning to the end.

Julie White
Correct.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Any more before we move.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, so we're ready to focus on rock climbing now and have perhaps a different set of voices.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Here if you put your camera on good. Yeah. Rock climbing slash fixed anchor points.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Obviously the suggested resolution is to propose new language related to rock climbing.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And that.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thing it was brought up that the.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Rock climbing.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The rock, the climbing management plan objective is based on predetermined undefined outcomes and suggest a new plan components.
So if you could help me understand specifically what's missing from or is too restrictive in the forest plan.

That can't be addressed in the subsequent climbing management plan.

Alright.

Daniel, would you introduce yourself please?

Yes, little one. My name is Daniel Dunn with access fund.

And I just want to provide a little bit of context to sort of our overall arguments I think will help inform this discussion.

Really, the central point of our arguments revolve around we're considering the interim management strategies that have been outlined in are other objection points.

We feel that those undermine the success of future climbing management plan process.

We're willing to support the strategy the Foreign Service identified and rejective, 09, of, of future later climbing management plan process that we disagree with. The current interim strategies that have been laid down, that's really kind of meat of our argument.

But we want to see is high level appropriate language around climbing management in this revised plan and then a prioritized timeline for completing the client management plan process. So to get into some of the specific objections.
Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
Or rec standard 19, we felt that that language was predecisional to this coming management plan.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
The zones of concern that were listed in the impact that climbing has on them, we feel that it's under evaluated and overly restricted and prohibitive for the climate community.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
We also felt that in this, in this section of the plan, the force was leadership already has the ability to close certain areas if they deem fit. We didn't really understand the reasoning for calling out these specific under evaluated and we're overly prescriptive types of strategies in this high level revised forest plan.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
Another note that we heard from the planning team over and over again that the plan was inherently permissive and that was some phrasing that was used throughout this process. And so we feel that this section is very restrictive and has these sort of unevaluated provisions that really are climbing management that's being decided outside of a climbing management plan process with the Community involvement.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
Umm. And we filled our new language. Does a better job of setting up that climbing management plan to actually be the solution for these concerns for climbing?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you and.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So it's it's really focusing on on the interim.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Management strategies that there's disagreement on.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You'd like to see some more high level appropriate language and you said another piece there, but I missed it. High level appropriate language when he talked about the REC standard 19 feel that's predecesional and overall what's in there now is overly restrictive. You would like to see the new language that you've offered.
Because it's better.

People have that put into the plan.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest) Is that and I'll let Mike Reardon. He'll touch on a couple other more points of our objections, but yes, your point like we we feel that the current language is deciding climbing management in a very restricted and prohibitive way and not letting a future climbing management plan actually decide that. And so our language tease up that future CNP that you all have discussed and committed to and we feel that that should be the deciding tool for these management strategies for rock climbing. And we don't want to see this in our language going to place it actually is what it was quite restrictive.

In is problematic for the climbing community. I feel also for the Forest Service leadership in terms of management.

So yeah, I would like, yeah, Mike, I think he's got a few more points to add that in some other specific objections.

Are you ready to go to Mike? Are you?

Ohh yeah.

Yes. OK. Thank you.

Mike Burden gonna introduce yourself?

Your mic is, your mic is on off.
Can't hear you. There we go.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
There we go. I'm like, reading from the Carolina Climbers Coalition. Thanks so much for having us.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
It kinda tip bridge on what what Daniel had introduced there.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
We feel there are are specific components that are are predecisional to the climbing management plan itself.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
And we we really want the climbing management plan objective to be to reflect best management strategies and we we wanna be able to set it up with the climbing community and recreation community so that it’s successful in the future because we feel like that, you know rec O, 09 of the climbing management plan that, that management objective is is a very important one for the future of climbing on the forest and.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Specifically.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Rec. S 19, CDWS 5, RWS 13. All all of those points are predecisional to the climbing management plan and and may undermine our ability to work with the Community and work with the Forest Service to create that climbing management plan. Once we get to that Tier 2 objective, so we we we have concerns that these.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Some of the restrictions around.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Ohh right S 19 and also in the fixed anchor language the which is CDWS 05.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
We have concerns that those restrictions would undermine our ability to to create economic management plan.
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Unless those were were adopted, those standards and objectives were adopted in in some of the
language was changed within them or omitted completely.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Umm.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
The that was our our our major hope in filing these objections.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Mike. And and Daniel and see there's another hand up, but I just wanted to.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm, maybe dig in a little deeper on.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I think I think what was offered was to temporarily mitigate the impacts that are occurring now until the
management plan is completed. If I could hear a little bit more about what what's meant by temper
temporarily mitigate.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
This is Daniel again. Max was fine. I'm not. This is sure where the temporarily mitigate language came
from, but I think something that is in our arguments, we try to highlight is it really the only temporary
strategy has been proposed and the current form service language is closure. Everything’s about closure,
obliterate, remove. And so we would like to see language that is not as restrictive and potentially get
touch on other management strategies such as education, signage, things like that, because it's doing
the plan.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
Climbing is sort of viewed in a very restrictive and negative sort of light, and a lot of the strategies have
been laid out are closure based.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Daniel.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Eric.
Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
Murdoch next.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
Yeah. Thanks, Sir. Thanks so much for having me. I'm Eric Murdoch. I run the policy program at the Axis Fund and work closely with Daniel and Michael. I just, I just wanted to provide a couple more details.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
That that speaks specifically to the points that they raised. I'll give two examples from from our objection. You know, one is the.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
The description of of climbing, you know, approach paths where people are essentially are off trail and and moving through in a dispersed pattern through the through the forest and that is regarded as unauthorized climbing approach trails.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
Umm or approach paths I believe is the is the terminology used? Correct me if I'm wrong Daniel. I don't have our objection in front of us.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
Unauthorized climbing access routes is the way it's regarded actually in the in the climbing in the forest, in the draft forest plan.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
There is no way right now for the forest to authorize. There's no authorization process for those.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
Ohm access routes, so I think referring to those as unauthorized access through its is is is not in the best interest of the forest or the climbing community because there's there's just no process right now and there's no national level guidance for that. The Forest Service has to allow for authorized to access routes. So I think that's something that's really important to to consider. The second thing is the fixed.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
Time frame for the Raptor closure.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
In the draft plan, it specifically states.
Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
In let me get to the point here.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
It specifically states that between uh, January and.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
August 15th of the climbing areas will be closed to to protect Raptors and that just doesn't follow the current body of literature. Right now we have a much better understanding than in the previous century about Raptor closures and most national forests across the country use a flexible closure system and there’s a lot of reasons for that. With the changing climate, changing use levels and and differences in migratory birds, we sometimes have to be more, more flexible. Sometimes closures need to be.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
Early or or or lifted earlier. Sometimes they last later, so a monitoring based approach to wrapped or closures is is preferred in most forests that that we work with as climbers because it allows for a little bit of flexibility and allows the actual behavior patterns of Raptors to be reflected in the in the closure period. So I just wanted to identify those two issues as some of the examples of of sort of unsubstantiated.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
Closures that a little bit.

Erik Murdock, Access Fund (Guest)
UM, tighter than necessary and also would play out in a collaborative climbing management planning process that thanks for listening.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
True thing. Thanks. Thanks, Eric.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right. Another voice.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ready for another voice? Megan Sutton.

Megan N. Sutton
Hi, good morning and night and I'm representing the Pisgah Forest Partnership of which we have a really
diverse recreation on constituency and the rock climbers have been a part of planning for the last
decade and a part of this whole process. So I just want to provide a little bit of substantive background
which is.

Megan N. Sutton
Umm, it's really difficult pill to swallow.

Megan N. Sutton
As a recreational interest group.

Megan N. Sutton
Where you've been really engaged in the planning process to have a climbing management plan
defered and you know we kind of collectively all got our heads wrapped around that when the draft
came out in 2020. And while we didn't like that the final plan, you know the the things that you've just
heard about from these organizations about not only.

Megan N. Sutton
Umm, you know, kind of deferring that, that planning to plan, deferring that to the future to create a
climbing management plan, but then putting more restrictive guidance in place which is less supportive
of this interest has been really difficult. And so I just wanna put a fine point that the partnership is also
objecting on these issues because.

Megan N. Sutton
We have. We're not just to constituency of 1 off you know interest but we have woven together a
collaborative framework and it is reliant on meeting everyone's needs and so far this interest in
particular has.

Megan N. Sutton
And has really suffered. And so I just wanna.

Megan N. Sutton
Give that back story and kind of put a fine point on this really needed to be addressed in.

Megan N. Sutton
Going forward.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Megan. Yeah, and everything I've heard been really helpful to get get some more
understanding on on this. I appreciate that and.
So you're talking about the dates and being more flexible, monitoring based approach?

Uh.

The groups have been really engaged, but then to have the climbing management plan deferred and then to see, you know, what appears to be more restrictions in place.

So you know, thank you for that.

And so, Mike, do you have another comment?

Ohh yes that.

I'm gonna seeing this as as going at 11 standard at a time if if, if that's possible. If I could focus on the rack S 19.

I don't think we we don't have the plan in front of us, but go ahead.

Ohh OK.

Everyday.

Yeah.

But I I think our our large objective to that or objection to that was.
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)

Some.

Really similar to some of the trails is when when you use closure as a management tool, which is largely what this standard outlines when you use closure as a management tool, it's difficult for us to get our the community on board and it's also difficult to enforce that and this standard is.

Could use closure in ohh wide encompassing range throughout all of our different climbing areas throughout the forest. When you read this standard from our point of view, it puts every climbing area in jeopardy in the forest.

And and it's because of the way that the standard is worded and and and we appreciate and and part of our our mission as organizations is to protect natural or rare species and and preserve the forest as is. But the way this standard reads it, it really.

It undercuts our ability to work with our community.

I on these different areas and we have many great on the ground examples of how we do work with agencies and how we do work with with rare species impact mitigations and so on. But in order to have a proactive plan component that's going to do that, this needs to be rewarded and rephrased and and I think and that's specific. I'm just talking about this one.

From standard right now req S 19 I haven't. We haven't covered fixed anchors yet either, but I just wanted to focus on that one.

So for records standard S 19.

What? What's the word? And you'd like to say?
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
We would love for it to highlight that.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Ohm these areas.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Shouldn't be? Shouldn't be it closure as the first management tool? It should be an inventory and evaluation with the climbing community.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
It should also point specifically to the climbing management plan that within the climbing management plan, these site specific areas that if they are.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
A unique habitat that that specific area has has a plan to manage the climbing around that unique habitat instead of a widespread closure.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
I'd just like to add the the language that we provided reflects exactly what Mike just talked on. And so that's in our specific objection letter and the phrasing we would like to see and feel appropriately addresses our concerns or request 19.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Is my hand still up?

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Is my hand still up?
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)

OK, good.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)

If we can get into fixed anchors in wilderness that was one of the standards provided. So first just to as an introduction fixed anchors as it's a major climbing management tool and a major climbing management decision. Anything that's made around fixed anchors and.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)

We feel that since a climbing management plan has has come about as one of these objections of the plan is to.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)

Push on future climbing management plans that truly fixed anchors should should be a major component of the climbing management plan process.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)

And and so we would prefer to see it in the.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)

Outlined in a climbing management plan, the Sierra Sequoia National Forest, which is also under the 2020, 2012 planning rule, just created a similar standard where they had said all fixed anchors and climbing management will be focused on a site specific climbing management plan.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)

And and so that's just one example of a related forest that is is coming out with a New Forest plan that that's how they've worked with fixed anchors.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)

So.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)

One thing that came up or stands out for us within the within the fixed anchors is line officer approval.
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
That is, that was brand new to US and.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Through us for a loop a little bit.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Mainly because climbers are are used to being able to place fixed anchors on their own if that is needed, and the climbing community maintains that those fixed anchors and replaces those. In fact our our coalition has replaced a few 100 just this year and those those fixed anchors are something that people.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
That that climbers are relying their their lives too.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
So it's a. So it's a really important element, but the line officer approval item when we saw that and asked for more clarification on what a line officer approval item or approval was needed in the final environmental impact statement, the planner's response to comments were that it would be an informal review process. So if if that is the case, if if a.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Line Officer approval is needed and it is an informal review process. We would like that to be listed in the plan because otherwise it reads as if it's a neepa process or a a special permit or something along those lines.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
The other other item with the line officer approval.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
The concept is that.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Ohm are our best management strategy that we've seen for fixed anchors on a nationwide concept in both.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
And the access fund can chime in a little bit more because they have a little bit more of a national perspective on this. So I have more of a North Carolina perspective on this, but best management
strategy for fixed anchor management, especially for existing fixed anchors is program programmatic authorization for replacement of fixed anchors. So I'll give you an example of that.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Some of these anchors in Linville Gorge, for example, were placed in 1960 and people have used them and relied their life on them since 1960 and.

1:49:41.400 --> 1:49:56.530
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
We would then go in because as we know, Russ never sleeps and this is metal and the rock and people are trusting their lives to it. We would go in and replace those one for one. We pull out the old and we put in a new and the new is.

1:49:57.910 --> 1:50:6.200
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Longer lasting stainless steel, basically a a more sustainable approach to climbing or to fixed anchors.

1:50:7.700 --> 1:50:17.910
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
So for that replacement, we would like it to we would like programmatic authorization for the one to one replacement of existing fixed anchors in wilderness.

1:50:22.0 --> 1:50:23.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, let's take a breath here.

1:50:22.420 --> 1:50:24.790
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Let's take a right here, OK?

1:50:24.80 --> 1:50:25.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yep. Anything there.

1:50:26.440 --> 1:50:27.580
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So yeah, just wanted to.

1:50:28.300 --> 1:50:31.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So the programmatic authorization of replacing fixed anchors.

1:50:32.40 --> 1:50:37.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
If you put in wilderness at the end, so just in wateriness programmatic authorization and fixed anchors.
Or was that that idea broader than just ordered?

Well, the Forest plan only references fixed anchors in wilderness. It we've submitted comments since 2012 of.

Of accepted fixed anchor use in wilderness and non wilderness and differentiated between those two languages because it is different of what you can do in wilderness versus non.

And.

The non wilderness aspect was not reflected in the plan at all.

The.

I thank you. Thank thanks.

So more.

Like or not.

How do you how much more do you have? Just I'm looking at a break. A break here.

One more major topic to discuss, but I just wanna make sure that we're all resolved with the fixed anchor topic before.
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
I moved on to that.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good. Yeah, I think so. If you'd like some more specificity around the informal review process to be listed that way in the plan.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And talk about was it Colorado had a good example of how they were addressing the fixed anchors as a major component in their climbing management plan.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Sierra, Sequoia and Morris.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Here's a coil.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Yeah. More specifically, they pushed that those decisions to a climbing management plan where it could be more site specific.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. So should we take a break in here? His last point next or when we come back?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We're good with that. Or do you want to complete this?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Let's let's take a break. We've been going for a couple hours and yeah, I think would be good. Alright, so it's 1025.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We'll come back at 10:45.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, we should be live. Somebody give me a thumbs up if you can hear us.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right, great.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Are we ready to begin, folks? Yeah. And my current, I think we left off with you and there we're going back to something else on this or is fixed anchors.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Ohh thanks. Yeah, there was something else on it.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
About.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
There was a management strategy for wilderness in the plan that highlighted naturalizing and closing unauthorized climbing access routes and climbing stages, staging areas where resource damage or impacts to the wilderness characteristics were occurring. And this was a this was new language in the final plan that was not in the draft plan or in.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
It it, it wasn't open for the public comment periods, at least nothing that we could find in previous drafts. So with it not going kind of through the 2012 planning Rule planning rule. Excuse me, I'm joking.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
The 2012 planning rule we.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
We're really hoping for this to be omitted from from the plan.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
It it doesn't give us anything to work with as a climbing community, it also it is a precursor or undermines the climbing management plan as well. It is just using closure as a technique and and that is problematic for us.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
And and with the big thing, like I said, it wasn’t. It was not in the draft and it wasn’t up for public review. It was just listed in the final plan.

2:16:1.250 --> 2:16:2.870
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
Alright. Thanks Mike. So the.

2:16:5.950 --> 2:16:8.640
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
Wasn’t in, wasn’t in the earlier versions.

Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
And then whatever work was done, comments received, other other work that went on between the draft and the final that this showed up about it. You said unauthorized access paths and staging areas.

2:16:23.470 --> 2:16:27.470
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
In the management strategies, talking about the the wilderness areas.

2:16:30.850 --> 2:16:34.40
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
For think, thinking ahead or the.

2:16:35.40 --> 2:16:36.530
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
Our climbing management plan.

2:16:40.780 --> 2:16:41.270
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
Would.

2:16:42.550 --> 2:16:51.660
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
Unauthorized access points and staging areas and impacts to wilderness. I imagine that would be addressed as part of the.

2:16:52.800 --> 2:16:54.970
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
Timing management plan as well, correct.

2:17:2.540 --> 2:17:7.850
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
So try not trying to draw a line then if it if it if it eventually be addressed.

2:17:8.990 --> 2:17:12.470
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
And what is it about the plan that is worrisome?
And you mentioned you mentioned about.
The closure being the only tool.
But they.
More than that is.
It seems like it’d have to be addressed at some point.
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Ohh.
Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
This is Daniel with access fun? Yeah, I think to your point, our concern is that we want this to be addressed in a proper climbing management plan that involves the climbing community as it's currently written. This language came sort of out of nowhere for us, with no involvement through the entire planning process and is very problematic addressing things that haven't been defined previously in the plan talks about unauthorized trails when there's no authorization process. It's really a confusing statement that.

Feels a little bit scary to folks in the climate community that that places are just gonna get closed for reasons that we don't fully understand. And so we like to see is this section either fully or moved or completely rewritten to reflect what's more been discussed in this process and then leave the decisions about closure based management.

Authorizing an unauthorized and climbing staging or is leave that to the climate management plan that's much better suited there. We can actually define those things, have simply understand. Currently this is sort of that exactly we're talking about. This is interim management strategies that are detrimental to a client management plan in the future and will really undercut the client communities interest in being involved because we'll feel like the decisions already been made in the forest plan, which is gonna be
around for 20-30 years. So that's why we really see this removed is to make sure we actually get to address this at the appropriate time.

2:18:48.360 --> 2:18:56.180
Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
We have a an inventory of climbing areas, an inventory of climbing areas, understandings of the impacts that are being caused, and how we address them.

2:18:59.80 --> 2:19:1.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank. Thank you for that Daniel and and.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, just just kind of thinking out loud. Pondering would want some context.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Be helpful too, because, you know, say when when impacts are found.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
With, say, the staging areas where they access routes.

2:19:22.270 --> 2:19:25.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Would there be any any worries of addressing that?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sooner than than waiting for a climbing management plan.

2:19:32.390 --> 2:20:3.80
Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
This is Daniel again. I'm certainly, you know, we can do things in the interim. We can work collaboratively with the climate community and the Forest Service to come up with strategies around education, signage, awareness. We have a number of tools we can use to address things in the meantime, not to mention the Forest Service has all the tools for closure based management already. You don't necessarily have an express lane made in the plan. So certainly we can address some of these things in the meantime. But by having this problematic language codified from the start, it just sort of ties our hands a little bit in the strategies we think we can use.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
And really, I to Mike's point, undercuts, I feel like.

2:20:7.520 --> 2:20:10.520
Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
The partnership element from the climbing community in the Forest Service.
It's very, very helpful. Thank you, Daniel. And James, that's gonna ask if there's any.

Context you wanna supply for what? The as far as the these interim measures before the climbing management plan that's been put into the the plan revision? Yeah. Thanks, Rick.

No, I think some of this too and I guess maybe a question for you all is like.

Well, you know, obviously we understand the importance of doing that, that the, the climate management plan and and and digging in on that.

No, no, with all the with all the the climbing community and partners.

No, I'm just wondering like.

You know.

Is there some value in having certain?

Sideboards by which we're working within or or or or. I guess you know how much do we defer to that climate management plan versus are there certain things that we wanna have in the plan. I mean this in particular is a management approach. So obviously it doesn't have like the teeth of a standard, but I understand the point of feeling singled out or or you know blind sided or something. So I guess where do you all see that balance point?
Having a basic framework by which we then work within on the climbing management plan. Or do we kind of have that be the document that goes into all these issues?

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Yeah, I think if some of that were maybe clarified in the climbing management plan standard of how that was going to be.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Uh unveiled or put together?

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Ohh that there could be a good.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
That could give us a better framework for the future, but on the ground right now, you know, a lot of these things are are happening on the ground right now.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
And and they're happening by us and the climbing community working directly with district Rangers and working directory directly with other nonprofits and biologists in order to create climbing management and more sustainable climbing areas. And and that's happening right now.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
And it's happening in a in a wonderful way. But when we see something.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Wait. When something like this goes in the plan and this is all we see is is closure, closure, closure from climbers it it kills that collaborative development.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
So James, I'm not sure that I totally answered your question, but I could give a on the ground example. One thing that we do feel really strongly about that we're making great impacts on ecologically as our peregrine Falcon management and we work directly with National Forest and with.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Uh. The while while the management organization too and and we understand that there is a specific
area of and a specific timeline based on the the fledglings of the species for peregrines, and we work with biologists and we work with the climate community to make sure that we are managing that appropriately and people aren't having a negative impact on peregrine Falcons.

Specifically, and since we're working within that. Within with all those partners, in order to maintain that speech, I mean that that's something that we can also do on the ground with staging areas and trails and so on, where if there is a concern about. If there's a concern about a specific staging area or a specific climbing area or access to that, you know we can work on the ground with the Rangers that are there in order to mitigate those impacts. And we've done that. But when the plan points to and specifically this points just directly to.

Closures as the strategy it it really cuts our legs out from us and and. Especially with this specific management strategy, since as Daniel pointed out and the Forest Service has the ability to close the these areas and and we all understand that it doesn't need to be in the plan, it doesn't need to be written.

Wait, we, everybody understands that when it gets written in the plan, it it, as we said undermines a lot of the on the ground work that we're already doing.

And Jim, this is Daniel James trying to little context your question, I'm in the megans point in the
partnerships point earlier, 10 years ago when this process started, our position was not to defer these things to a client management plan in the future. That's sort of came about from the process and we had this sort of roll with that in terms of the way this plan has unfolded. That being said, we are committed to that process happening in the future and we think that there are other ways besides having these closures defined in this level of planning document.

2:25:46.880 --> 2:26:11.590
Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
20 potentially 30 year document. They just focus on the negative aspects of of closure based management that we can address. In the meantime, you've got a great partner in the CCC that is already doing amazing work on the ground. I would continue to happen and that's why we're really driving this point home that we don't want that relationship and that collaboration to be undercut by current language in the plan to have it addresses a little bit of your concern your question.

2:26:13.90 --> 2:26:15.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thanks for that. And I you know.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I hear you on that and close your base management. That's I, I'll doesn't usually work out too well for us, but so I appreciate you saying that and.

2:26:27.440 --> 2:26:32.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, sometimes you know the language of the plan and the way that it's structured.

2:26:33.520 --> 2:26:43.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It's it's hard to, you know, articulate what what you all just said about, like, real life examples of how we work together to to solve real problems. So I hear you all on that.

2:26:45.720 --> 2:26:51.540
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So can we go back to to Michael with your last point you were?

2:26:52.810 --> 2:26:56.270
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ready to wait till after break to bring up one last point? Or have you covered it?

2:27:3.800 --> 2:27:4.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Umm, we covered it. It's the IT. It was this unauthorized climbing route. Staging areas would be close.
Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
That that was the major thing. But yeah, we're we're just thrilled to be a part of the planning process and thank you. Thank you all for.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Hearing us out and we're looking forward to climate management being on the correct course on this, on this forest.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Daniel. Thank you, Michael. OK, we've got a couple other voices here.

Andrea Leslie.

Would you introduce yourself please?

OK.

Leslie, Andrea J
Yeah. So this is Ron Jacobs with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. I'm here with Andrea. I just wanted to speak a little bit regarding closures, not specifically to the the climbing stuff, but in terms of all the recreational topics that we've discussed already today and and say that the Wildlife Commission is, is supportive of a collaborative process and determining how to address, you know, user created issues. But we're also supportive.

Of the four service in service, using closures as a management tool of direct to address.

UM, use your created issues to to resource resources and we realize that some, sometimes those things are immediate need to be addressed immediately and closures do allow allow the Forest Service to do that and in some cases those are temporary and other cases they may be permanent. But.

Ohm. Ohh. While we're not completely.
Leslie, Andrea J
And do not support the the, the, the, the some of the language and in the plan that we're we are supportive of the a lot of the language in the plan realize that there is opportunity to in some places to adjust a lot of the languages as James has mentioned we didn't wanna call out as Mr Holzhauser mentioned earlier that you know while we support flexibility of management.

Leslie, Andrea J
We we just want to encourage the four service not to get in a situation where we're encouraging more user created resource issues. And so that's a really big sticking point for us, whether we're talking about climbing, we're talking about user created trails and that kind of thing. So thank you for letting us be a part of the discussion.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks Ron. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So back to Mike.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Yeah. I I I just wanted to say in response to that that you know we have been supportive of of closures and I'll I'll give an example again of the peregrine closures.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
That we've been supportive of of that closure of that seasonal closure, some of the language I think we're gonna hit that on Thursday, surrounding peregrines and enclosures with that, but.

Mike Reardon Carolina Climbers (Guest)
Umm. What? What we're hoping for is more specificity and and also language that supports site specific and more evaluation of different areas instead of widespread closures specific to to wildlife or ecological concerns.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, and.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, I looked up. Are you talking specifically about Rec S 19?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Because I think.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That's where I just wanna check because I think we're maybe talking about the same thing you talked about site specific and the need and a further look. So the under that B part, it's where the existing routes are in impacting unique habitats.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh or heritage program eligible one evaluated or sacred cultural sites. Climbing routes shall be closed. So let's talk about when there's impacts. Things will be closed.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And what you're talking about is when we do that, make sure we do it in a collaborative way and you could help a lot with education and maybe some other avenues before we have to get the closure when those impacts are occurring.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
This is Daniel here again.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is that tracking?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
So what you somewhat you know, I think our main concern here is that this, you know, out of context, this language is a little hard to interpret and it has a number of things like unevaluated sites. And what does that mean? What are these? You know, just what are the concerns and sort of more elaboration and what that point is being made. And I think these are these are better addressed in a holistic climbing management plan. Certainly we can do things in the meantime if we see their impacts on the ground, we can address them.
Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
But this language all by itself is sort of that interim management strategy is problematic because it just it, it's just not enough clarification. It's not clear that you understand where climbing routes are even located just yet. There's a lot of groundwork that needs to go into place before these kind of decisions are being made, and that's the main concern I wanna bring up. And then to the point that was made by gentleman earlier climbers, we're not anti closure. We understand when things need to be closed for cultural concerns, resource concerns, species concerns. We have supported that across the country. And Mike and North Carolina done a great job with his organization doing that.

Daniel Dunn (Access Fund) (Guest)
We just want to make sure that there's a full understanding of partnership there and there is actual modern science is being used behind it. Some of the language has been used in this plan does not reflect the current literature for Raptor management specifically. We'll talk about it on Thursday. But even for this, for Rec 19, it's just the language is vague and it feels like there's a lot more homework that needs to be done on actually understanding climbers is a rec user group through climbing management plan and then what the best strategy would actually be to manage as impacts.

Very good. Thank you. That that helped round that help from your appreciate that Dana.

All right. Any other voices on rock climbing that we haven't heard?

All right, very rich discussion, ready to move.

To the last.

Sub topic here on sustainable recreation.

Yes, sustainable recreation.
And the.

Suggested resolutions.

Objectors suggested remedy is to include all of their points raised in the draft plan comments and the final plan to more fully ensure sustainable recreation opportunities for five million annual visitors.

Also, uh, bring each pair in the final plan into alignment with the partnerships comments on the draft plan.

So I think would be helpful is helping me understand what's missing in the Forest Plan language and what you're most concerned about as it relates to sustainable recreation.

Hi there.

That's me.

So who got Megan?

Yeah. So again, Megan Sutton, representing the vanilla Pisgah Forest partnership.

Part of our objection is about.
Integrating sustainable recreation.

And I want to explain kind of what I mean by that so.

They're sustainable recreation that the agency has kind of.

Defined what means sustainable and they're components that go with that with those recreation. But there's also integration across the whole plan.

Because these forests are so heavily visited, as so many of you all know, they're well aware of the plan. Components around recreation and sustainable recreation really need to be integrated in a way, and these are some of the topics that we're gonna be talking about throughout. But throughout, like management area, allocations, designations, having management side boards.

And really, having sustainable approaches to all the recreation. So we're really looking for ways to decrease conflict.

To have fewer conflicts during implementation of projects, and that's between stakeholders between user groups, between user groups and the Forest Service, and between visitors and the natural resources. And I think that's, you know, we've just heard specifically about some of those related to rock climbing.

I think what we're suggesting is that we would like for recreation to be considered throughout and not
just kind of as this kind of standalone like here's where we talk about recreation because people are a part of these forests in every way. And so you've heard.

2:36:6.550 --> 2:36:36.280
Megan N. Sutton
As we've spoken this morning, you've heard some examples of how collaborative trail planning could work within project design. How can projects, when they're being designed, also consider user related impacts to recreationists? How can we bring in education and resources before we're making decisions about closure orders? I think those are all great examples, but I think just to put a fine point on the fact that we can't silo.

2:36:36.770 --> 2:36:48.90
Megan N. Sutton
Sustainable recreation and sort of just talk about it in this one place and we really need to be thoughtful about how we do it and what the you know, we pointed out some specific.

2:36:48.830 --> 2:36:57.900
Megan N. Sutton
Umm, things within our partnership? Objection that we've talked about mostly today, one that we have yet to cover is related to paddling.

2:36:59.560 --> 2:37:17.680
Megan N. Sutton
And talking about the impacts of paddling in the plan, which I know will, I think we'll get into when we're talking about wild and scenic rivers, so that's an allocation and a designation that really impacts recreation heavily, right? While and scenic rivers. So I just the purpose is to point out.

2:37:18.740 --> 2:37:38.450
Megan N. Sutton
The the need for integration throughout versus siloed and really considering the recreational user standpoint, user interest and how we can ameliorate conflict in the plan as we're going forward. And I don't know if you have more specific questions, but that's what our intention was.

2:37:42.60 --> 2:37:45.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, so far as what that would look like in the plan.

2:37:46.170 --> 2:37:55.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is that suggesting not having a recreation session section, but having everything throughout or or the paint a picture for me?

2:37:56.530 --> 2:38:5.950
Megan N. Sutton
Sure. No, absolutely not. No, it's not taking out the recreation section because clearly there's tons of critical things that need to be addressed directly with that. I think it's.
Megan N. Sutton
More inclusive in other sections of thinking about how would recreational users be impacted?

Megan N. Sutton
As in these other sections.

Megan N. Sutton
Umm. And you know, I think wild and scenic rivers is a.

Megan N. Sutton
There's a prime candidate you know, because clearly that has recreational user impacts, whether you're on, you know, a Fisher person or you're a paddler, or you're a hiker. And through those areas. And so just thinking about different ways that we can incorporate those ideas. And and again, I can get into more specifics. I think when we're talking about the wild and scenic rivers.

Megan N. Sutton
But that's what I would offer is to just the more consideration throughout about the as you've heard today, you know different ways to incorporate.

Megan N. Sutton
On recreational users.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And just to maybe round that out.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is that a?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is that a?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
A major.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The major flaw, something that'll just help with implementation, is it get it? Is it getting ahead of some things in a in a purposeful strategic way, you know, kind of, you know, this the the context of.
If the plan is as it is, is it gonna unravel?

The way it is in cause harm and damage is it? Is it a? Yeah, just what what's the?

We're playing it forward as is versus the changes. What? What? What? Tell me a little bit more about that.

I really appreciate that question. I think it's a very thoughtful one.

So.

You know.

The Nanny Hill Episcopal first partnership has our gold. Our primary goal is to reduce conflict and to figure out ways that we can work together and collaborate to be more successful with you all. And you know, kind of have this resilient, thriving for us that we can all visit. And so.

I think that what we are suggesting is not necessarily. I wouldn't call it a major flaw. I think it makes a good plan and takes it to a great plan in terms of figuring out ways to address.

Conflict substantively in the plan.

Will help seed you know and and give direction to current and future line officers in terms of how they operate and how they are kind of expected to bring in collaborative components no matter whatever it is that they may be doing.

And so I think that it's really trying to go from good to great.
And I think. We'll also.


And, you know reduce, you know, assumptions that then lead to conflict. Like for example I think it's what they what Mike and Daniel have said is really great like.

It's not necessarily your intent not to collaborate on climbing management, right. However, the words that are written on the paper look like it precludes that.

Umm so I the idea is to really be thoughtful about incorporating recreation really across the board and how to end incorporate users and their feedback throughout implementation.

Nobody will be able to read my writing other than me, but be thoughtful to incorporate recreation and users across the board throughout implementations. So that's.
Thank you, Megan. That was very helpful to to to flesh that out a little bit, I appreciate that.

And Deirdre, on that point.

Yep, this is Deirdre with the Backcountry horsemen. I had an an example that might help to flesh that out.

OK.

We often hear when we are engaged in a project, say 12 mile project.

That recreation is not part of the wheelhouse of this particular project, however. Recreation often is impacted by these projects, and if we can be a help to the project to help guide the project, to not interfere, or possibly make recreation better without changing the the scope of the project that it it, as Megan said.

It would make the project more effective, efficient and it would help to not so alienate the recreation community. That's just the Backcountry. Horseman has had several examples of that happen throughout the southeast on different forests where projects impacted recreation and I just wanted to maybe, you know, give you that word picture to see if that might help.

Very good. Thank you. Deidrick is, yeah, when you said that, you know, made me think of a lot of things of.

You talk about.

Kind of strategically baking that right in from the beginning rather than just assessing the impacts of it. So it's part of the.
But.

So everything we've gotta think about which is sometimes is.

You know an Infinity of dimensions, but.

Uh, we talk about our desired future condition for a project. That recreation is you're involved in that end of describing the ends so we can build in to the planning the project.

The recreation component, rather than propose a project and then.

Disclose the effects of.

Have it on recreation.

Yeah, I I believe that you're recreation folks are probably going to understand the effects of it.

Better than the folks that are coming in on the project could possibly, as we're we're in the field and and being users we we would know the impact to the recreation whereas you would know that impact to the environment, to the habitat etcetera. But but please don't discount the the fact that recreationists are out there and very vocal when when something happens that impacts their recreation.

They can. They can be very loud, about about their displeasure if they're involved in the beginning.
Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
You are gonna be. You're gonna be building your team for this project with, with advocates versus
adversaries. And so, you know, we want to help the forest be as efficient and productive with their
projects as we can. And we think and and back country horsemen believes that that's a great way to do it.

Very good. I appreciate that and thank you.

Not this.

Megan and Deirdre and and others one of the.

One of the things that I think we're always trying to weigh is.

You know when you're looking at a particular.

Chunk of the forest that you're going to do a project in.

You know, one of the things that we're always trying to weigh is.

Do we? What's the scope that we're gonna do the analysis for? Do we do we incorporate every thing
because we know it's all interrelated and then we get into well by the time we capture everything in the
project?

You know, we'll never, you know, we might might not be able to to, to move forward and and keep the
more narrowly focused.
I mean, of course, making sure every folks are that are interested in that particular area are engaged. But I guess any thoughts on on that balance of?

2:46:54.410 --> 2:47:4.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, focusing the scope in order to move forward on, on, on things versus trying to corporate, everything that that might happen on a particular part of the forest.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Megan.

Megan N. Sutton
Thanks for bringing that up, James. I'm and I, I totally understand exactly what you're asking.

Megan N. Sutton
So I think.

Megan N. Sutton
This request is.

Megan N. Sutton
Somewhere in between what you've just described. So I think that there's kind of, you know, if there's a spectrum.

Megan N. Sutton
So there's.

Megan N. Sutton
If here's the project area that we've defined.

2:47:32.740 --> 2:47:44.540
Megan N. Sutton
So there's one opportunity to say, OK, we're putting our arms around everything that needs to happen in this project area that could possibly that includes AOP's and trails and this and that and the other and you know, veggie management and all the things.

2:47:45.290 --> 2:47:45.790
Megan N. Sutton
And.
Well, I think. From some people's perspective, that would be ideal.

Umm is to do it that way, but we recognize that that can't always be done right for a myriad of reasons. Resources the way that you're lining up work, how much you know staffing in that kind of thing, I think the request is that.

Let's say you put your arm around this and you say, OK, for this we're only doing. We're only talking about.

Umm, burning are only talking about veg management or OP or whatever.

If that is the case, it's also drawing in the ideas around recreation. It's not necessarily. Well, yes it would. It would be great if we could see if all interest could see their interest in every project. We recognize that that's not always possible and when it's not possible wanting to understand, you know, I think, Rick what you said, which is not just the impact.

Here's the impact on the recreationist, but here's the recreational viewpoint.

A rub about this work, you know, so here's the recreational viewpoint about AOP's this particular these, you know, 10 AOP that are proposed and how that's gonna.

Kind of more broadly, what are ways that we can do to still just if if the scope needs to be narrow, how can we also include sustainable recreation as a part of that?

Even if it's not able to be included as a part of the body of the work.
Megan N. Sutton
Which I know is kind of tricky, right? It's not like it's a. That's a kind of a delicate dance.

Megan N. Sutton
But thanks for asking that.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Julie White
Uh, yes. So I think that one of the things that you should be looking at James's in you're already doing it, you've got with the with the various partnerships who are looking ahead towards implementation. There are like project teams.

Julie White
And you know, it's it's kind of on us as recreationists to make sure we have representation on those teams and we're working towards that because that seems to be, you know, when you're in the pre scoping phase is where we need to be involved. So I think if you continue working with you know various project teams and make sure we're encourage recreational participation in that, that's a good starting point.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good. Thank you, Julie.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Jason, I see your hand up.

30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
Ohh yeah, it's Dale Wiggins again.

30af8f79-5278-460b-aa75-c5c3634dfb4a
One thing as as far as sustainability of all all these different recreation categories, you know, Graham County is a little unique.
About 23% of the Nano Highland National Forest is in our borders, where we're almost 70% US Forest Service land. So we need the economic benefit that we can get from those lands in the form of recreation and other forms too. And I don't think that the plan.

Going forward, recognizes future use levels and.

We really need to see, at least in Graham County long term planning to to deal with these future increases and and we have seen our room occupancy tax collection over the last decade. It has increased by about 130% and and I think that demonstrates how many more people are coming into this county and how many more of those people are are looking to that National Forest for their recreation needs during the tourist seasons.

So I think it's critical that at this before this plan is implemented that that at least some language be included that will cause the force overs to to plan on amenities and and additions to to deal with the future use of the forest. We're a smoky Mountains National Park border county. So we're we're getting the overflow, we we market.

The forest lands very heavily through our travel and tourism office, and we're seeing the results of that, but we are lacking amenities to accommodate all these people, so that would be our ask on recreation and sustainability, you know, going forward to do some long term planning and work with us on the local level to implement those things. Thank you.

And just to just to check in. Thank you, Dale is?

Do you see anything about the?

Revised towards plan that would prevent that from occurring that long term planning.

They all did you hear the question?
I'm sorry, Sir. I didn't hear the first part of your question.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Yeah, it was. Do you see anything in the the revised Force plan that would prevent?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

That long term planning from occurring.

Well, I don't see anything specifically.

But.

Add a really.

Don't recall seeing.

Something that I would consider a long term goal or long term plan.

Uh, and it may be there. Uh, and I may not be understanding it as I read it, but.

You know, I just wanna make sure that that some language is in there to to not only encourage that, but to work towards the implementation of it as well.

Thank you.
Thank you. Do.

You know.

So.

Umm, anything more on sustainable recreation? We're gonna check with the format.

But anything that tells from you at this point? No. OK, so we.

We've talked about sustainable recreation that completes the topics we had in mind to talk about. We still have time on the agenda. So we wanna open this up for you to bring up any other recreation related.

Objections that you might have.

But before we do that, I want to just call out the people on the phone and see if you have anything you wanna offer before we move in that direction.

So phone callers speak up.

If you have something to say.

OK.

Wanna put your hand down? Probably. It's probably still up for me for. So let's just open the Florida. Other issues we haven't talked about that you would like to address Rick on.

Is there anything recreation related?

Yes, Sam.

Hey there, Sam, I'm speaking for the Southern Criminal Law Center and the other objectors on our written objection.

Uh, yeah, I think, you know, there were a number of objection issues that we had to cover. We did not raise specifically the failure of the Forest Service to to programmatically analyze and to create a decision framework around special uses in the objection. I think at that point, we're basically responding to what we saw in the plan and not what it not as much. What we didn't see in the plan, that is something that we've raised throughout the process, I think.

We feel like the plan does a not great job of anticipating and planning for special use permit requests in the future. We you know, everyone is aware that special use permit requests are increasing and will continue to increase and and that recreation pressures for a lot of the reasons we discussed already today you know are going to put a lot of pressure on forest resources and those pressures are uneven. In some places they are straining ecological and social sustainability.

And when we know that responding to those special use permits is a is a big drain on the on the forests resources, you know that that it takes a lot of energy, analytical energy and sort of logistical energy. The to do that. And it takes energy away from other work.
So what we've suggested along the way is that the plan should have a programmatic framework for a special use permits. You know, we think that the plan should identify types and levels and areas for special uses, probably by the GA scale, where those uses are expected to have no more significant impact than ordinary noncommercial use. I think that could give a lot of guidance to permittees.

Uh, you know, perspective permittees about where and what they can ask for and expect easier approval and and it will tell them where they might have a higher bar to justify sort of what you know, what would be additional impact to an already stressed area.

Even when you know whether or not we have this framework in the plan, we expect the pace of permit requests to keep going up.

What we have seen lately is that that pace has resulted in pressure to take shortcuts.

You know to use CE or to not scope.

Uh, see, but a permit requests appropriately and missing issues that the public could have helped.

You know from my perspective, that's what we would like to avoid in the future and we think that this sort of a programmatic framework would help to not only streamline permit requests for the agency and the PERMITTEES, but also help avoid some of those kinds of missed impacts because we would, you know, we would projects would be binned by their potential for unusual effects we would pre.

Umm, you know, so say on front end.

What? What projects are gonna have the kind of minimal impacts that it can move forward in a more streamlined way? So yeah, I think.
Sam Evans

Again, you know this is something that we believe and it won't surprise you that to hear that we think that the this plan is going to need to go back to the forests for another look for a variety of reasons. And when it does, we'd like to see this be on the table.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

I think.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Especially this framework.

Yeah. Thanks for that, Sam. I I think we've talked about.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

I yeah, I think we have more outfitter and guides than any force in the country, so obviously, yeah, we definitely see that.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Umm, that workload and request, I mean part of that is just.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Umm, you know what we're doing intentionally in terms of increasing our capacity so that we're we're better able to to, to intake and then I think there's some other things we can be doing.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

You know in terms of?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

As we've seen with some some recent examples, where as we do that intake, we can.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Make it easier, like here's kind of an easier path that someone can go down, and if and if you if you wanna do it on certain areas, well, that's gonna have to take take some a harder look. So I think there's some things we can do around that, but I appreciate that was definitely.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Definitely something that we're mindful of and and how do we?
You know, big part of that is simply having the staff capacity to so that we're not just kind of putting holes in the **** kind of thing. So, but I appreciate that.

Yeah, Sam to some level, we have direct some amount of direction in our Forest Service handbook. And.

That has different.

The different levels of involvement that we have to do and you know parsing out the complexity of the special uses.

Is knowing that we have some amount of that in our handbook already.

Does that? Does that influence your thoughts on what should be in the plan versus what's already in our core service handbook?

Thanks. Thanks for that question. Yeah, I think what I'm describing more is a programmatic application of that direction.

Rather than sort of a case by case application in a way that makes it quick both quicker and more environmentally protective in the long term. And I think in other discussion that we've had a number of times is the potential for this to spread use out into places that could benefit more from it economically like our far Western counties and and perhaps.
Make it a you know, in a more environmentally protected for for the counties that are already a little stressed by for by overuse.

3:1:42.850 --> 3:1:43.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

3:1:44.360 --> 3:1:46.270
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So. So let's hear from Nicole.

3:1:52.120 --> 3:2:19.770
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Good morning. This is Nicole Haller with issue, too, Conservancy. I just wanted to follow up and support Sam's comments by citing a specific example that we just experienced in the strategy watershed regarding the special use permit that was going down the pipelines with no scoping. James I know you participated in the call about the recent controversy with the Ultra Marathon race that was proposed for the three.

3:2:19.930 --> 3:2:41.0
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Ranger districts in the Chattooga watershed and I wanted to make you aware that I have a standing request out now to the Andrew Pickens Ranger District to coordinate with all three national forests and specifically the range of districts in this to the watershed regarding special uses, specifically within the Wild and Scenic River Corridor to.

3:2:42.350 --> 3:2:51.590
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Uh, nail down how we're going to preserve the RV's that are associated with the different segments inside the wild and Scenic River Corridor, which is I think, a special case.

3:2:52.290 --> 3:3:22.400
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Umm, that all three national forests need to collaborate on actively and inventory. What special use permits are out there? What they're for, what the carrying capacities are for the different areas inside the wild and Scenic River corridor to preserve the RV's and also to collaborate with the known pressures from private use in there which we think should be emphasized inside the river corridor consistent with the wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

3:3:30.840 --> 3:3:40.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Nicole for providing that answer. Is that talk about the Ultramarathon the three Ranger Districts watershed, how to preserve the outstanding resource values and collaborate with the known private uses?

3:3:41.980 --> 3:3:43.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That don't miss anything with that.
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
And well, that pretty much sums it up, Rick.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Uh, and we're, you know, just obviously concerned about the escalation of commercial special use permits inside the wild sync inside the wild and Scenic River corridor.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Umm. And we need to get a handle on it because there's already.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Arguably too much commercial use inside the river corridor.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Something up good. Yeah, alright. Thank you. Great. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How about you, Deirdre?

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Yeah, I echo what Sam and Nicole have said and just wanna reiterate, this went back-to-back country horsemen's objection about the the special use permits and to to build in some way to monitor.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
On the four service.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Says that a holder shall be liable for any damage or cost connected with rehab or restoration as a direct result of their use, but there is no there is no current way for the four service to understand what that to monitor those.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Those uses and we just felt that that was something that even if you you don't have the capacity to do it, you can empower your volunteers to help you and build the parameters to go and look at the resource impacts so that you have a better knowledge about what what they are.

Deirdre Perot, Back Country Horsmen (Guest)
Thank you.
Thank you, Deidre.

So so.

Nicole, did you have something else? Your hands still up?

No. OK.

Alright, so other.

OK. Just on that I just want to mention that.

I appreciate your bringing up the special uses and guides. It's something that.

I feel very I think it's such an important part of what we do.

And we've we don't always get the ability to have the staff capacity to do it just as I think when done well it's a way that is bringing in economic.

Some potential, like as Sam said, finding ways to provide opportunities in places that might not be able to. To see that as much. And then Nicole, to your point, how do we manage that, especially in special places in the appropriate ways to reduce impacts. So I appreciate you bringing up because it's something that we are intentionally trying to make sure that we're bringing on the staff to look at that. And I think there's other ways.

You know, not this going to solve all of that, but there's other ways in terms of, you know, we've talked to some of the other forests in kind of the southern apps around kind of intake seasons, so that we have
a better sense of when they're coming in. We can see them all the applications at the same time instead of kind of whenever someone sends it in kind of a thing. So I think there's ways that I guess I'd say.

3:7:10.200 --> 3:7:37.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We definitely see this as something that we we're we're trying to improve on and I think it done well. It's a way for people to interact with the forest, but that may not be able to other ways, right. It's a way to introduce them to a forest in a safe way that folks might not just wanna go out with their map and start hiking. So we see it as a really critical component of our work, to engage the public and provide those opportunities. So appreciate you all bringing up that issue.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And Nicole, back on James's point.

3:7:45.410 --> 3:7:46.990
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Yeah, I just had a.

3:7:47.980 --> 3:7:57.270
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
A quick question I guess and also follow up well, maybe I'll start with this statement. One thing that prompted our.

3:7:59.490 --> 3:7:59.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good.

3:7:58.540 --> 3:8:9.90
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Written request to Andrew Pickens, Ranger District, regarding commercial special uses inside the the River Corridor was that we just fielded a scoping notice that was.

3:8:10.280 --> 3:8:23.270
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Proposing to give a temporary special use permit to two Outfitters that have been running, basically what we call pirate trips. You know, pirate outfitting and guiding and.

3:8:25.390 --> 3:8:41.480
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
I'm don't know whether you're looking at that in the forest now in the nantahala about a methodology for fielding these requests and and essentially wedding out people that have a track record of already flagrantly.

3:8:42.720 --> 3:8:56.680
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Size stepping the procedures that are in place, and if not, I would suggest that an inventory of those
folks you know to, you know, note that in any kind of upcoming special use commercial application needs to be you know established.

3:9:0.200 --> 3:9:1.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then your question.

3:9:2.130 --> 3:9:3.20
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
A.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
I guess that's really not a question, it's just a further elaboration on.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
More attention to this this issue.

3:9:15.410 --> 3:9:17.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thanks to Cole and I, I made a note of that to.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Follow up on that the pirate.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Guiding and the proposal to permit those.

3:9:28.80 --> 3:9:38.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, we have about a 20 minutes left in this segment. If we need it. Are there other recreation issues that anyone wants to bring forward?

3:9:45.700 --> 3:9:49.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Any closing comments on the recreation issue before we break?

3:9:50.910 --> 3:10:15.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You two didn't get anything? No, it just appreciate the the the dialogue this morning and we we know how important recreation is on an antelope piska and important how it is important Dale and everyone from Graham County appreciate you all being on and I think you speak for a lot of the counties in Western North Carolina as well that they're facing similar opportunities and challenges. So thanks.

3:10:16.360 --> 3:10:30.380
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. For me, I just want to say thank you. This is very helpful and thanks for being patient with me, taking the time to answer my questions. And and for me to take take some notes while I'm doing that and very helpful really appreciate.

3:10:31.870 --> 3:10:56.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Just your your time and and understanding and also what? What rings true through through the questions and through what you had to offer is just a high degree of care of this very, very special place that that we all we all have a stake in and an interest in. So thank you. Thank you very much and looking forward-looking forward to the afternoon.

3:10:57.620 --> 3:11:6.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And to continue to work, work through these concerns and objections and and here hear what you have to say. So thank you so much.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So we will.

3:11:12.390 --> 3:11:12.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Great.

3:11:13.170 --> 3:11:15.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
He ohh yes we can.

e1de695f-89ca-4652-8b44-f9ddb9c5a0b7
Nancy and Ken this, this is Mike Fisher with Carolina Mountain Club. Can you hear me now? I've tried to speak a few moments ago and I think I did not have the phone unmuted. Hello.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, great. We are you now.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

e1de695f-89ca-4652-8b44-f9ddb9c5a0b7
OK, good. I the star 6, I forgot to do that. I pressed the mute button unmute button but that yeah I have a procedural question. Our discussion earlier regarding multi use trails as well as subsequent discussions are very substantial discussions back and forth when the climbing management plan they involve what will be we anticipate would be substantial changes in the text and in our case a replacement or a.
Correction of an omission of treatment and the procedural question is we don't want to see this plan go back through a reproposal to allow public comment on additions to the plan in the way that we have described or the way that the climbing community was describing. But what will be the process going forward for this not to become something simply where the Forest Service comes out with the Fiat set of statements about here or how we have addressed these matters and and not then expecting whether it's Carolina mountains.

Stop or the climate community to come back to a formal suit process to try to address what could still be issues or errors from a technical standpoint, in how the plan is going forward.

OK. Yeah and.

Difficult to answer just based on the recreation section today because we've got the other days to move through as well.

And so for everything that we've got before us and the conversations we have, the sum total of that we've got to work through and there's some amount of like mentioned earlier here the you know the legal policy, all of that is there, there's an evaluation of that. So depending on what.

What the objections are what the determinations are from our review will determine what we've gotta do.

Right. And so so so for if there's a clarification then that wouldn't would not involve going all the way back and redoing the plan if there's something something different than that. So depending on what what the objection is, what the, the, the, the thing before us is what we've got to do, how we've got to deal with it and it's a lot to sort through and there's a lot to go through and we've got a team of people that's gonna help advise me on the specialist reports.

On the evaluation of the plan, the all the all the different pieces that we've got to work through. So what you'll see is going some of it's gonna look fairly bureaucratic. You know it's gonna this this says this.
The law, whatever the policy says this, but woven in that too, is we're trying to find ways to be responsive to your concerns as well. So there's the, there's the very technical side of it. Then there's also listening and hearing is that's what we do. We navigate the bureaucracy to find solutions that are legal and lawful and smart and science based to follow. And that's what we've all got a background in it. We've all got experience in it.

And we have you all of you, to help us, you know, figure that out so.

I can't answer your question definitively because we've only heard you know this part in the morning.

And it will be the sum total in total that we've got to look at across all the objections across all the the reviews that we've gotta do before we'll know what has to happen and what instructions that I might be giving James. So hopefully that helps.

But it's not. It's maybe not the yes or no answer you're looking for, but that's the answer, Michael. Michael, any follow up?

Well, I yeah, I do brief follow-up. Yes, I appreciate that and that's fully understand you can't, as you said give a definitive answer on something like this now and you will have to look at the totality over the remaining 2 1/2 days. So there is a lot and it's because precisely there is a lot that I'm concerned and just wondering and and not expecting again a definitive answer now, but what would be the character of further dialogue that you may have with?

The participating parties in this process, the stakeholders to prevent their being a situation, as I said earlier where you issue some things. In our case fixing an omission. And we looked at and said well, wait a minute, you still didn't address really what our public comment was and that's I'm done. I'm not asking for an answer now, but just knowing having you know that that is our concern. I don't know whether my career didn't and crew would feel the same way regarding the climbing community and some of the discussion there, but is absolutely is a concern that we will have going forward in terms of how our.
How our objection is addressed and then coming back to the components of our original public comment that we feel we're sort of ignored in terms of what came out as the response to comments and their the Land Management plan. So that's that is a concern that we have going forward then that's I don't think we need to have further dialogue on that other than to know that that is a material concern of ours at this stage.

Yeah, I appreciate that because sometimes it's.

You know, difference in maybe understanding and expectation of what the plan is and what it does.

So and we faced that internally over the years, I've seen where you know our own planning teams will want certain things in, in a plan. You know our own folks like we gotta get this in the plan and there's some discussion about whether that belongs in the plan or it doesn't belong in the plan. And we've got a tease through all of that. So sometimes it's an understanding of.

You know what, what the plan is, what the plan does. And then again, we've got people that are working through.

Working through that and consulting with others to make sure we we put our best foot forward and have have the the plan meet you know what it's supposed to meet. So some of it might be you know a difference in definition of what the plan is and what the plan does where.

You know, we know that say whatever the concern is, uh, that can be, you know that that's that's going to happen and we've we've covered it in the plan but somebody else may say well I wanted this in there as well to make sure that happens and we've got to work through what work through all of that that's on if that's helpful or not or raises more questions but.
Just, you know, being trying to be, you know, realistic about it. That's that's all the there's the the legal side of it that we've got to go through and the policy side. But then there's also sometimes.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It is some things are covered, but maybe not exactly the wording that people would like to see. And then that's what we've gotta say is well, you know, can we include some of that wording or or not? Is it already covered. So Mike on this same point, can I can I just.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Just just to add.

3:18:27.850 --> 3:18:38.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, ultimately, the this objection that we're in right now is the forum for hearing those concerns that were you all provided written.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Just in terms of the steps in the process, there's not gonna be a comeback where we say did what Rick gave me an instructions meet all your needs. That's just not part of the process. So you know as always, we try to be as clear as we can about if we if we didn't land exactly where you would like us to be at least understanding our reasoning behind that. But I just want to make clear there isn't like a second objection.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hearing or or anything like that before we we we sign the the the final plan. You know what we've captured in the written and that all that analysis that Rick talked about and the conversations today what will ultimately result in specific instructions that Rick with the consultation with all the folks that are doing that review will provide to me and our team on the forest level to make specific changes or consider things.

3:19:39.780 --> 3:19:42.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. I just want to make clear where it's not going to be a.

3:19:42.960 --> 3:19:48.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Another round of back and forth dialogue necessarily like like today.

3:19:49.280 --> 3:19:51.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good clarification. Yeah. Thanks, Jane.
Understood. And that I think is what I was saying that you know, we’re not expecting that the plan wouldn’t affect be reproposed or segments of the plan be reproposed. But at the same time, you have the obligation by law underneath and APA to to respond substantively to the substantive comments and discussions that have occurred in the public comment process and presumably as a matter of the objection and the discussions today as well.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right. Yeah. So all the, you know, when we get those instructions and and and responding to these objections that will be part of the record. So you all can see the reasoning and how we how those were considered.

3:20:32.940 --> 3:20:36.900
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, Sam Evans and then we'll ease ease into a lunch, I think.

3:20:38.610 --> 3:20:57.30
Sam Evans
Yeah, I'd like to offer one clarification to to that the you know, I think there's certainly a quantum of change that y'all can do through the objection process. But and this is perhaps a topic best left for tomorrow, but there are some sort of an analytical changes that if you fixed the plan.

Sam Evans
It well enough to comply with me will be required. We, you know.

Sam Evans
Yeah.

Sam Evans
Uh, allowing public comment on it on a supplemental EIS. So I think that that, you know, I would, I would hope that you have not prejudged whether that is is going to be necessary.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ohh no, no, that that's what it says. We gotta hear the.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Go through the sum total of everything to make determinations on what's what's needed.

Sam Evans
Thanks.
Right now that the universe is available for what may happen next.

Or in another hand up, Mike.

You're on mute.

Keep doing that. Ohh I was curious to hear about the process of how the forest plans to.

Umm.

Train the Forest Rangers or or the Rangers on the ground on some of the new aspects of the plan and what the what? The kind of implementation looks like in the rollout of that of of the new plan once it's finalized.

Yeah. And and James risen detail on that. But that's always something that is the the team that's working on the plan is always thinking about.

That those next steps and part part each, each forest plan revision that I've been involved in, there's a an aspect of that, that training and delivery and then continued work with the the specialist that are out there on the districts as well as the line officers.

Anything to add, James? Yeah. And, you know, we've talked a lot about.

Part of socializing that new clan you know both internally and externally. So we've talked about.

You know, kind of practicing the plan, taking a a real life project and kind of working through and we've done some of that with some of the earlier drafts, like, what would this look like if we were using the
new plan and kind of use real life examples? So I think that's where I think it helps to make it real for folks and how that looks and what did that look like is, as you all know, one of the driving factors in the old plan is that we have a whole lot of different management areas that can be kind of confusing to.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Keep track of and so we tried to simplify some of that. So our hope is is that some of the on the ground implementation will be a little more straightforward. We're also thinking about ways that we can again use some ways to.

3:23:34.20 --> 3:24:3.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Automate some of that so that you know if I draw this is my dream. If I draw a line on a GIS of a project area that relevant planning components pop up and so it's like, oh hey, we're in a wilderness and scenic river and we're in the bad. And just so y'all know, Sam and Nicole, I'm hoping we could also, wouldn't it be cool if we could do that on the front end for a special use thing, right? Like, hey, draw where you want to do it. Hey, wait a minute. You're in a while and scenic river. Just a heads up.

3:24:3.200 --> 3:24:10.990
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You might wanna. So anyway there there's a lot of cool things we could do in the future to kind of make it easier on our folks that we're not.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know my, my what? I don't want to do is have our nipa folks like cutting and pasting, right? Like Ohh, let me. Let me dig through the paper copy of the plan. Like we we we have tools that can make it a lot easier to implement. And we're thinking about how to do that.

3:24:30.550 --> 3:24:32.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good question. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So we're we are at a time for break. Do you have anything else to close this out on recreation?

3:24:42.380 --> 3:24:51.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, but I'm glad the last caller figured out. Started six. That looks like good, good discussion. We got into. Thank you, Michael.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right. Thank you again for for all of your attention this morning and we will take an hour break for lunch, return at 1:00 PM and will focus the afternoon starting with an hour on national scenic areas and the back country.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For the first hour.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right. Thank you again.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hi. Hi folks who are back on the line. Many of you were with us this morning. Is there anybody who's with us now that wasn't with us this morning? Wants to do a sound check.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How about you will?

4:28:43.390 --> 4:28:45.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Even can we make sure we hear you?

4:28:47.220 --> 4:28:47.540
Will Harlan
Sorry.

4:28:46.320 --> 4:28:50.100
Will Harlan
Take your take your mute off. Hello, everyone. Bill Harlan.

4:28:49.670 --> 4:28:50.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There you go. Thanks.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. Anybody else wanna make sure we can hear you?

Michael Numinous (Guest)
Hey there, I'm Michael Newman, us just joining in for this part of the meeting.

4:28:59.510 --> 4:29:0.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right, great.

4:29:2.610 --> 4:29:2.940
Michael Numinous (Guest)
Hello.
Terri Wells
Hello, Terry, Wellsburg, County commissioner.

Michael Numinous (Guest)
Aye.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS 8.

rob lenfestey
This is Rob Lenfestey can hear me just fine.

rob lenfestey
Thank you.

Steven McBride
That's right.

Kim Porter (Guest)
Porter.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Say that again, I missed you.

Kim Porter (Guest)
This is Kim Porter.

Bill (Guest)
Bill Horton here.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hi, bill. Hello.
Steven McBride
And Stephen McBride.

Even McBride.

Nick Biemiller
Yeah. Hey, everyone. This is Nick B Miller with the Rough Grass Society.

Hi Nick, this deep voice.

Ohh no, I'm sorry that.

Yeah, I'm also. Well, the deep voice is partially because I'm sick right now with COVID, so participate as much as I can.

Feel better. Appreciate you being here in that regard.

Hi I'm joy.

Eric, give your hand up. Sorry.

Mainly fit something like enjoy little heart. Joy. Eric, you have your hand up.

And I'm also sick. So sorry for my voice.

Darn.
4:30:14.950 --> 4:30:16.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm calling on Herrick.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Edgerton, you have your hand up.

4:30:20.220 --> 4:30:23.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Do you wanna voice take your mute off or are you frozen?

4:30:24.770 --> 4:30:28.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I can. I can take his hand down. It looks frozen. He's not moving.

4:30:32.820 --> 4:30:39.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, there we go. OK. He probably even know. Anybody else wanna voice that has not yet. Just for sound check.

4:30:41.630 --> 4:30:45.950
Schaner, Jessica
Hey, I'm Jess Shaner with the North Carolina Natural Heritage program.

4:30:47.480 --> 4:30:49.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Great. Thank you, Jess.

4:30:51.570 --> 4:30:54.760
Pohlman, Scott M
I'm Skype home and I'm also with a natural heritage program.

4:30:56.80 --> 4:30:56.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright.

4:30:59.20 --> 4:31:1.520
Buchanan, Misty
And Mr Buchanan, with the natural heritage program.

4:31:3.30 --> 4:31:3.900
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Great.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Anyone else who's joining us this afternoon that has not voiced yet?
Rebecca King (Guest)
I'm Rebecca king. I joined this.

Christopher Sacco
Hi, this is Chris Sacker.

Rebecca King (Guest)
Yeah, I joined this morning, but I'm done checking my sound check.

Christopher Sacco
Does.

Christopher Sacco
Chris Sacko, nice to be here again.

Bridget Herring, City of Asheville (Guest)
Good afternoon. This is Bridget Herring with the city of Asheville.
Hi, Bridget.

Charles Faires
Is this Charlie Ferris with rough grouse society in American Woodcock society?

OK, great.

A big new crowd, James. Or do you wanna start?

Just hi everyone. For those who joined, I'm James Milonas, the four supervisor for the National Forest and.

And Rick Lentz is here.

Yeah, yeah. If you're just joining us, Rick Lynn, deputy regional Forester, Southern region and I'm serving as the reviewing official for the objection process.

Welcome. And I'm Nancy. Walter. I'm facilitating this meeting today. I just want to make sure you all know that this whole 3 days of meeting is being recorded. And so you you are agreeing to to that just by the virtue of being online.

Umm.

Yeah.

We'll bring remarks. Let's see just a Full disclosure, we pinned the room yesterday. We're in the supervisors office. There's 12345 folks support folks that are in the room besides the three of us.
Made introductions this morning that we want to again today, but just so you know that there's more of us in the room.

Note about how we're trying in the interest of trying to have a conversation, I'm facilitating with the intent to honor threads of conversation rather than individual contributions that may be disconnected. It worked pretty well this morning. We'll see how well it works. This afternoon. We are striving for an environment that is not so much 2 minutes in front of the MIC to.

To rehash what I submitted as an objection, but.

Adding value to what I submitted and has already been read and specifically focusing in on this suggested resolutions, so that's what we're hoping for today. And I also have the role of moving from voice to voice so that we can hear from everybody in the time that we have allotted. We have an afternoon of chunks of time that people.

Umm, maybe coming in and out of today. And so we're trying to honor those chunks of time. The first the the large.

Context for this afternoon is Land Management allocations, but we've we're gonna start with the national scenic areas and back country area and give an hour for that. We're going to move then into wilderness.

Then to the North Carolina Natural heritage areas and then to the Wild and scenic.

Ever since, so try to.
To offer your comments in the appropriate bucket as they come up.

So is there anything that I need to share that I didn't?

Any questions about how we're going to proceed from the folks online?

OK.

Great. So the way we're working this is that Rick sets the context for each of the sub topics.

We try to start with the lead objector and ask you to raise your use the raise hand feature to let us know that you want to enter into this topic and then I do the calling calling on you based on what I see for raised hands.

Pardon me.

Alright. Thanks Nancy and.

First up.

And thank you all for for being on.

I make making the time to be on, and we've heard a lot.
About and then from you about the importance of the craggy big Ivy area. Also, there's a thing Panther town as part of the land.

4:35:49.560 --> 4:35:52.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, allocation discussion as well.

4:35:53.270 --> 4:36:10.980
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And back in June, I was able to come out to the his good and see see some of the Pisgah and I was able to see the big idea area from the scenic Overlook looking down into it and then without in the Show Creek area, a little bit as well.

4:36:11.890 --> 4:36:13.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And you know, beautiful area.

4:36:14.760 --> 4:36:17.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And you know, as just.

4:36:18.80 --> 4:36:24.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I will visit just many, many beautiful places on the forest and want to hear from you about.

4:36:26.60 --> 4:36:31.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
These areas and and you know why they're different, some of the suggested resolutions.

4:36:32.780 --> 4:36:35.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For this were to include.

4:36:35.790 --> 4:36:42.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
4 to 5000 acres of matrix that's in the Forest Scenic area, including Snowball Mountain, North Pole.

4:36:43.160 --> 4:36:45.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Show Creek and Ox Creek.

4:36:45.790 --> 4:36:50.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, consider an alternative and detail to make the area a national scenic area.

4:36:51.780 --> 4:36:56.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Also change the land allocation to either special interest area.
Or Backcountry for wateriness inventory areas natural heritage areas.

Mountain treasures. I heart pisco priority conservation areas, Panthertown Valley and inventoried old growth force. So a lot around designations and with that.

Here from the objectors. So yes. So where's your hand? If you're one of the lead objectors, that is representing a lot of voices here.

And would like to enter in.

OK, will.

You're up first.

Everyone, thanks for the opportunity to.

To speak with you all today, there are a lot of other folks in this meeting. I wanna make sure they have time to speak the city of Asheville, Buncombe County. Lots of folks from the community who are also objecting. The only thing I wanted to add here first is that I heart hizbut is representing over 750 consolidated objections. So as you know.

This received a A an unprecedented number of objections.

For the interest of simplicity and logistics, we consolidated many of those objections into one.

Uh iheart, his go Jackson. And that's who I'm representing today. And and those objections in the 34,000
public comments that have come in over the past decade have clearly and consistently supported protecting all of the big Ivy area as a craggy national scenic area. And we just want to.

Will Harlan
Uh, reinforce that support by mentioning what happened yesterday right outside the Forest Service headquarters, when more than 500 people showed up at the Protect Pisgah rally to once again show support for protecting all of cragging and Big ID as a national scenic area and and to protect the 100 and 1000 acres of old growth forests and national.

Will Harlan
Ohio State Natural Heritage areas as well. I know that's that's coming up later in the discussion, but there’s clear widespread public and political support for protecting these areas, and I'll leave it to some of the Community voices and some of the other entities to describe just how special and important these places are. Thanks a lot.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thanks will.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Rob, you're next in the queue.

rob lenfestey
Uh, thank you. So my name is Rob Lenfestey.

rob lenfestey
And the owner of Mandala Chocolate and Mandala Springs, which is a center.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And.

rob lenfestey
That is actually bordered, so I'm I'm I am on Snowball Mountain. My my land is actually on Snowball Mountain here and I'm also a conservation ecologist.

rob lenfestey
So I am I am very uniquely qualified to speak on this subject of Snowball Mountain. I chose to move to this place because.
Of the water features the very unique ecosystem. You have unique populations here that you don't have anywhere else. And I've actually done a pretty comprehensive survey of the entire 4000 acres and I've identified previously unknown.

Uncategorized. Populations of very rare species, including golden seal.

And.

There and just the water resource, the forest resource, it is also.

One of the most valuable view sheds in the entire country, let alone Buncombe County.

There's no reasonable.

There's no reasonable strategy that does not involve including Snowball Mountain as part of the National Scenic Wilderness area, and that is.

That is definitely the entire consensus of the Community is the consensus of the county. It's the consensus of the city.

So it.

It really stands to reason that that should be a really simple.

Choice to be made by the Forest Service right now, especially considering.

That the, as you probably witnessed yesterday, people were pretty riled up and it will. It'll be very.
Costly, likely just with the attitude of people. If the Forest Service were to decide to do otherwise. And my goal personally as a conservation ecologist, as someone who is very well, networked and connected into this community is, I want to work with you. Whatever problems or whatever issues that you are going to be, that that might be presented by making this choice, whatever needs to be solved, whether we need to be fundraising or whatever it is that we need to do.

I can assure you that this Community is ready to stand behind you and work with you and support you in the way that you support us.

And that is all I have to say. Thank.

OK.

Are you good to move on? Yeah. It really appreciate covering that is it, is it Rob. Rob.

Umm yeah, you go back including Snowball Mountain in any designations that we have along with Cragging, Big Ivy in particular as a national scenic area.

You're on mute, rob.

Rob.

Yes, I'm sorry with strong emphasis on the fact that there are, there are lots of populations of rare species, there's significantly more spring heads that are being reported in the existing report on on the resources that are there.
And there it there's a lot of unique.

Uh, yeah, a unique special and very rare.

A wildlife that exists on that mountain. So I wanna just really emphasize that point.

As far as a.

And aspect of reasoning. So thank you.

Moving to Terry.

Terri Wells
Hello, thank you, Terry Wells, Buncombe County commissioner. To begin. I wanna acknowledge that we appreciate the Forest Service efforts to create a forest Scenic area designation for the craggy Big Abbey area, a critical step now is to include the entire craggy big ADI area, including Ivy Nob, Snowball Mountain, Ox Creek, Shoal Creek and all of these areas in this forest Scenic area designation. This would total 8000 acres, including the 4000 that in this current plan.

Has been left out and these 4000 acres contain Bucky's largest old growth forest on public land to the area's most popular trails, the Snowball Trail and the mountains to Sea Trail and the headwaters of the Ivy River, which is the drinking water source for the town of Weaverville. And it's imperative that these 4000 acres are included in this area designation, and under this designation.

From my understanding, right prescribed burns would be allowed to help with the forest management, multiple recreational uses, as well as hunting and fishing would be allowed.
Terri Wells

While at the same time protecting this important natural resource for our water quality, which is very, very important to our Community as well as the old growth forests and the biodiversity, and then additionally, we respectfully request that you formally recommend the entire eight 18,000 acres as the craggy National scenic area. This would be the first national scenic designation in North Carolina. Currently, I believe there are only nine dozen nations on.

Terri Wells

US Forest Service land nationwide.

Terri Wells

And I know I'm partial, but I do not think it is a stretch to acknowledge that we live in one of the most beautiful, scenic and biologically diverse areas in the nation and the proposed Cragging National Scenic area has unanimous political support from Buncombe County, the city of Asheville, the National Park Service and more than 150 local businesses and organizations, as well as the full endorsement of the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership, a coalition of 30 diverse organizations who've been working together to find common ground.

Terri Wells

On the Pisgah National Forest since 2013, and that is a testament to the importance of this area and the vision of all of these partners because it is not often these days that we get this many people agreeing on any given subject. So I encourage you to work with us and our partners in achieving this vision for our Community that will benefit our county and the region for many generations. And I thank you very much for your time.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

She thinks it. Thank you, Terry. Appreciate that so.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

In addition to including four thousand more acres into the four scenic area you'd like us to formally propose 18,000 acres.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Uh, of.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

And have it be the craggy national scenic area.

Terri Wells
Yes, we would definitely appreciate you formally recommending that the craggy National Scenic area.

Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
Yeah. And what? What I thought I'd do is go through most most everybody and then get into the reflective. OK, more questions. Great. OK. Thank you. So for those of you that have raised your hand, but now have said what you came to say, would you lower your hand so I can keep this straight? Rebecca King, you're next.

4:47:1.560 --> 4:47:1.990
Rebecca King (Guest)
Hi.

4:47:3.450 --> 4:47:13.20
Rebecca King (Guest)
So I, uh, am a Asheville native who currently lives between Weaverville and Barnardsville about a mile and a half from the Ivy River.

Rebecca King (Guest)
Umm and I, uh, the forest here basically is my life. I am an artist, a jewelry artist. I'm inspired by it. I.

Rebecca King (Guest)
I go into it all the time and I just want to say that I support what Terry Wells just said about making the whole 18,000 acres and national scenic area. And because there are so many places that aren't included in that first 4000 acre that you're talking about, all these little places off of 197 where there are also kinds of trails that are not marked on the Forest Service maps.

4:47:49.160 --> 4:48:0.440
Rebecca King (Guest)
And people use them locals and tourists, and also just all that area back in there was just this most prolific amount of wildflowers I've probably ever seen. The trees, of course.

Rebecca King (Guest)
And and. But the wildflowers, there's places you can actually just sit with hundreds of trilliums around you, and I don't really know anywhere else you can do that.

Rebecca King (Guest)
Also, I wanted to point out I was on this morning and what James had said about how what a great conservation achievement it was that these forests have been brought back from logging 100 years ago.

Rebecca King (Guest)
And so I just want to point out that the old growth trees, of course, but also are mature forests that are only 100 hundred and 50 years old, though it take us another 100 years to get them back.

Rebecca King (Guest)
Thank you. Thank you for listening.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You’re welcome.

4:48:42.600 --> 4:48:59.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So just a reminder and a lot of you weren’t on on the line this morning where our main hope here is that we hear if you’ve heard your your point represented by someone on this call this afternoon, don’t feel like you need to.

4:49:0.870 --> 4:49:7.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Had your voice, if it's the same perspective, just so that we have time to hear from all the different perspectives.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I am. I know you all came with something to say, but let's try to at least hear from the different perspectives before we hear the same over and just a note that.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Rick and James have read all the objections, so we don't need to hear the actual objection as much as add something to add value to it and something around the suggested resolution so.

4:49:33.370 --> 4:49:38.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good stuff. Just a reminder. OK. So now moving to Karen.

4:49:44.320 --> 4:49:45.690
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Karen says that. I mean, are you there?

4:49:46.750 --> 4:49:57.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Corinne Corinne was having audio problems. I told her to dial in on the phone. OK, so we'll see if she can dial in. Alright. Current. Are you on the phone? Just calling you out.

4:49:59.600 --> 4:50:5.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Or will speak up if you end up being on the phone and and we can't see you, city of Asheville, Eric.
Eric Edgerton- City of Asheville (Guest)
We'll hear me on this.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Are you with us?

Got it.

Eric Edgerton- City of Asheville (Guest)
OK, great. So really here to 2nd, what was already expressed by Commissioner Wells, we echo that sentiment in, in, in support of that request. I think adhering to your request for only augmenting the perspectives previously expressed, I wanna share that.

Eric Edgerton- City of Asheville (Guest)
This is a matter of extreme significance to the city of Asheville. Our Council voted unanimously to oppose the current draft of the plan and I think that.

UM, one of the key reasons why is the craggy big IP area the city strongly feels that it needs to be protected as a national scenic area, and the reasons for this. I think everyone on this call understands that the recreational outdoor recreational component of this area's culture can't be understated. It's a poor metric to describe it in terms of dollars and cents, but studies from Eastern Kentucky University, for example, have.

Indicated that more than 1000 persons are employed by that industry in this area directly related to the Pisgah Forest, and that generates more than 115 million annually. And that was as of 2017. So we know those numbers are probably understatements at this point.

In addition, when keeping in mind the cultural impact of this plan, we can't forget that Asheville is widely recognized as one as one of the key destinations for climate refugees in the coming years. So this area is going to receive an influx of folks due to climate change. We know that for a virtual certainty. The reason that's important to keep in mind is we as a city can only do so much to protect the forest and our urban canopy within the city of Asheville we're doing.

Everything we can and we've got our sustainability director here on the line as well. If you want to hear
more about that following this. But I say that to emphasize that it would be a true tragedy if we as municipalities in this area have done all that we can to protect the forests that we know will draw people here as climate refugees and as we continue to experience the effects of climate change.

4:52:16.470 --> 4:52:45.220
Eric Edgerton- City of Asheville (Guest)
And so to the extent that you all have a key role in protecting eminently more force area, we really want to view the Forest Service as a partner in protecting our forests so that we don't end up with a situation where as climate change worsens and as people fled to the mountains as a result, we come to a place where we don't still have the same level of natural beauty that draws people here in the 1st place. So from that perspective, the city of Asheville reiterates the call from Commissioner wells to.

4:52:45.390 --> 4:52:50.930
Eric Edgerton- City of Asheville (Guest)
Consider protecting a a sizable portion of craggy Big Ivy as a national scenic area.

4:52:53.140 --> 4:52:56.680
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. But I think I think you're.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Might be wrong, but from from here I wanted to jump into some questions.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And I'm sure people have some things to have, but I wanted to.

4:53:5.410 --> 4:53:8.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That kind of big into the suggested resolutions.

4:53:10.310 --> 4:53:15.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And so one one question and just just a basic question.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I've I've not been involved in the creation of the National Scenic area. I know you know where they've occurred and everything, but I've not been directly involved in that. What?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
What?
What's preventing you and the community from having pursued that already?

Will Harlan
Thanks for that question.

I think that's a good one. We are pursuing that, but it would be immensely beneficial if the Forest Service formally recommended it as well. I think congressional leaders look to you all as stewards of the land and they respect your opinions and guidance immensely. And with all of the input you've received, they they consider you the experts and would greatly respect a formal recommendation from the Forest Service, just like you would for.

Any other for for wilderness designation, a national Scenic Area recommendation from the Forest Service, would hold immense value.

OK. Thank you for that. Well and and there's that middle portion of it too that has a lot of recreational use and trails.

Is that part of what you'd like to be included as well?

Certainly that's that's the the core hub of of craggy big idea, but it's it's the entire picture. It's everything from Ivy Knob to Snowball Mountain. It is a contiguous wildlands, and it's important to keep it all together. So.

It can't be fragmented and and that's one reason there's been such an outpouring of support for protecting all 4000 remaining acres as a four scenic area and ultimately as a national scenic area.

OK. Yeah. Thank thank you, will. And we can another question.
Depending on the legislation for a national scenic area, there’s still management activities that can occur. You know, it’s what they’re geared towards. You could be anything from maintenance of the existing trails. I think there’s some things that had to be navigated as far as adding new trails. I’m not too sure on that. There might be some difficulties there, but management activities I think prescribed burning it was mentioned. But one of the folks, just a little bit ago so.

And I think even depend on the legislation like commercial timber sales could occur there. So so wanted to hear more about the concerns for.

What’s what is proposed with the combination of of?

Uh, designations that are there as far as the Forest Scenic area.

And uh, the matrix. And you know, addressing any.

The habitat needs or or ecological needs that are out there through various types of management activities.
Will Harlan
Yeah. No thanks.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That's that's a long question to be nice to get there.

Will Harlan
Thank you for that question. And and I'll I'll invite some of the attorneys on this call and others to weigh in. I'll, I'll just respond briefly.

Will Harlan
The the National Scenic Area designation provides some flexibility as as you mentioned. So it's it's not as prescriptive. And so that makes it more malleable and we think that's a good thing and we'd love to work with you on the ultimate National Scenic Language Scenic Area, Bill language to make sure it has that, that flexibility, that, that we might need.

Will Harlan
But ultimately, we we wanna see this area permanently protected. We want to see conservation and recreation prioritized. So that essentially means no commercial logging in the craggy national scenic area and all existing uses would continue as Commissioner Wells mentioned, it's hunting, fishing, all of the current uses would continue. All of the access would continue.

Will Harlan
But we would just like to enshrine that permanently we 30 years ago in the in the previous forest plan, the big Ivy Community spoke up.

Will Harlan
A powerfully and stopped a timber sale that was about to happen there and and y'all kicked the decision for Big Ivy to this force plan. And here we are again.

Will Harlan
Advocating to protect our forests, and we're just hoping to not have to do this every 15 to 30 years and hopefully this time we can detect it permanently. And that's why we're requesting the National Scenic area designation.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, there's a few Megan and a few other hands up that go to that. Yeah. Yeah. So let's hear from Megan. I've got you. You've been you've had your hand up for quite a while.

Hi, I'm Megan Sutton and I'm the leader projector for the Nantahala Pisgah Forest partnership.

And I just as I think many of you know, we do represent a really broad diverse group of people. And as such, I and my partner, mainly Fuller, who's sitting across from me, are the only people that can speak on behalf of the partnership. I just wanna call attention to that.

Our viewpoints are reflected accordingly, so I'm not disagreeing what has been said, but I would refer you to our 2020.

Comprehensive comments around land allocations, in particular to see what the partnership has come to reach agreement on and I do feel that this is the broadest.

The first interest that could reach agreement, and so I wanna just reflect that here that we do have a lot of agreement on a number of these things that have been said today.

And for specifics, I would just refer you to those comments. Thank you.
How about Jessica?

Because.

Hey, I'm.

I'm just Shaner with the natural heritage program. I just wanted to add that we did some recent field work in the both the area to the north, the North Fork Coxcomb Mountain area and the Snowball Mountain area to the South, two areas that are currently both in Matrix and we found especially on the upper slopes some extremely high quality natural communities as well as some rare populations very mature forest.

So we are going to be extending the natural areas onto the some of those areas.

We're currently in the process of doing that, but we will recommend those areas being included in a significant interest areas and or the forest scenic area.

Thank you.

Was that what was your name? Yes. Shanna. Shanna, good information. Thank you.

OK. If I could, what? Thanks Jess. And and and.

One of the things that I think is important to know with with the work of the National Heritage Program is that we know that that doesn't stop right there. There's.

You all are continuing to do field research, taking a look at areas that have previously been looked at,
finding new species and things. So that's part of that. And that's why, as part of the plan we do have, I
know we're going to be talking about that in more detail later, but that we do have that standard
around making sure that we're coordinating with the heritage program as we're looking at projects on
the ground because we know it's not a static.

5:1:16.760 --> 5:1:29.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Set of information that's going to be constantly updated and improved and we have some of the richest
data I would say of any natural heritage program across the state. So thanks.

5:1:31.220 --> 5:1:33.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, ready to move Q?

5:1:35.460 --> 5:1:36.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You are right. Are you?

5:1:36.670 --> 5:1:59.420
Hugh Irwin
Yeah, I'm here. When the Wilderness Society and Rick I wanted to address your question of, you know,
why the Forest Service should recommend the big Ivy area for National Scenic area, you know, National
Scenic area would be a very important component of the forest plan and, you know.

5:2:1.380 --> 5:2:31.570
Hugh Irwin
It's not, uh, you know, those sorts of issues are the sorts that the Forest Service would address, you
know, in an overall management plan. And when a, you know, national Scenic Area designation, right
rises to the top and the issues in a forest plan, I think it should absolutely should be addressed in, you
know, in fact, the George Washington National Forest Plan that came out a few years ago.

5:2:31.900 --> 5:2:51.270
Hugh Irwin
Did recommend a national Scenic area designation in their forest plan so you know there's certainly
precedent for that. And you know, it's an important element of kind of moving, you know, the public
preference forward. Thank you.

5:2:53.70 --> 5:2:53.630
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

5:2:54.340 --> 5:2:55.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sorry, go ahead.

5:2:57.290 --> 5:3:5.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Anything else? Move on. Yes, we have just a couple more with their hands up here that I want to make sure we get to Michael. Numinous.

5:3:7.940 --> 5:3:8.180
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

5:3:6.740 --> 5:3:37.480
Michael Numinous (Guest)
Hey there. Thank you all for taking the time to listen to us. Just to give you a little bit of context, I’m blessed enough to steward 50 acre piece of land that joins up with Big **** and the Coleman boundary out in Barnardsville called the Hawk and Hawthorne. It’s been a huge privilege and responsibility just to manage this 50 acres of property and all the work that goes into that and thinking about y’all managing thousands and thousands of acres, it's just an enormous responsibility. So thank you for taking it seriously.

5:3:37.550 --> 5:4:10.450
Michael Numinous (Guest)
Been listening to our voices. I wanna speak to something a little bit different that I haven't heard mentioned too much because it's very clear what the public will is here. I think it's been thoroughly established that the economic value of leaving these trees standing if you're actually thinking about a long term management strategy, there's far more value in leaving the forest standing. And I think that's very clear. But I just want to speak to the fact that, you know, we talk about these forests, we talk about these trees as if they are ours. They're not ours. They're not even the indigenous peoples whose lands that were currently.

5:4:10.520 --> 5:4:41.150
Michael Numinous (Guest)
Who who stewarded these lands for thousands of years? I think it's critical that human beings start to get off of our ego trip. That's LED us into this place of destroying the planet that we call home and start to realize the trees are their own. They're not just something to be cut down for quick economic profit, their habitat, their nature, their ecosystem services, but also they're living beings. They're they're creatures, their entities who need to be respected. One of the greatest shortcomings.

5:4:41.230 --> 5:5:13.590
Michael Numinous (Guest)
Of humankind right now is that we don't prescribe rights and personhood to other living and sentient creatures. We think that humans are the only things that are beings, and everything else is in it, and everything else is here. And some of this comes from our our Scriptures and doctrines about the way that the world is here for us to exploit and capitalize. But it's very obvious, I think, at this point to all of us where that line of thinking and where that ethos has LED us. And it's very problematic. And when we look back at past generations, when we look back 50 years ago.

5:5:13.750 --> 5:5:44.580
Michael Numinous (Guest)
To segregation and to Jim Crow laws and all of these things that now, in hindsight, are just so plainly abhorrent, at least to most of us. And I pray everyone on this call that it's very, very clear to me in the
next few decades that the way that we choose to perceive and interact with nature and these resources and these beings, that we will be expanding rights not just to all various forms of people, but also to other living sentient creatures. I also want to speak to the fact that, you know, when I go out in these woods that are my backyard.

5:5:44.670 --> 5:6:12.0
Michael Numinous (Guest)
And some of these woods that are talking about being cut down are literally, you know, in my backyard. And that's why I moved here and why I do the work that I'm doing to bring back the old growth forests. I currently have an eco stewardship plan on my property through Eco Foresters, which does involve removing some of the timber. But really like doing so in a responsible way. That's maximizing long term use and the return of the old growth forests and the hardwoods and restoring the native ecosystems here.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

Michael Numinous (Guest)
But I just want to speak to you know, it's very easy when you're in the forest to feel into how impressive and how bountiful. And like, wow, there's so much woods here. Look at all these 10s of thousands of acres.

Michael Numinous (Guest)
But really, what we have left.

Michael Numinous (Guest)
Is a scrap of what these woods used to be. This entire continent used to be a food forest of old growth with, you know, where our interstates and highways were. We're trails through old growth food forests, and tended lands. What we have left is scraps. We have almost nothing left. Less than 3% of the old growth on this entire continent remains. And here we are, people having to take time out of their days to beg and plead with you. Who happened to be in the position of power and control for some reason in this dynamic.

5:7:23.50 --> 5:7:23.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Michael.

Michael Numinous (Guest)
Please don't cut down the couple of percent that we have left. These forests are baby forests. These are not old growth forests. We have a a few tiny little sections of 100 to 200 year old trees, but old growth forests are 500 year ecosystems. None of us living right now can even imagine what these forests truly look like. If we could just leave them alone for a little while. Yes.
Michael Numinous (Guest)
Yeah.

Michael Numinous (Guest)
Michael, can I help? Can I interrupt respectfully? Can you do you have a concluding comment before we move on? I just wanna make sure we hear from the rest of the folks. Yeah. I don't feel like I talked that long, but I will happily wrap up in the next 20 seconds. I just wanna say here that the my favorite poet says the only war that matters is the war on the imagination. All other wars are subsumed in it. And what I'm asking for those of you who are in the position to make this decision is to not just presuppose.

Michael Numinous (Guest)
The edicts of old and the Oh well, we have to cut some of them. We have to serve some of these capitalist interests. We don't. Actually, we have other options.

Michael Numinous (Guest)
Please employ your imaginations and trust. Fall into your community and know that we will support you and coming up with creative alternatives. And I'm not saying we shouldn't log anything or that we don't need any of the timber, but if we are gonna log it, please don't clear cut it. Please work with Eco Foresters or indigenous land stewards so that we can take the harvest that we do need in a responsible way without causing irreparable long term damage to these forests that are sacred and critical to all of our well beings. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Michael. Thank you, Michael and yeah and.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I really appreciate you you putting you know your heart and your your your thoughts into the room. And you know from from where I where I said I always think is you know we we care deeply about our our forests and our natural resources and I think you know when I think that way I think but we're we're you know largely in agreement we're 99% point 9% in agreement on things and it's.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It's a how? How do we how do we figure that out? And so a lot of what the purpose of the meeting today is is to talk about.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, from the objections.
The resolutions. Is there a way that we can navigate and resolve those resolute the the objections?

And what we'll do is we've got all that information that's been provided, a lot of information provided, all the analysis we've got specialists that are from across the country who are looking at all the objections gone through the objections in detail and today.


Today is a promise to hear more.

About the the resolution maybe a little bit of context on the objection as much as needed, but really what the the rich discussion around potential resolution and what I've heard through this is the, the, the, the need for the designation as a national scenic area and even though.

The folks on here in the community are pursuing that.

That it would mean much more, or maybe may make a a the hurdle would be a little lower or the hill not as steep with the Forest Service to have been.

Have that in the forest plan.

And so some of this too is when I have questions is, you know, digging a little bit deeper into that, you know, to understand and I might book in some things or you know high low things. So try not to try not to be provocative but to ask questions to for me to hear more. For instance, you'll one question I have is.

You know.
I think it was mentioned by one of the folks about prescribed burning so.

You. So what about the prescribed burning aspect of a national scenic area? It might be question about the.

What do you think about the trail system in the shop area? So it's for me trying to figure out from the proposed resolution getting a fuller, richer picture of that resolution so I can understand it because what I'm gonna do is all this review that we're doing, going through all the objections.

Hearing from we've got a team of specialists from across the country that are combing through the objections and to provide me with the staff work on it and then to the conversations over the next three days. I wanna take all of that and then I'm gonna provide whatever instruction I need to back to James on this process. So hopefully that's helpful. And that's really where the rich discussion.

You would would benefit me is the the resolving official to to hear more about that, those resolutions and your thoughts on that so.

To tee that up.

What do you think about the use of prescribed burning in those 4000 acres you'd like to see in a national scenic designation?

Shouldn't do any of the folks that have their hands up on and answer that question.

I'll just try.

OK. Anybody else go ahead.
Will Harlan
We have, yeah.

Will Harlan
I think prescribed burning would be a very useful tool in the craggy national scenic area. I think that would certainly be supported by the Community and by all of the stakeholders involved. So I think that's certainly a discussion and there's nothing in the craggy national Scenic area language or the 4 scenic area language that would that would limit that.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, thanks will. Another question is what do you think about designating the improving the trail system and the the Shope Creek area?

Will Harlan
Absolutely. Uh, I think there's a lot of need there and I think we've seen the damage from previous logging has created some serious issues there and there's a an unregulated trail system that has that has developed there. I think a craggy national scenic area could go a long way in perhaps bringing federal funding, additional federal funding and more support for for strengthening the management there.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Do you want me to go on to another person or do you want to keep probing?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, thanks. Thanks for that. Was making a note. Yeah, and.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, I think, yeah, we have just a couple of just a few hands left here. So John?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Could you cook couture? I'm sorry, colclasure.
John Culclasure
Yeah. Thanks to John, will. Pleasure. Yeah, I really appreciate all the passion for big guy, craggy area and seems like being a lot of county and city and community consensus to protect that area. I'm just curious why that area is not the local stakeholders aren't, aren't supportive of wilderness in that area. That seems like a pretty good area to put the most restrictive designation out there on it.

Will Harlan
We're good.

Hugh Irwin
Uh, yeah, I, Hugh Irwin, wilderness society. It actually is a portion of the big movie area is recommended for wilderness very strongly and with a lot of support from both. You know, the city and county and many, many groups. You know, a subset of that scenic area is well of proposed for wilderness.

John Culclasure
Yeah, but there's what about the larger, I think will was talking about a larger 18,000 acre area that seems to without looking at the past veg management, all those tests, it seems to be definitely qualifying for the acreage amount to protect, protect it as wilderness and if there's consensus for it, maybe that's a force wide recommendation in lieu of some other areas. Well, the groups that work done this did.

Hugh Irwin
You know, assessment of which areas would fit wilderness and which would fit scenic area more. And you know the the recommendation is based around that.
John Culclasure
Well.

But what is that you?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I think it, John, I think some of that goes to the uses. There's a lot of mountain bike use and other things in in some of those areas that were mentioned that will was talking about. So I think it's a lot looking at the existing uses and things that kind of I don't want to speak for will and others, but I think that's part of part of how they landed.

OK.

Yeah, that's what I was getting at. I thought it was wilderness. I thought it was mountain biking and wilderness there. So I was curious. But yeah, good to know. Appreciate that clarification. So it's more about trade-offs between user groups as opposed to, you know, actual on the ground. Have it set blade life needs as opposed to other areas of the forest. That's.

I'll leave my comment there. Thank you.

Thanks John. So sevens been in the queue for quite some time, McBride.

Hey, yes, thank you.

I just wanted to, you know, just speak briefly. You know, I agree with just about everything that everyone's been talking about today. And I just wanted to wrap in just a little bit more sort of broaden the scope a little bit.

About the National scenic area and and it truly would be a national scenic area. I've been really lucky in
my career to travel a lot as a professional location photographer and I've photographed a lot of the world's most scenic areas and without hesitation I know that our backyard and big Ivy craggy area is.

5:17:0.170 --> 5:17:4.170
Steven McBride
Stands up to so many of the world's most beautiful scenic.

5:17:4.640 --> 5:17:25.440
Steven McBride
UMA College you rich places and I would really, really hate to see anything change that quality and in a lot of my travels, I always tell people where I'm from and and almost without exception, everybody knows Asheville and the beautiful scenic beauty and.

5:17:26.160 --> 5:17:56.70
Steven McBride
You know, just A and and even beyond scenic beauty, just the, you know, the biodiversity and the ecology footprint, pristine water, the trees, you know, the list just go on and on about what everybody talks about when they find out. I'm from Asheville and and the Blue Ridge Mountains and everybody is pretty much in agreement that that that you know, it's just throw a wow factor and to to to eliminate that wow factor on all the different fronts, whether it's scenic beauty or the cology, the biodiversity we would just be.

5:17:56.980 --> 5:18:4.600
Steven McBride
A really bad missed opportunity for this area, so I just wanted to to sort of bring in that more of a national scope.

5:18:5.650 --> 5:18:6.160
Steven McBride
Thank you.

5:18:5.500 --> 5:18:6.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thanks Steven.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I I wanna make sure like it's not like all or nothing here. You know what? What we have in the in the final plan. I think there's there's a large zone of agreement with.

5:18:26.770 --> 5:18:35.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, with some of the the recommended wilderness and and and there's forks for scenic area. It comes down to.
You know some places that in in the in the final plan that weren't included in some of that scenic area. And so it's, I just want to make sure I think folks know that. But just to clarify, it's not 0 or 100 that there's a large zone of agreement on a lot of the management allocations. I think in this area and then some areas that in some of those particular places that Rick mentioned that where there's.

There, there's some concern that we're hearing from.

So so the question I had that would be helpful just to hear more about is contrasting the Forest Scenic area.

What that brings and the national scenic area. So what?

What affords?

So you protection wise is so the the plan, the plan as it is going forward.

Or as a national scenic area.

To kind of fill in the gap for me a little bit on what what that looks like, why that's why that's better or why the National scenic area.

Fall short somewhere.

Who wants to?

Help there. Go ahead well.
Will Harlan

Thanks for that question, Rick. I think they overlap strongly for sure and we appreciate the Forest Service adding the Forest Scenic area designation and we think that should apply across the entire craggy big Ivy area, all 16,000 acres of Forest Service land there. But ultimately this is the second time we've had to come begging to the Forest Service to protect our backyard and we want to see this protected.

Will Harlan

Permanently as a national scenic area, I think that's what the community wants and we've been saying this now for 30 years, but also as other folks have mentioned, a national scenic area recommendation would bring a lot of additional benefits to this area. It would bring national recognition to this really special part of the country.

Will Harlan

It could potentially bring federal funding as well, which is much needed. And as you may know, two of the roads in Big Ivy have been closed for almost a year.

Will Harlan

A largely do I think lack of funding, so there's some real benefits that a national scenic area could provide to on the ground management as well.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

We're talking about the.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

The slide.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Thanks Lisa.

Will Harlan

Yeah, but even force 63 is also closed. I'm sorry. 74 is also closed. It's been closed for a year as well and with only minor damage, and I think.

Will Harlan

If that were a national scenic area, I think you would be able to to acquire the funding and the resources to to help manage that and maintain it better.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks. Well, so a lot of overlap, but you'd like to see the whole 16,000 acres and that national recognition.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, brings brings national recognition, possibly, possibly more funding. And as he said, this is the second time you've had to come begging to the Forest Service. And I've been saying this for 30 years.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That would be a permanent solution.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Great. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I'm looking at the clock and I'm wondering. I know that in addition to being ID and craggy during this hour, we wanted to give folks an opportunity to talk about Panther Town. So I'm wondering if there's anybody online who wants to talk about Panther tone before we get to.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Close to the end here.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Jason is very good.

J K
Uh, yeah, Jason camenker. I'm the executive director of Friends of Panthertown.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right.

J K
Yeah. Can you hear me OK?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes, I can.
OK.

OK, great. I understand that we'll have some time at 3:15 as well to talk about special interest areas. So if we have to carry it over to them, I understand. But I do want to express appreciation and thanks for for being on the call and and letting us be part of this process.

OK. Thanks will defer the content then to that that place on the agenda. So let's continue now. I've got a couple other hands up that I haven't. We haven't talked with yet. Josh Kelly with mountain true.

Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah. Thank you. Just a couple of things I wanted to add 1 topic that hasn't come up explicitly in this discussion is compatible management and that's been a big topic throughout the planning process. And Rick mentioned that the Forest Service is in 99.9% agreement on this. Well, we found out very early in the planning process that even the folks that wanted to see a lot more logging and active management on the forest and the folks that wanted to see more land protection.

Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
We're about 87% in agreement on the land allocation and what the Forest Service has done with alternative E is to basically put all the lands or the vast majority of those that were in any sort of disagreement in matrix and interface, which are prioritizing.

Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
You know, but timber harvest as a means for diversifying age classes, and that's the that's what they've done in Big Ivy. That's what you all have done in Big Ivy with Costco Mountain and Snowball Mountain and also in Shock Creek and Ox Creek. And so I think there are much more compatible management areas. I mean I think flexibility is great. But I think all the flexibility you would need would be an ecological interest area management area and special interest area for example. And so there's.

Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I think you could recommend the area for a national scenic area, and if those areas remain in Matrix, I think the community is gonna have problems. So I think I think there's really 2 steps that the community would benefit from. One would be allocating compatible management, which would not include interface and matrix and also a recommendation of scenic area. And then second, there was a question about.
Control burning and prescribed fire in the craggy mountains, and I agree that that would be beneficial. I definitely think that, as the congressional designation is pursued, there should be allowances for that and encouragement of that also. Want to point out, though, that in the scope of the whole forest, the craggy mountain area is very low priority for controlled burning, very high elevation, a lot of very moist communities. There are not very many fire dependent species or maybe may not be any fire dependent.

Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
The communities in the area and I'm using fire dependent after Cecil Frost in that fire. Dependence is when a species or community declines in the absence of fire. So compared to the rest of the foresters, a lower proportion of that sort of thing in big, I do think on the South facing slopes of Fork Ridge and Coxcomb Mountain there would be some great benefits to control burning, and I do endorse the idea of including allowances for that. So I just wanted to add that. But I think part of a resolution for this.

Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
For for craggy would be compatible management, and that would probably mean the ecological Interest area management for.

Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
For Costco Mountain, uh Snowball Mountain, Ship Creek and Ox Creek.

Helpful, helpful comments, Josh. Thank you. Josh, anything?

Hannah Furgiuele she/her (Guest)
Of course I get to follow Josh Kelly. That's a hard, hard role to fill and I'll just take just two seconds here. I'm I'm representing friends of Big Ivy, which is a neighbor or not neighborhood, but a community group based in Barnesville area. And I know we've talked a lot about and I don't I don't need to go into all the details everyone has covered so beautifully and I appreciate you all taking the time to hear from us today.

Hannah Furgiuele she/her (Guest)
I just have my perspective is is coming from the position of flooding that we've seen in barnardsville and and really wanting to prioritize protecting the intact for us that we see because I believe that the more we log on public lands, the more flooding we're going to see. I have a house that's been in construction
for over three years now that was flooded in, I guess whatever year that was is all blur as it is. I think for a lot of people with the pandemic time is different now, but we're still renovating because of the pandemic shortages. So it's taken.

5:27:1.590 --> 5:27:15.30
Hannah Furgiuele she/her (Guest)
I have three years we hope to finish the animation in in two months, but it was flooded during hurricane. Since then we've had additional flooding. I've had Barnes and animals of back or barns evacuated the animals to higher ground. Lots of you know.

5:27:17.830 --> 5:27:40.40
Hannah Furgiuele she/her (Guest)
Various things flooded and ruined and destroyed through the flooding, and I just think that protecting these forests on public lands is critical because a lot of the private lands in our area are being logged and we don’t have control over that. But the public lands, I think are we need to prioritize some of these designations. They're going to keep those forests intact and prevent that flooding that is impacting just the heart of barnardsville on the Ivy River watershed.

5:27:40.620 --> 5:27:43.980
Hannah Furgiuele she/her (Guest)
So anyway, I'll stop there. I know there's a lot more to say, but thanks for your time.

5:27:45.260 --> 5:27:45.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

5:27:46.660 --> 5:27:49.100
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks Hannah, and say the name of the town again.

5:27:49.600 --> 5:27:50.620
Hannah Furgiuele she/her (Guest)
Barnardsville.

5:27:51.510 --> 5:27:52.550
Hannah Furgiuele she/her (Guest)
Yeah, I understand.

5:27:50.280 --> 5:27:53.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Arnold darner Parnell Parnell.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yep. Thank you.

5:27:54.930 --> 5:27:56.200
Hannah Furgiuele she/her (Guest)
Lot of barns and barnardsville.
5:27:59.360 --> 5:27:59.650
Hannah Furgiuele she/her (Guest)
So.

5:27:57.660 --> 5:28:1.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thank you. So I'm gonna go back. Corinne, are you on the line?

5:28:1.630 --> 5:28:4.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Can you hear me now? Yes, we can. Thank you.

5:28:4.520 --> 5:28:22.10
Karin (Guest)
Uh, wonderful. OK, some of them are quite as timely now coming from the perspective is ecologist and Asheville resident and someone who is very active in the plan. The last time in getting Big IV protected and we thought we had it protected forever. I just really.

5:28:22.790 --> 5:28:52.620
Karin (Guest)
Endorsed the idea of the National Scenic area for the entire big Ivy area and also too again say we really need to protect the old growth, which is really irreplaceable to keep that protected and to protect the entire area for now and I'll chime in while I'm able to speak now too that Josh said what I was thinking too with the prescribed burning that there are only going to be really a few areas that need it. But that sounds like a fine idea to be doing in the national.

5:28:52.760 --> 5:29:12.250
Karin (Guest)
Scenic area and I really hope we can get that and it makes a lot more sense than wilderness. It would really lock things up in different ways and probably bring a ton of extra people coming in and everything else. So if there's any possible way we can get the national CA area for the entire big area area, that would be wonderful. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks Karen.

5:29:14.790 --> 5:29:30.500
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I wanted to just recognize that this topic is very closely associated to the next. Perhaps there'll be some bleed over. And I wonder if you wanna close out our our topic that we're on now and move into the wilderness to honor the time slots.

5:29:32.120 --> 5:29:35.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Anything. What time is 2:00 o'clock time flies.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, 111 question, let me see if I've got it.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. And then we talked.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Maybe I'll come back to me.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We're talking, yeah, so.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Now I lost it. I'm sorry. Good information. Thank you for that and the.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And and we're of course with with wilderness and the National scenic area that those would be handled through.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Legislation.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. OK. So people are not and.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, I think, yeah, we could shift to the next one and still trying to think of that question I had. Ohh I know what it was. Yeah, I know what?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Because it is something Korean had mentioned about.
Because we've seen that is when something designated as wilderness, sometimes it gets more heavy traffic.

It makes it a, you know, much more of a destination, so any any thoughts or concerns? If if there is a national recognition of the big heavy area of that influx of interest and traffic and you know that people love it, people love it a lot. And and there's, you know, increased impacts from it. Any any. I'm sure you've thought through that any thoughts or concerns around that?

Karin (Guest)
I guess my thoughts would be.

Yeah, it's still better than getting it logged, but I think, yeah, Wilderness would bring in maybe too many people. But National Scenic area, I don't think draws as many people so.

Will Harlan
Ohh.

That that's it.

Well.

Yeah. Thanks, Greg. I'll also add.

It's it's already been discovered. Uh, this is. This is part of the Blue Ridge Parkway. The craggy gardens is the most visited national visited spot along the Blue Ridge Parkway. So Craig and Gardens has already been found. There's already a lot of use. This would simply ensure that those views from craggy gardens are permanently protected, and so we worry less about overuse because the traffic is already there and primarily most of the access would come from the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Which is which is and that's already a really popular spot.
5:32:11.760 --> 5:32:35.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, good. Thank you. Thank you. That's something creative. Mentioned Joe. Joe, my memory. But thanks for your patience while I found that question again might get harder and harder as the afternoon goes on. Yes, Kate hours. OK, so before you set the stage for the wilderness, would you all mind taking your hands down for now? And feel free to put them back up under this new context that Rick is going to set.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Unless there is still something hanging on Big Ivy and not covering water.

5:32:43.410 --> 5:32:45.880
John Culclasure
Yeah. Did y'all cover panthertown more?

5:32:47.190 --> 5:32:47.910
John Culclasure
Are you done?

5:32:47.860 --> 5:33:22.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We gave you the opportunity. Do you have something to offer on panthertown that?

5:33:22.800 --> 5:33:34.510
John Culclasure
Yeah. I just like to see more areas in the ecological interest area or matrix. I mean, that's, you know, before that power required it. And then TNC that was historically a good area for hunting and wildlife and prescribed fire is definitely needed in that area, particularly the North End. We have the largest lease on that property that the largest private property that borders that area and has historically been used for that. And definitely a lot of repairing and bogs. And we're bogs need management too. I'd like to see something. I know a lot of this stands.

5:33:22.800 --> 5:33:34.510
John Culclasure
First day and looking at the the way, the laundry on the map, some of that, some of those areas are skeptical. So I would encourage all to put more of that area in green matrix or ecological interest area at a minimum, please.

5:33:36.400 --> 5:33:38.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It's so John, tell us who you're with again.
John Culclasure
I'm representing myself today.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Great.

John Culclasure
I work for the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation and work with the North Carolina Legislative Sportsmen's Office as well who votes submitted are they don't can't legislate, Sportsman Caucus submitted comments previously and I've submitted comments individually as well.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. And Sam?

Sam Evans
Hey there, since we've got limited time on the agenda, I did want to flag sort of at the at the beginning of this next section there were that we were really talking about two different issues and one of them doesn't seem to have sort of a natural home in the agenda, so.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So.

Sam Evans
Yeah. Basically, the agenda had a focus on paint, the town and craggy and focus on recommended wilderness. What I don't see in the agenda, and I think is absolutely essential for us to cover, is the other wilderness inventory areas that that are at issue still. And I don't think this objection process can be successful unless we tackle that. So there are a number of other inventory areas that need to be discussed because they're misallocated because the analysis doesn't capture what's special about them.

Sam Evans
And because they're sort of default.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sam, Sam.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Let me just interrupt you because though we did intend to include that, the nature of what you're saying right now under this bucket that starts at 2 and ends at three.
That's exactly what that fits.

OK, great. That's gonna be.

So there's a place for that. That's gonna be a tight time frame, but that I'm glad to hear it.

OK, alright, we'll do the best we can and knowing that I'm gonna just ask each of you to.

Honor the let's not hear the same the same comment if it's been offered before and.

Keep the comments to things that add value and focus on remedies. That's the kind of the mantra here.

So do you wanna set the stage for the wilderness section? Sure thing. Yeah. Wilderness suggested resolutions.

Include the following areas as recommended wilderness or national scenic area, cranky Big Ivy.

As wilderness and national Scenic area overflow.

Black Mountains, Mackey Mountain, Joyce Kilmer extensions excluding yellow hammer.


Lost Cove. Snowbird to Squidy, Unicoi and Cantrell top.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Unicorn in control? Toxic.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
In Middle Prong extension.

5:36:17.880 --> 5:36:32.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Also pose resolution. All wilderness inventory areas should be managed to maintain or restore their wildland values and should be off limits for construction of utilities, highways and energy development.

5:36:33.640 --> 5:36:35.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And again so here and more.

5:36:36.290 --> 5:36:39.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
More about the proposed.

5:36:40.230 --> 5:36:40.630
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.

5:36:42.320 --> 5:36:50.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Resolutions and digging into those for understanding. It's all all kind of kick things off with a question that we ran across was.

5:36:51.470 --> 5:36:54.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I think the term wilderness inventory areas was.

5:36:56.100 --> 5:37:5.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Used so was interested to know a little bit more about what's meant by wilderness inventory area and with that include.

5:37:5.930 --> 5:37:10.900
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All of the 360 four 1920 acres.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That was included in the initial inventory for wilderness.
Hey there. Thanks for the question. Yeah. So we are talking about the Chapter 70 inventory, the we we have used wilderness inventory areas throughout this process as.

A shorthand for the very cumbersome phrasing from the planning rule, which is areas that may be suitable for inclusion in the national wilderness preservation system. Once you say that about 5:00 or 10 times, you start looking for shortcuts, and this is the one that we have found. We use WIA's because to differentiate from a previous version of the four service directives planning directives which used the PWA moniker for these areas.

That for you know, the Chapter 70 areas, but you could just as easily call them the Chapter 70 areas. We also refer to them as the mountain treasure areas. The North Carolina took North Carolina's mountain treasures inventory, which was an NGO sort of initiative is essentially the same for practical purposes. It's the same lands as we're included in the Chapter 70 inventory.

OK. Yeah, thanks. Thanks for clarifying that, Sam. I appreciate that. We just wanted.

Figured that but wanted to make sure.

Do you want to follow on with any other comments, Sam?

And I'd love to you if this is a if this is a good time, I think just it's kind of set the stage for what we're talking about since you know, since we have such limited time, I'd like to.

I'd like to pull up an image.

Let's see.
5:39:3.380 --> 5:39:4.450  
Sam Evans  
Give me one second.

5:39:5.870 --> 5:39:6.520  
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS  
Take your time.

Sam Evans  
Hey.

5:39:15.730 --> 5:39:18.560  
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS  
Too small for us to see in the version that it is right now.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS  
Very very small.

5:39:21.120 --> 5:39:25.190  
Sam Evans  
Yeah, that's unfortunate. It's not giving me the option to share the.

Sam Evans  
That just the window that I'd like to share, I wonder to Quincy if if you're able to share?

5:39:32.510 --> 5:39:35.250  
Sam Evans  
And that image that I had sent ahead of time.

5:39:37.20 --> 5:39:38.170  
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS  
He says he's not.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS  
Our somebody used your voice. I don't understand you not through the system. You're hooked up in. Not on the system. There were hooked up in.

5:39:47.440 --> 5:39:47.900  
Sam Evans  
OK.

5:39:47.360 --> 5:39:48.90  
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS  
Sorry.
Sam Evans
Let me try one more thing.

And we'll see.

Sam Evans
How about now?

Sure. OK, well.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Very.

That's better. Better still, you're gonna have to lead us through this, cause you can't read the words. We can see the graphic. Let's let me just Orient you to what this is. This is a ranking of the wilderness inventory areas. The North Carolina Mountain treasure areas against all inventoried roadless areas in the country by a composite of wild and values. That includes biodiversity antagonist, lack of fragmentation.

Factors like that the these these lines that you see vertical lines, that Gray line is the 90th percentile for all inventory roadless areas in the country. The dashed red line is the 95th percentile. So every dot you see to the right of these lines represents a North Carolina Mountain treasure area that by these wildland conservation value metrics ranks in the top 10% of of areas.

In the entire country. And so you know the the names that you'll see are familiar. Snowbird teleco ball places that we're gonna talk about in more detail. I'm sure in this, in this hour to squidy bald alarka, Laurel, the Bald Mountains. Panther Town, Daniel Ridge, Cedar, Rock mountain. These are, you know, these are really important places to to the folks who are who are interested in this discussion today. So I'll stop sharing for now. But I just wanted to.

Just to get a sense of the relative conservation value of these areas on the national context, these are not just locally important places. They are nationally significant places.
Sam Evans
Umm.

Alright.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That did show that didn't think that point. Thank you for showing that.

Sam Evans
So you know again, yeah, I think the there are a couple of binaries that we need to talk about and I was getting at this a little bit earlier this sort of the binary between whether and area gets recommended for wilderness or not. And then there's the separate question of whether it's in a suitable management manager that's suitable for timber production or not.

And the the reason that this matters so much is because in the Old Forest plan, a lot of these areas were sort of lumped into the suitable base. These were the the four service in the east did a pretty famously bad job of the rare and rare two inventories, a lot of really high quality undeveloped areas were left out of the protections of the roadless rule. And so under the current plan, we've had projects proposed in these areas again and again and again. And we fight over them again.

Again. So they're talking about rotational style harvest proposed in these areas, not because the there's a site specific need, but because that's just what they're prescribed, they're scheduled for at at the plan level. Those kinds of proposals have really caused a lot of conflict and you know the you can even, you can probably remember the bumper stickers and the T-shirts don't cut bluff don't cut, but Big Ivy. These should be pretty important reminders of how how willing people are to fight for these places because they're special and we're not talking about again.

We're not just talking about areas that people wanna advance for wilderness recommendation. We're just talking about places with really special values that exist on the ground.

The same the history is is repeating itself in this plan. So let's talks about some numbers, about 100,000 acres of these wilderness inventory areas are mapped into the suitable base in the new plan. And as Josh mentioned, just a few minutes ago.
So this is essentially all the air hits that were kind of could they go either way, right? Like every acre that could have gone either way, it could have been protected or not the the Forest Service has defaulted into suitable management and and we know what happens when that, you know, again like the time and time again Rd road construction timber harvest gets proposed in these areas and time and time again they cause conflict.

I guess I would point back to the beginning of the day when James mentioned that, you know, the goal here was to try to hit 80 to 90% consensus in the plan and you all think you got there and I guess measured by acres.

I guess I agree. You know fewer than 20% of the acres on the forest appear to be at a very high risk of conflict.

But that's at least 1/5 of the of the plans suitable base, and the projects in that in that in that portion of the forest are gonna require 90% or more of our time and conflict resolution in the future.

So when the plan goes back for another look.

Where these wilderness cemetery areas get allocated is one of the key questions that you are gonna have to handle.

Let's see. I I really wanna be able to show you another.

And Sam, I'm gonna ask you to to share.

You could segment your comments so that we get some other voices in your comments.

Are there is no there is.
Sure. Yeah. I mean, this is a lot. There's a lot of context here and there are some and I apologize for that. But you know I think the.

Yeah, I'm. I'm happy.

There's some good breaking points between your points. Maybe we can share the airtime a little bit rather than you doing all years at work. I'm happy to do that. Let me share one more screen so I can give you sort of a visual sense of what this looks like.

OK.

And then I'll see the floor.

So hopefully y'all can see this in just a moment.

So everywhere you see hashmarks or places that there that you know that we are recommending these wilderness inventory areas that we are recommending for protective unsuitable management that are in the matrix and and interface management areas right here you're looking at the Nantahala District and I'll Scroll down.

Again here to the Piska district, you can see there's quite a bit of land that is at issue here and and these two districts are where the bulk of these conflict areas are are located, but but the the issue repeats in other areas as well. And again these are just like these two areas are sort of the heart and soul of recreational use and the Nahla and fiscal National Forest. And I just wanted there to be a sort of visual sense of just what we're talking about here.
Reflection or what? One question. One of The Wanted to ask. You had mentioned that the in the past there was a.

5:46:37.480 --> 5:46:41.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Rotational aspect of projects being proposed.

5:46:42.580 --> 5:46:45.510
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And that that wasn't acceptable.

5:46:46.250 --> 5:46:51.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, and you said they weren't based on specific specific, you know need?

5:46:52.490 --> 5:46:58.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So if if projects were proposed based on specific need, would would that be acceptable?

5:47:0.420 --> 5:47:19.660
Sam Evans
IT projects are going to be proposed based on specific need, then the areas certainly don't need to be in the matrix and interface categories. The difference between matrix and interface and other categories like ecological interest area are special interest area is that the former default into rotational harvest and the latter are managed for site specific needs.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good. Thank you. Thanks for clarifying that, Sam.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Sam will come back to you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How about, UM, Dale, are you there with Kern County?

5:47:33.170 --> 5:47:33.780
c465efe9-a254-46dc-bca8-05bc99214616
I am.

5:47:35.970 --> 5:47:37.150
c465efe9-a254-46dc-bca8-05bc99214616
Umm.

5:47:38.680 --> 5:47:45.750
c465efe9-a254-46dc-bca8-05bc99214616
I want to talk about Graham County and the land based led, the land that probably that we have here.
Uh, in 1905, when the four service was being created, the mission was to sustain a healthy, diverse and productive forest and grasslands for present and future generations.

Wilderness designations or the Office of Productive.

Graham County, from 2010 to 2020, lost 10% of its population. Our largest employer closed, putting 400 people out of work.

We have approximately 100 and 22,000 acres of Forest Service land here. 68% of our entire county, about 44,000 acres of that property, currently has some designation that excludes timber harvest. If the current plan is implemented, that IBRIDGE will increase to around 52,000 acres or approximately 43% of the total acreage of our county.

Over the Forest Service approach in the county.

So what we don't understand going forward is what about that other 70,000 acres or are we gonna be able to have a reasonable timber harvest on that? Where will we every few years see more and more acreage chipped away?

As a result of all these things.

We are seeing a tremendous loss of habitat for game animals, other animals, species within the forest.

It's estimated that less than 1% of the forest is is considered habitat for minimal wildlife sustenance. We need at least 5%. Ideally, we would want 10 to 11%. You can hunt fish, do all these things in a wilderness area, but to designate more and more acreage into a wilderness area just further reduces the amount of habitat that some of these species need to survive.
For Graham Piani, it's not just those issues, but it's job creation, it's the ability for people to support their families and their livelihoods.

You know, we wanted to see in this plan some forest restoration front to repair damage from clear cuts of, you know, from decades ago. We're good stands of hardwood timber were slashed left to lay on the ground and rock and replaced with white pine seedlings.

A tree that literally has no value as a timber product, and so you know, we are staunchly opposed to any more additional wilderness area. And in Graham County, because of these things, you know, we're trying to survive over here. And the not having the ability to have timber harvest it, it impacts our economy, it it impacts monies that go to our schools etcetera.

We would like to see something in this plan that says, you know, if you're gonna take all this acreage and set it aside to where we can't have timber harvest, give us a plan going forward on the rest of those acreage so that we can plan for our future based on some of these changes and some of this timber harvest that we could have.

We're just getting choked out.

We're we're just getting choked out.

You hear you?
That's all I have.

Thank you.

Thank you, Dale. I appreciate that. Thank you.

OK, let's see. I've got Chris Sacco in the queue.

Hi there. Thanks so much. Yeah, I'm here representing myself, but I also do a lot of work with a number of groups in the area, including app later, Wildlife Refuge.

I'm I'm here mostly today or at this this section in the meeting. Anyway to advocate for.

Wildlife and to encourage in these interface areas in the matrix areas that then we've talked about.

I think it's really important that we are clear on on.

And those areas in in the sorts of uses that are permitted to go forward in them.

And I think.

Sure.

It's just a second. We've got some interference. Chris. Hold on just one second. We've got some interference. Holly. Holly, do you have your button muted? Muted, I think.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And might be coming. There we go. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sorry, Chris, would you back up just a little?

Christopher Sacco
No, no, you're fine, absolutely.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Go ahead.

Christopher Sacco
Yep, sorry about that.

Christopher Sacco
At any rate.

Christopher Sacco
Again, I think that.

Christopher Sacco
Making sure that the designations are appropriate to the to the areas, either matrix or interface or wilderness or whatever, we end up with.

Christopher Sacco
In.

Christopher Sacco
Coordinating with people who are.

Christopher Sacco
Knowledgeable about this sort of wildlife that use those areas.

Christopher Sacco
Is really critical, so I've done some work with Fish and Wildlife my.
Christopher Sacco
My background is in wildlife management.

Christopher Sacco
Umm, you know different uses or compatible with different sort of wildlife and just making sure that.

Christopher Sacco
Those designations aren't lined up with the sorts of wildlife, particularly the endangered and critical.

Christopher Sacco
Everything dangered wildlife and have those areas, so that's all I just wanted to add my two cents. But yeah, I do encourage continued collaboration with other other organizations, nonprofits and.

Christopher Sacco
State and in federal wildlife organizations to to make her designations are appropriate for this species that.

Christopher Sacco
Have it those. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Chris.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, let's hear from David Reed.

David Reid
Yeah, hi. Thanks, Rick. David Reed here with the Sierra Club.

David Reid
I just wanted to speak to the the process of achieving the highest and best use for the remaining wild areas on the Piska nantahala, whether that be an official wilderness recommendation or, as we've heard, placing lands that have wilderness characteristics and wildlands characteristics and other ecological characteristics in the right.

David Reid
Uh protective category.
I want to zoom out a little bit.

When I was reviewing some of the decisions regarding recommended wilderness.

I know in the context of specifically the eastern United States, and how rare.

Areas that that qualify for wilderness are as recognized by the 1975 Eastern Wilderness Act.

And so I just want to encourage.

You and the Forest Service to take another look at these lands and your recommendations.

Through that lens of of how rare this habitat is and how rare these designations are, and the lands that qualify in the eastern United States within driving distance of millions of millions of people.

I know that there can be a management challenge when you designate wilderness.

Umm, but I think that could be managed. I also think if I've heard the concern that there can be economic benefits associated with that as well to local communities.

I know that may not be the complete answer.
But I just think that with the recommendations that came out in the.

And the final EIS and alternative E, which we felt in the club fell short of what qualified for recommendations.

Umm.

That they deserve another look.

Especially regarding the precedent set in the eastern United States, was minimizes the importance of the sites and sounds, for example argument.

So just to clarify our saying that the sites and sound argument.

The pursuing that criteria would.

By default cause less wilderness to wilderness areas to be eligible for.

I that been reading some of the rationales for recommending or not recommending wilderness, it seems like that in multiple cases you know the sights and sounds were used, which in people that have been in these areas really have relayed the remarkable quality of the ruggedness and the and the Backcountry experience of these areas. And so I just think that that deserves another look and and that we think that my result.

And recommendations of some areas that were left out.
David Reid
Umm. And I just wanted to also second the concern about the wilderness inventory areas that I believe Siam.

David Reid
Referred to that that is extremely important to our group and that if if we wanna plan that is.

David Reid
Can be implemented by minimizing conflict in addition to preserving.

David Reid
The areas that have high quality.

David Reid
Habitat and and and have old growth and have a lot of the state natural heritage areas where there's an intersectionality about some of these issues that would seem to point in the direction of a of a resolution or remedy.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thank you, David, and thanks for clarifying that as well.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right, so we got a few few hands here. Hugh Berlin.

Hugh Irwin
Hi you are when wilderness is society. You know the wilderness, the wilderness inventory areas do represent not only priorities within, you know, a large number of the commenters and objectors on non holidays can forest plan. But you know objectively, you know, represent extremely important.

Hugh Irwin
Areas for conservation priorities and you know the uh, the graph that uh sound showed earlier was of the overall conservation priority, but even more stunning is the component of biodiversity importance. These areas are the very top nationwide about biodiversity importance and you know, we don't feel that that was taken into account in the allocations.
Hugh Irwin
In the plan and.

Hugh Irwin
Ohh, you know, we'll get it tomorrow in the discussion on NRV and other issues and all growth will get into some of the issues that we feel like the forest plan or the the EIS didn't adequately analyze. But you know these areas include the wilderness inventory areas include a lot of the state natural areas. They include a lot of the.

Hugh Irwin
Remaining existing old growth, so they're extremely important for a wide range of areas and putting these areas into matrix and interface.

Hugh Irwin
Ohh, you know is we don't feel as a proper balancing of the values of these very important areas.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks, Hugh.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Capture that last thought he's writing.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thank you. So back to Megan.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

Megan N. Sutton
I all Megan Sutton, representing the Nantahala Pisgah Forest partnership. I wanted to just kind of come back to the recommendations that we made.

Megan N. Sutton
As a group of a large constituency of very diverse interests.

Megan N. Sutton
Umm, what we did was we made management area allocation recommendations and we use that as the necessary glue to hold all of these issues that are intention together.
Megan N. Sutton
We felt like the land allocations that we recommended provided for the space to meet all of the goals, member interest. So the things that you hear about from some wanting more of this and from others wanting more of that, we felt like coming to a balanced land allocations on everything from young forests to wilderness to eligible wild and scenic rivers.

Megan N. Sutton
Umm would really provide that glue to guide the development of broadly supported project.

Megan N. Sutton
And for us, this means that you know these these land allocations will make implementation of the plan more efficient and less contentious.

Megan N. Sutton
And again, I know I've said this a number of times this morning that you know our real.

Megan N. Sutton
The crux of the objection from the Tannehill Pisgah Forest Partnership is about resolving conflict, and we feel like land allocations is a great way to do that. So I would advise you on.

Megan N. Sutton
To take a look at what we've provided, because we have wrestled it out on recommended wilderness, we have wrestled it out on, you know, all of these different topics on, you know the contentious areas, the wilderness inventory areas and what to do with those and.

Megan N. Sutton
Between a broad you know a broad array of represented groups, we've been able to come up with something collectively that covers the National Forest wall to wall. So I would just encourage you to think about one way to to resolve the differing opinions that you're hearing today is to take to go back and to take a look at that.

Megan N. Sutton
Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It's Megan and quick question is just for here.
Got, you know, a lot of thoughts swirling, hearing a lot of things. Could you just contrast what you've provided with alternative eat?

Sure. So I mean, so I can tell you I can't tell you all of it because I'm just like your ports plan. I'm looking through, you know, flipping through 100 pages right here, trying to summarize it real quick. But I can tell you that the areas that you mentioned as.

A potential remedy for wilderness. The specific areas that you noted, our areas within our the partnerships agreements. Now what we have that you all don't have a way to do in the forest plan is we have just like you have two tiers of objectives. We have two tiers of agreements around. Some of these designation areas. So we have a tier one.

Of certain places that you know, we collectively support moving forward for recommended wilderness when the plan is finalized and we have a tier two which means certain metrics have to be met and some of those metrics.

We go into our for example, there may need to be a fire use management plan in place so that we can do prescribed burning in that area or.

Providing quality deer and Turkey habitat in or near Clay County is one of the one of the agreements when timber harvest is within Tier 2 levels forest wide. So there's a lot of nuance and that went into providing these and we recognize that the forest plan can't do that right. You either recommend it as wilderness or you don't. So what we as a partnership have kind of made.

And agreement to you is this list of places being recommended for wilderness, but that they would not have the broad support of the group until certain measures are met for some places and in other places they're already have unconditionally those. Those things can move forward. So those that's one piece. And then I would say each.

Of the wilderness inventory areas is gonna have a different answer. You know some it's gonna be no. We're gonna move it to to ecological interest area. Some is gonna be like, no, it can stay here. So it's each one is different. So I can't really summarize that very succinctly.
But that well, things going for going over that, that it's helpful just to hear more. So when you go back and look at that that'll help kind of keep me in. So thank you, Megan.

Sam Evans
Rick, if I may, the maps series that I had flashed on the screen briefly and that we shared with y'all yesterday evening, those maps do exactly what you asked. They compare the partnership recommendations with.

Sam Evans
The with the the forest services. Alternatively, and you know, we've also submitted the the partnership rather submitted those same maps in GIS and spatial data so that they can be players can be toggled around anyway that you'd like.

Pretty good. Yeah. Thank you, Sam. So how about this? How about will harlins in the queue, but if we from here from will and then we go back to Sam.

For more of what you've come prepared to talk about.

Thanks. I just wanted to add that these wilderness inventory areas, these mountain treasures, these are the exact same priority conservation areas that the iheart Piska coalition supports. And so these are the same areas that 34,000 public comments support. So if you're looking for places for broad public support, these are the places. These are the most important places that the public is fighting to protect and that's why they were outside.

The Forest Service door yesterday and they will keep coming to advocate to protect those places. So these are the most important recreation and conservation areas that the public wants to see protected.

I think you will.

OK, back to Sam and then we'll go to John Kocher again.
Sam Evans
I'll try to be quick to this time and they're just a couple of different things that I want to take a run at. And again, I just want to make sure that we are keeping separate in all of our minds. You know, it's sort of there's, there's these, there are a lot of builders, inventory areas that have defaulted into matrix and interface that opt to be in bad country that ought to be an ecological interest area or special interest area that have really special characteristics that would be degraded by the applications rotational harvest.

Sam Evans
And what I wanna get to there is that this kind of comes back to a point Dale was making of Implementability.

Sam Evans
How do we, you know, if we're gonna have protected areas, and we're gonna have an unprotected areas. How do we make sure that ultimately we get a plan that is implementable and then we get something done with and I know that the Forest Service wants to increase the pace and scale, especially if young forest creation on the inhaled piska.

Sam Evans
But but I wanna make sure everybody realizes that all the plan alternatives, including the old plan, the no action alternative have about the same objectives for regeneration harvest, right. We talked a lot about we need to increase the pace and scale with these new action alternatives. But the old plan has the same objectives practically speaking as the new plan.

Sam Evans
But of course, the old plan has been hard to implement. The EIS assumes, rightly, that if we keep the old plan, we are going to keep implementing it poorly. And you know something like 650 acres a year. So why, why do we think that the new plan is going to be so much more successful? You know, I think that requires a really hard look in the mirror at why we've been unsuccessful under the old plan and every project we see has these poison pills and every time.

Sam Evans
It is rotational harvest proposed in a wilderness inventory area, proposed an existing old growth and proposed in natural heritage natural areas. That's it. Those are the things that slow projects down. Those are the reasons that the existing plan has been fairly well unimplementable.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Take a pause.
Sam Evans

If we want to fix the problems, if we want to get closer to full implementation, we wanna have a consistent and steady flow of timber and young forest habitats. Fixing the allocations is the way to do it. It also fixes what is essentially an apples to oranges problem in which right now you say, well, we can't implement our old plan, but we'll get 100% in our new plan with no explanation. I just want to make sure that we kind of flag that and I think given the time on the clock, sorry.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Take a pause. Just. I just want to make sure. Are you good with that? Do you have any follow up questions for Sam's last point?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

I'm following. I'm following up. Yeah, OK.

Sam Evans

And given the time on the clock and also you know, I think several people who have talked already have kind of already gotten into the the questions about wilderness recommendation and that is again like a separate issue, but it's one that we need to cover in this hour. And I have just something that I think will help us make it concrete. And so real quickly I'll show what I've got here. There are a couple of areas that have come up again and again it's just being real head scratchers.

Sam Evans

And the Forest Service is wilderness evaluation.

Sam Evans

And these are test booty, bald and the blacks, the Black Mountains. And when when you look at the at the long range, views from Tusk, woody, bald here.

Sam Evans

What you're not seeing is is a lot of signs of human development, a lot of sites and sounds. These are really typical pictures of what it's like to be on the rim trail.

Sam Evans

And which kind of encompasses this bowl of mountains in the test would be bowled area you all have enforced y'all have these pictures. We share them with you yesterday. This is a view to the South from the rim trail that I'd like you all to take a special note of, which I'll mention again here in a moment.

Sam Evans

Same with the Black Mountains. You know, the typical view from the Black Mountains is something that
should not be missed in a lifetime. The Black Mountain Crest is just an incredible experience for whether you are a trained cologist or just a lay person who is hiking. There will be something memorable and magical for you on the Crest, and there are occasional views to the east from the blacks like this. This is probably the most intrusive example of sights and sounds.

Sam Evans
Yeah, from the blacks, this is looking north upstream to the east to where the golf course is.

Sam Evans
But these are pretty minimal intrusions.

6:11:15.720 --> 6:11:47.210
Sam Evans
And I'll give one to contrast this with this is the view from the Balts which the Forest Service has recommended as wilderness, and you can see that the rural, pastoral agricultural development in this area is quite a bit more intrusive than what you than what you just saw. So I'm hoping that that helps makes the next conversation more concrete. I'm not. I'm gonna try not to dominate the airwaves here, but I just want to make sure that that we have something images in mind to kind of anchor this next discussion.

6:11:47.560 --> 6:12:12.700
Sam Evans
Yeah, the the forest services evaluations of these areas and the reasons for rejecting them for, for wilderness recommendation, do not track with those of us who have spent time in the area. And we don't think they could have been written by people who have spent time in those areas. And we think that they were based primarily on desktop analysis and conjecture based on mapping.

Sam Evans
And we.

Sam Evans
At yeah, I I think what I would leave you all with on on that point is that if if the Forest Service doesn't have the direct first hand experience.

6:12:24.40 --> 6:12:35.600
Sam Evans
To be able to evaluate these areas, it needs to trust and have the humility to trust the experiences and the information presented by members of the public who know them the best. And I've heard from a lot of them today with craggy.

Sam Evans
And I'm, you know, we're showing you pictures of some of these places to. But but I would really encourage you to to, to take another hard look at all the data and information submitted by members of
the public explaining why these areas are so special before dismissing them. And one more very short point before I go. And David Reed made this very eloquently before. But I think as a lawyer in the room, I need to make it to the sites and sounds justifications, even if they were accurate.

Sam Evans
Would not be a basis for excluding these areas. Congress in the Eastern Business Areas Act and in a number of other statutes, contemporaneous and more recent have told the Forest Service that it is appropriate to designate areas right up to the edge of wilderness. The Ewa designated Bristol Cliffs which overlooks the town of Bristol in Vermont, designated the Presidential Range Dry River Area, which is just a stones throw from I93.

6:13:36.910 --> 6:14:5.440
Sam Evans
The Mount Rose Wilderness overlooks the casinos in Vegas. These are the wilderness. I don't think the Forest Service wants to live with interpretation of the Wilderness Act that requires it to care or prevent degradation of wilderness values by exterior sites and sounds. This is something that it's been it's been repudiated as clearly as possible by Congress. And the Eastern Winners Act one more time. The Congress told the Forest Service.

6:14:6.80 --> 6:14:32.710
Sam Evans
To look at the areas that it had designated to find and recommend it, more areas like that, the areas that we've that we've recommended in this process are far, far more qualified than some of the areas that Congress has already recommended. These are not close calls, they're not marginal, they are really special. And and again, if you all don't have the first hand experience to be able to recognize that, please trust those of us who do.

6:14:34.400 --> 6:14:35.30
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks Dan.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Any reflection for?

6:14:46.970 --> 6:14:48.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Think I’m looking my notes here.

6:14:59.750 --> 6:15:2.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So the part part of the thinking is if.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But the sights and sounds was a primary factor.
And excluding areas from analysis.

So yeah, so any any more about that?

It was a primary factor in not recommending areas that made it into the analysis.

Just to clarify, but yes.

There are some similar factors would include a rejection of areas for a perceived lack of naturalness because they weren't, because only small portions of them were in old growth condition.

Rationales like that, and I think we don't have the time I would, I'd be happy to discuss more like all those rationales and why for each of those areas and and why we don't think that they're appropriately applied.

And but I sort of I picked what is I think the easiest examples, the easiest to see in pictures for this.

Because we simply don't have, you know, the the time that that would take here.

Thank you. Appreciate the help.
Uh, yeah. If if I could interject it since, uh, since you asked that specific question, I want to call out one other factor, which was proximity to state lines. That's certainly the case for the overflow Wilderness study area. That is, of course, already recognized by Congress, but it's still not recognized by the Forest Service.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
We've identified that if you go across the state line with suitable areas in Georgia, there's thousands of acres across the state line that would put it over the, I would suggest rather arbitrary 5000 acre.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Cut off and we would very much encourage you in the Chattooga watershed, which as you know covers portions of three states to look across the state line from North Carolina into Georgia concerning that particular wilderness study area.

Dispatch, NCNF01-FS
Very good. Thank you, Nicole. Good addition. OK, so we're we're narrowing in on the time for this particular topic and before break. But Nick by Miller a year in the queue.

Nick Biemiller
Yeah. Thank you. So I apologize in advance. I mentioned this at the beginning of the call, but I'm I'm sick right now with the kovid. So certainly not on my a game, but I'll give it my best shot.

Nick Biemiller
And hopefully I'll be feeling better tomorrow for the next couple days.

Nick Biemiller
So I just want to, I guess the highlight that I don't think there is consensus among a broad group of stakeholders with how to handle these wilderness inventory areas and mountain treasures that have been discussed. And I think that's evident if you look at the way that the partnership broke out, their allocations and their comments were some areas that were under these willingness inventory areas were allocated towards more restrictive land use designations such as recommended wilderness and others.

Nick Biemiller
We're not. We're element allocated towards matrix or Backcountry areas that allowed for more active force management. So I think as you hearing.
Nick Biemiller
From the rest of the group here today about the importance of these WIA areas like, it's important to note that they represent a relatively large portion of the forest and that I don't think there is universal consensus about how to treat them, so might make sense to put towards recommended wilderness and more restrictive uses, but others would not so.

Nick Biemiller
Again, to Megan's point, I think the partnerships recommendation provides pretty good perspective of how things were broken up by that collaborative group.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Nick, and hope you feel better, yeah.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Could go. Hope it goes quick. So I have a Dale, David Reed and John Cocksure. Hands still up. Are these new comments.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Or did you just not take your hand down?

John Culclasure
Yeah. Hey, thanks. Yeah. I just wanna go on live here. I do wanna agree with Sam. I think it is important to look. Listen to people that know the know certain areas and you know I think saying a lot of folks live in Asheville and the fur debunked county residents on their county resolutions. But I'll just draw your attention to I think the 10 plus county resolutions that basically adamantly opposed restrictive designations and supported wildlife habitat and supportive management flexibility across the poorest. So I think I'm per the 2012 playing a role I think it's supposed to take into account the you know.

John Culclasure
You know the positions of the counties, so just refer you to all those resolutions that are still standing to the state as I'm aware. And I'd also like to point out that, you know, in this forest memory vision started, the biggest buzzwords were wildlife and habitat and restoration. And I think that carries forward to today. I've only heard while I've mentioned I think twice now. But you know, we've got climate change
we're facing, we're facing invasive species. There's a whole host of ecological threats we're dealing with and to.

John Culclasure
You know, put on these restrictive designations that are gonna handcuff the Forest Service and resource managers and their ability to get in there and help us stand or help wildlife. I mean, it's just it's pretty short sighted. So I don't know how in one hand post can talk about restoration, red spruce, hemlock, acidification of streams, you know, you name it, how can you care about the ecological integrity in these areas if you're going to continue to handicap that, the management capabilities of them? And in particularly when we're losing young forest species?

John Culclasure
Left and left and right so I don't. I disagree with the rotational the the comments about rotational concept of timber harvest and and it's because of these management allocations that that's why we have this conflict. We've seen time and time again when projects are proposed and quote from country areas, the project in North Mills River about 10-15 years ago comments were it send the they're opposed because it's in a view scope of the Blue Ridge Parkway it's a front country high recreation area so there's basically little areas on the forest that aren't gonna get opposed from management.

John Culclasure
For one reason, under the sun at at some point and I'll even draw you to comments that you know I've seen written before I said, hey, this is the management area, hey or whatever it is where it's supposed to have 8%, you know for us well, there have been formal comments written over and over again that say even though it's the goal is 8% young forest, that's just the goal, even if it has zero, that's OK. It's consistent with the plan. So I think some of that stuff is a good talking point. But when it comes to the project level analysis, every single projects highly scrutinized and gonna be opposed for one reason under the sun. So.

John Culclasure
I'm just encourage you to to to think about these these designations seriously, and we all know that wilderness and wilderness study are designations are really a politicized issue, and people are gonna be lobbying for them regardless of what the Forest Service recommends. And that's why some of these wilderness areas that Sam pointed out are designated when they, you know, may not need the sound solitude test or the minimum maker saying because they're they're largely a political decision at the end of the day. So again, just the final comment there would be also.

John Culclasure
Sometimes we their comments earlier pit in quote the recreational use against you know that recreational use is not compatible with management. We know that's not that's the incorrect you know the management of forest can help you through stewardship contract and other things can help bring a lot of resources to the forests that need management can help provide roads for access for sportsmen
and for mountain bikers for everybody else. For equestrians and hunters and anglers or recreation is too. So the one pair of body and to recreation versus management.

John Culclasure
That's a false dichotomy. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, John. And you mentioned the 10 county resolutions. Did, did you wanna say anymore about that?

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
OK.

John Culclasure
Sure. I mean, I think a lot of people on this call are aware of them. I think most counties Dale could probably talk to Grand counties. You know, a lot of them are actually, they're probably painted a negative light. But I think they want from Henderson County has written really well. It talks about the need for sustainable resources that support sustainable recreation to support mountain biking, the supported questions to think long term, think about ecological health, think about watershed restoration, watershed needs. But they basically said, hey, we support management flexibility. We've been managing these for us for a long time.

6:23:34.660 --> 6:23:51.500
John Culclasure
And we want to continue the way they are and we're we're concerned about, designations are gonna limit management capabilities and also potentially bring in additional visitors, which are gonna have a higher resource impact on the forest, which you know that's kind of the double edged sword with wilderness or scenic areas or other areas you might care about.

6:23:54.120 --> 6:23:55.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thanks for calling that in, John.

6:23:56.710 --> 6:23:59.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, we got 2 two more.

6:24:0.960 --> 6:24:13.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Boy, oh, we got more than two more. We've got about 5 minutes here before going to take a break. And David, you've been in the queue for quite some time, but you had something to say before. Do you have something in addition?
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Been offered by all the folks here.

6:24:15.570 --> 6:24:15.990
David Reid
No.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

David Reid
No, I don't show my hand being up, so maybe there's something stuck, but.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank. Thank you. How about Nicole and then Josh?

6:24:29.840 --> 6:24:46.10
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Yeah, sure, Rick. I know in your former position as Sumter, Francis, Marion Sumter, National Forest, you're pretty familiar with the Alt Rock Wilderness area as part of the upstate South Carolina Wilderness area and.

6:24:47.310 --> 6:24:53.40
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Just to dive down to one of the specifics, that's also supported in the partnership recommendation Ellicott Rock West.

6:24:53.520 --> 6:25:12.50
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
UM, making it look a little more closely at that and added it on to the existing wilderness area. We know that the Ellicott Rock Wilderness gets a high degree of recreation use and as as the protected node as it were at towards the top of the Chattooga River, which is also under tremendous pressure.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
We need the extra acreage that has been identified as a wilderness immaterial inventory area to go ahead and be carried forward and added to the Ellicott Rock Wilderness to boost its resiliency into the future.

6:25:36.80 --> 6:25:40.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So that the addition would help take some of the pressure off the existing wateriness the additional.
Traditional wilderness would help spread the use out.

Well, certainly that's one thing and add resiliency to the overall ecosystem, which as we know is a biological hotspot.

Thank you, Nicole.

All right. Thanks, Nicole. Josh Kelly.

Ohh yeah, I just wanted to address a couple things. One is the tenancy throughout this process for.

Wilderness designation to be used as a sort of a binary. It's either you know, designate wilderness or manage the forest, and I I think for the most part the places that are appropriate for wilderness designation are not appropriate for heavy timber management. And I think I think knowledgeable people know that. I think the general public may not a lot of times.

I also also think to the point that you know.

Umm, I I heard some of the speakers wondering about, well, where we'll timber harvest occur when there's always going to be some people that don't like timber harvest.

Umm. And I think sometimes when we talk about a public plan management, we confuse unanimity.

Umm, that we confuse unanimity for, you know, the broadest possible consensus consensus does not necessarily mean unanimity. And you're not gonna find unanimity in the public at large. I do think that there are proposals on the table, including the one by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership that deal with these thorny issues and come out in a place where everybody can get what they need. And I do think that the forest services alternative E went too far in One Direction.
With land allocations in particular and that's why you have so many objectors, quite frankly, to this forest plan.

And so I just would like folks both inside the Forest Service and outside not to get stuck on some of these troops about needing unanimity to do management or to designate or needing.

You know, needing the most purest version of consensus to move forward. I do think that there are a lot of people who have done a lot of really good fake work on this plan and that we have a good we're in a good place socially to move forward with all sorts of things including timber harvest, including young forest wildlife habitat creation, including restoration, including designations, including rare species, reintroductions, all sorts of things that we can do, including recreation management. So just wanna sound a little bit of a positive note there.

Alright. Thank you, Josh. And that might be a good place to stop for a break. Sam, I recognize your hand is still up or no, it's not anymore.

So let's do take a 15 minute break and then come back and we'll we'll address special interest areas next. Sound good.

Sounds good. And it is 3:00 o'clock. So we'll we convene at 3:15.

See you then.

Alright.

We're back home. Yep. Can you hear us?

So give us a thumbs up. Good. OK. OK.
Dispatch, NCNCF01-FS
It's showing at the top. No camera, no money.

This guy? Yeah, that's because the power is. I got you. I got. I just notice that. But welcome back, everybody. And we're gonna move into.

More about uh land allocations with our.

North Carolina Natural Heritage areas and really appreciate everything people have been putting in the room all day, and especially in the last hour, a lot, a lot of information to work through and move through and I was ready for I was ready for a break. It's I'm really work on and intent on listening and sometimes that doesn't give me an opportunity to process too much. So appreciate.

People will be in be impatient while I do that and and sometimes I've gotta go back back over my notes.

But one one thing I wanted to mention too is.

When when we're working through these things, you know?

I really want to hear.

Your paths, forward solutions and I know some of these can be emotional issues. You know, we feel deep in our heart and as I said earlier, I think I think if and maybe I didn't say it as well, say it again as I know, I know I care. I know we care and everybody here is because they care about our, our resources, our natural resources.

And and then us us as far as public service.
And so that's why I say is, you know, I know that you care. We care and that's why I say we're boy. We're we're in. There's a lot of agreement there. You know, we're working out some details and everything. So one thing I think is important is you know as we work through these.

Is on.

Really really having that that respect is one of one to hear, one to listen. So as far as speculating whether or not we've we've done our due diligence, whether or not we've been out there actually and seeing what we've seen or done thorough analysis, I you know.

I wanna hear. I wanna hear the solutions. I want to hear the things going forward and not not.

Make making maybe something that sounds judgmental on on our folks that are out there that are less than less than through the brush, just like you all are and and trying to make a difference every day with what they do so.

To this one. To put that into the room.

For for we're we're, we're leaning forward. We're together more than we're different and we're we're figuring this stuff out and there's a lot to navigate when we're talking about public Land Management. So thank you. Thank you for that.

All right, so you want to set the stage for the this next set of topics, we'll just just a half an hour allocated to special interest areas. So the natural heritage areas.
Allstate Natural Heritage Area should be excluded from the timber base. Protect all natural heritage areas.

6:47:40.940 --> 6:47:51.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The ones that are related rated as exceptional should be added to the special Interest area management area. The ones rated is very high and high should not be mapped as suitable.

6:47:52.280 --> 6:47:54.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
What should be moved to ecological interest areas?

6:47:56.0 --> 6:48:15.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Clarify the desired condition to explain that heritage areas unique ecological characteristic to be maintained or restored included not only the element occurrences, but also exempt natural communities as described by the North Carolina Natural Heritage Program.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then add standards that coordination with HP must occur before any stands where the natural heritage areas are prescribed for treatment.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The boundaries are verified and the coordination is intended to determine how best to maintain the rare and unique ecological characteristics of.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The Natural heritage area.

6:48:43.450 --> 6:48:54.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I understand many of you would like to see more protections of the state natural heritage areas in the forest plan and a more robust analysis of the effects to the state natural heritage.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Natural areas.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Wanted to hear more about that and you know, so maybe a one question that kick things off is is there a
difference in analyzing the effects to rare species and rare habitats compared to analyzing the effects of state natural heritage areas? And if you could help me understand that that difference.

So Ben and Josh's hands are up. I don't know if they, if you intend to sort of address what Rick is posing or not.

Ben Prater
Well, I'm.

Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I see. And then go ahead, Josh.

Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
No, that's you, Ben. I'm. I'm setting my time to you right now.

Ben Prater
Sounds good. Well, thank you both. I'll. I'll try to address that question. But I thought to start, I'd kick us off a little bit of context as well. Good afternoon. My name is Ben Prater. I'm the Southeast program director for Defenders of wildlife and want to outline our concerns regarding the protection of biodiversity and the plan under the National Forest Management Act. Plans must provide for the diversity of plant animal communities.

Ben Prater
And under the planning rule, plan, components must include must be included that maintain or restore ecological integrity. The overarching obligations here in the plan are are the development or to restore ecological sustainability and biological diversity, and the mechanisms to do this involves both a coarse filter and a fine filter approach. In other words, habitat and a species approach to evaluate the effects of the plan. One of the tenants of Conservation biology is that the most important step in maintaining biodiversity.

Ben Prater
Is to protect areas where species are known to occur there. Existing habitats most, and many of these habitats on the piston and ihala are known. The North County Natural heritage areas as identified, delineated and monitored by the cloud Natural Heritage Program represent these areas. These reservoirs provide diversity harbor 70% of the known locations for rare species on the forest. So Rick, maybe that gets at your question.

Ben Prater
The plan simply does not go far enough to recognize and protect the values of these habitats.
Ben Prater
I continue to be frustrated that the fire service erroneously has reduced the argument about the need to
protect these places around. One of recognizing a state designation rather than simply knowing that
these areas in effect are the best available scientific information that should be used to guide the
plan.

Ben Prater
Uh, the fire service failed to fully utilize the natural Heritage areas inventory to inform the coarse, coarse
filter and did not adequately assess the trade-offs for managing 10s of thousands of acres of biodiversity
hotspots with rotational silver culture. This is especially egregious considering that the significant
majority of species of conservation concern of which in this plan there are hundreds associated with
these valuable habitats, are dispersal limited and vulnerable to ground disturbing activities.

Ben Prater
Shockingly, none of the terrestrial species within the natural heritage areas currently allocated to matrix
and interface are associated or dependent on young forests, and 100% of the aquatic species are
sensitive to sedimentation and point source pollution.

Ben Prater
Therefore, the logical and obvious remedy is to ensure that all natural heritage areas that are rated as
exceptional, very high and high are allocated to a protected designation out of the suitable base, such as
ecological interest areas, to ensure these biodiversity values are protected. This constitutes over 100
areas totaling around 400.

Ben Prater
Pursuing.

Ben Prater
44,888 acres.

Ben Prater
And additionally, the first service must do more in the plan to ensure these resources are managed
adequately at the project level, especially if designed with an area is allowing for restoration activities to
proceed. This straightforward approach would allow us to have confidence in the plan, avoid
controversial projects and ensure that biodiversity is protected for future generations. Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And if you could tell me a little bit more about the straightforward approach?
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Flesh that out. What does it look like?

Ben Prater
Absolutely. Well, I think as we've argued for.

Ben Prater
Quite a while the heritage areas were really your course filter available and yet.

Ben Prater
They got looked at through the easy tool and the various analysis made available through the planning process to come to some different conclusions, which essentially, as I've stated, left about 44,000 acres of some of our highest value by diversity areas.

Ben Prater
Managed in matrix interface, the gain has been pointed out in earlier comments. These these areas, the intention from management those areas is of course to provide a sustainable flow of early sessional habitat and distribute distribution of age classes. But again, the species within those acres, the ones we know to occur, the ones that have been inventory, the ones that are systematized by the state.

Ben Prater
Do not require that management, so the those 44,000 acres have been allocated erroneously and need to be reconsidered.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank thank you for clarifying that then.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Allison next, that's you'll see. Would you introduce yourself please?

Alyson Merlin
Yeah, I'm Allison Merlin. I'm speaking on behalf of the Southern Environmental Law Center and the folks that signed on to our objection. And I'd like to echo and under score everything that Ben just said. I think it's possible to do the rare species analysis without protecting nnas in more protective designations, but that is a substantially more difficult undertaking. And it's one that this plan just hasn't completed yet. So we've seen examples of this on the George Washington and Jefferson National Forest where you have taken state special biological areas.
Put them in protective designations and in doing so, protected all of the rare species and the rare habitats that occur within when you don't do that, you have to have substantially more fine filter components to make up for that and to protect the rare species that are not being protected by those allocations of the HNA. And we just haven't seen that in this plane. There aren't enough fine filter components to make up for the fact that all of these natural heritage natural areas, which have a disproportionate amount of biodiversity, can be managed in ways that are incompatible to both.

The things that are special about these ecosystems themselves and the needs of the rare species that are within them, and this is an area where there is large consensus and agreement, I mean even the FBI says that these are places that contain special biodiversity significance. That's a direct quote from Page 3106. So it doesn't make sense to bend to myself, to many others, that we would create so much conflict. As Sam said earlier, a lot of the timber stands that we are constantly fighting about are when we are trying to do rotational harvest or management activities that don't make sense for rare species.

For sensitive species or for rare ecosystems in an in an annas, and in other places, the four services obligation to protect these areas and to pay attention to these areas doesn't come from the fact that the state designated them, it comes from the fact that Nygma and the USA require the four service to take rare and imperiled species seriously and to protect them on the forest. So it's great that the state has underscored how special these areas are by designating them, but that's not where the four services obligation comes from, and the species analysis. We need to be very different if we're going to disregard those completely.

Hey, thanks. Awesome. Maybe this is a question for you and Ben is of those 44,000 acres?

Is it?

Like the idea of well, every square foot of those 44,000 acres or unique habitats and species are within those 44,000 acres.

Yes.
I'd love to actually share a slide if it's possible. While I and I'll pull that up right now, just so I can explain sort of what we're talking about. So this is a map. Can everybody see the map?

Dispatch, NCNCFO1 -FS
Not yet. Can you make it any bigger?

Alyson Merlin
Yeah, I can zoom in for sure. So this is a map of the top three ranked oops, sorry the top three ranked nnas on the Nana Paula and Pisgah National Forest that are currently allocated to Matrix and interface. And when we did this analysis, we did exclude old growth designations. So these are areas where regeneration harvest and other active management can occur that might not necessarily be in keeping with what these special areas actually need.

Alyson Merlin
Umm. And I think it's important that we talk about the NRA's not as a fungible designation where they can all be equated to one another. But as really discreet and special places on the ground. If you look at this map and you look at how far apart some of these habitats are, they're not going to encompass the, they're not all going to be the same for needs for different species that happen to be there and more importantly, dispersal, limited species like all of the wonderful salamanders that we have on the forest are not going to be able to travel from one to another if we decide that we only need to protect.

Alyson Merlin
Some of these top three ranked HNA, and on other if you look at, you know, the top northeast corner of the Piska, if we are allocating that to timber management activities that are not compatible with the needs of the species on that for us, they're not going to be able to travel to the southwest forest corner of the Nantahala to then go to those ananas. These are really special places on the ground. And this map also shows how many of those top three ranked and HNAS are already on the chopping block potentially. Like Sam said earlier, if we're going to do site specific analysis for projects that are going to be in these places.

6:58:41.720 --> 6:59:12.360
Alyson Merlin
We don't need to put them in matrix and interface. Those projects can still occur in more protective designations. You just have to do more analysis to make sure that it is actually responsive to what both that rare ecosystem and the rare species within it actually need. So putting them in matrix and interface and pushing that analysis to the project level #1 means that we might not be able to take into account the scope of what these engineers actually mean on the ground. And also it sets us up for conflict in the future. It sets us up to have these same arguments.

6:59:12.430 --> 6:59:42.30
Alyson Merlin
Over and over again that we've been having many of us, you know, on this call for decades about how to handle these exceptionally rare places. And these places are rare, not just because we say so, not just
because the state says so, but also the Fbis says so. So no, it wouldn't be sufficient just to put some of these protective allocations into matrix or outside of matrix. We would need to really protect all of the top three and annas. And also, sorry to, I'll try to be quick. I know others have their hands up.

Alyson Merlin
But there were also some draft desired conditions and guidelines in the draft plan that didn't make it into the final plan that might have also offered some additional protection if we weren't going to put those in a protective allocations or even if we were, that would protect the not the NHN's. They're not ranked as top three. You know, there was a guideline you mentioned in your description of the issues we might talked about today about the need to coordinate with the natural heritage program themselves to make sure that our understanding of borders and needs of these NHN's is up to date.

Alyson Merlin
The reason that needs to occur, in our opinion before prescription for projects is because it really doesn't help the forest manage these areas for their unique characteristics. If they find out after they've already prescribed regeneration, harvest or some other incompatible activity that the NHP thinks that that needs to go differently or that those are just incompatible on those sites. Specifically coordinating before allocating before prescription decisions are made, number one really does prevent a lot of that conflict.

Alyson Merlin
A lot of those special places that just cannot support some of those management active management activities, they never end up on, they never end up in the public in the 1st place, they never end up being fought over in the 1st place because the Forest Service has given yourselves the opportunity to get your best available information about those places where they are and what they need. So taking that out and just saying that the Forest Service will coordinate with no temporal limits, the original draft guideline said that the Forest Service would coordinate annually. That's been taken out in the final plan.

Alyson Merlin
Now, just as the four silvers will coordinate, we think it's really important to have temporal constraints on that to make sure these conversations are happening before those prescription decisions. And there was also a desired condition in the draft plan that said that these natural heritage natural areas we're going to be managed for the things that make them unique, that those special ecological characteristics we're going to be maintained through all four service activity that's been taken out. That's not in the final plan, which is it worrisome for those of us who care about those special places in the species within them.

Alyson Merlin
And more importantly.
OK, Allison.

Yes.

I'm just gonna ask you to take a breath, and you're talking really, really fast. And are you where? Cause we got a bunch of people in the queue.

I know you are. I know. I know. Go ahead.

Yes, sorry, I was trying to make sure I went quickly so other people would have a chance. I am almost done. I promise. I just want to remind you all I know that you know, but never requires the Forest Service to have planned components like standards and guidelines enforcing the activities that you're gonna do to maintain biodiversity and ecological integrity and walking back some of those draft guidelines and draft desired conditions.

It is, I think, the opposite direction of what the Forest Service needs to be taking. So we, we'd love to see those on top three antennas reallocated and we would love to see more protective standards and guidelines put into place. And I will let other people have some air time. Thank you.

Thanks Alice. Thank you. Getting one. Yeah. So Alice and B with a natural heritage program. Are you online?

Misty, I'm sorry. Misty. Misty B. I'm my bad.

Hi. Yes, right, thank you. Yes, I'm here. I'm.

Is there anything?
I just really wanted.

Go ahead.

No, go ahead.

I just wanted to echo some of the comments that were made earlier about the natural heritage program, sharing many of the same goals of the Forest Service in terms of trying to protect these rare species in their locations. And really both of our agencies having very limited staff time and resources and wanting to be as efficient as possible when we work together and trying to avoid conflict.

If in any place where this plan can head off any potential damage to natural heritage areas, it would be ideal to be as clear as possible in the plan so that we can avoid, you know, getting into any, any.

Staff time reviewing plans that aren't just gonna or reviewing projects that are just gonna not go anywhere. So I just wanted to echo what Sam and Allison were saying with respect to that and also just kind of verify as well that the natural heritage area is really do.

Represent not just the rare species and the natural communities that are present within those areas, but also any kind of ecological buffer that is necessary to maintain those over time. And we have prioritized them to make it easy for us to identify which of those natural heritage areas are most important for protecting the species that are, are, and so those top three categories exceptional, very high and high, collectively contain the best examples of each of the species that we track in the National Heritage program.

So anytime you see one of those designations.

You know that that site has one of the 10 best examples of a rare species that we track, or a natural community that we track and so collectively all of our national heritage areas in the forest protect our best examples of rare species and our collections of rare species in the state.
Anything.

I'd be happy to answer any other questions if you have any.

Nasty.

Yeah. So.

When we're talking about the the coarse filter and the fine filter and the.

The 44,000 acres of high, high value areas.

And matrix and interface.

Could could do address some of that.

Yeah, yeah.

I think Ben had brought that up and I'm not sure exactly if you had a specific what, what your question is about that specifically.

Well, the sound like that, 44,000 acres were left out.

Yeah. So, so Rick, I'll, I'll jump in.
So with the course filter fine filter approach, the course filter allows you to look. Across the landscape at the habitats, the ecozones, the ecological conditions. And the plan needs to assess it through the course filter approach, how those areas can be allocated to ensure they're protecting geological integrity to the life of the plan. Umm, if in fact it can't do that, or if we want to achieve management goals. And certain areas where we're gonna have rare species occurring, which again are known heritage program has done the work for you. The then the plan needs to go through a fine filter approach. Looking at the specific needs of individual species and their habitats were related to the management that you want to see play out. What we're arguing is that a modified course filter that is inclusive of these exemplary areas, which are analysis shows there's about 44,000 acres of those areas that were allocated to matrix and interface, and within those areas, those species require certain types of management. Of which there in an allocation that is incongruent with that. The every single it's of 21 out of 28 species that are within those areas. Our dispersal limited and their threats are ground disturbing activities. 100% of the aquatic species in those areas don't, can't, can't handle sedimentation. And again these are species that are, many of them exceptionally rare for variety of reasons, but many of them because they're on the brink because of the threats that they've been exposed to for generations. So what? You're what the plan is essentially setting up is a zone of conflict to where we're gonna have 44,000 acres that.
Ben Prater

We all objectively understand that there are rare species that in those areas that have certain needs, we’re ignoring those needs by putting those species at risk in allocations that do not line up with the very management, those fine filter approaches that these species would require. So we believe it’s an elegant solution to simply reallocate the exceptional, very high and high areas, those 44,000 acres into.

Ben Prater

Hey, management allocation that protects those values, recognizes those values and prioritize management within those areas that enhances and maintain those values in the future. The situation we’re left with in the current plan is a project by Project District Ranger, District Ranger, deciding whether or not the features are important and that’s unsustainable. It creates inefficiencies in the system, it creates gridlock, and it’s one of the reasons that we've talked about earlier why projects don’t move forward.

Ben Prater

There is plenty of room out there, yeah.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

OK, breath OK.

Ben Prater

There is plenty of room out there, yeah.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Yeah. Clear. Yep. Got it. That help is very helpful. Really, really good. Yeah. OK. I've got two folks that have been in the queue quite a quite a length of time. And JK, what's your name?

JK

Sorry, Jason Commager, I'm the executive director of Friends of Panthertown. I represent the users of Panthertown Valley and the stakeholders that have participated in this process for about 10 years now, I guess.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Thank you.

JK

Thank you. The the high quality natural communities that we have in Panthertown Valley have been recognized as special interest areas and ecologically interested areas in the South portion of Panthertown, which we consider to be called Panthertown Valley in the north portion, which contains
bonus defeat. We recognize that currently an alternative E it's listed under Matrix. We feel that this is not an appropriate designation for this area, particularly because we are in a natural.

7:9:51.270 --> 7:10:16.800
J K
Heritage area we have a a diverse species population in the north that definitely needs to be protected under either Backcountry Special Interest area or Ecological Interest area designations, and we hope that you'll readdress and relook at that area, particularly for the species that are dispersal limited and we have we're in agreement with several of the other speakers that are on the call today. So I don't want to take up too much time, but if you have questions for me, I'd appreciate that.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Jason, anything.

7:10:22.500 --> 7:10:25.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks, Jason. I guess this is a broader thing and maybe.

7:10:27.440 --> 7:10:28.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ben or others could.

7:10:28.970 --> 7:10:59.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh answer, you know, you mentioned some of those are that are that are of concern or in interface areas of course interface was created to look at those major access points and where we have a lot of developed recreation and and use. So I guess regardless of our allocation that those uses kind of exist if you get my point like I guess set aside the.

7:10:59.830 --> 7:11:8.510
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The management allocation, those are issues that are gonna impact. I know we've been focused on timber harvest as the only threat, but.

7:11:9.540 --> 7:11:12.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I I guess maybe any thoughts on that piece of it?

7:11:14.720 --> 7:11:15.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Anybody.

7:11:14.740 --> 7:11:16.110
J K
While in particular in the north.
J K
I'm sorry.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

J K
In the north, we have had timber sales in the past that have been done right up to the trail right up to the trail head. In fact, we partnered with the US Forest Service a few years ago to build a new parking area, particularly for equestrian access from the north of Panther Town. And that area is right in the middle of a matrix. It is particularly vulnerable to us, it will have more recreational usage. We know that currently the roads not being maintained. So that's a challenge both on a force level and user level.

J K
In the north, we have two trails that are in the matrix. We have uh, rattlesnake, knob and Turkey knob, which are both access points to get into Panthertown Valley from that new parking area that was constructed. So these are recreational destinations in the north. Flat Creek Falls is another one. There's not an actual designated trail to it, but it's being used. We are not currently listed under the map in the IIS as interface at all. In fact it's all listed as matrix and am I incorrect in that?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, I think you might be right there. But I think Ben had mentioned some other.

John Culclasure
That's interest area too.

J K
In in the portions we do agree with the special interest area designations and the EIS areas. It's it's really just looking at that matrix in the north that we're afraid that that's gonna get forgotten about over the next ten 1520 years as recreation increases and we see more need for loop trails and connections on the ground. There's user created social trails that are on the ground. We don't maintain them, but people are using them. They're on all the maps. So it's kind of challenging for us because we are doing our best to maintain 30 miles of designated maintain trails.

J K
But we know in the north there is going to be an increase in need to in the future open those up and matrix right now is is not compatible with what what we're looking at.
Thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, let me move on helpful. Yeah, very helpful. Thank you. Thank you, Jason. OK, Megan.

Megan N. Sutton
Hi there.

Megan N. Sutton
And representing the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership, I just really, Rick, I wanna.

Megan N. Sutton
Address what you asked us to do, which is acknowledgement of the staff and James's team and the work from draft to final, particularly on this topic, improved significantly. I think that you know that the work was moving the needle towards resolving conflict and so definitely want to acknowledge that the partnership really supports that and.

Megan N. Sutton
Also want to acknowledge that your request to to drive towards solutions rather than just restating the problems and I wanna just make sure that.

Megan N. Sutton
That it's that you're fully informed on. On what? Why we see some of those solutions the way that we do, so for example.

Megan N. Sutton
One of the primary issues of the partnership sees around natural heritage areas is around their boundaries.

Megan N. Sutton
So the boundaries of these places.

Megan N. Sutton
And many times our well, I shouldn't say many times there are instances where there are inaccuracies.

Megan N. Sutton
Either direction, right? Either direction in that they're not big enough to incorporate what they need to
to fully protect those resources, or their historical, and they're old and due to, you know, some past management, the the relevance of setting aside that that area may be changed. And so we are strong agreement that.

7:14:50.990 --> 7:15:2.630
Megan N. Sutton
These areas should be able to be remapped at the project level to identify what the ecological issues are on the ground, but the importance is that the plan really needs to provide guidance on this.

7:15:3.330 --> 7:15:5.260
Megan N. Sutton
At the plan level telling us.

7:15:6.40 --> 7:15:22.250
Megan N. Sutton
What and how that would how we would go about that or what would be the criteria which we would be assessing? And so I think you know to be more solution oriented the way if the plan can tell us things criteria that we're gonna look at then it lays out the chart for implementation.

7:15:24.260 --> 7:15:41.850
Megan N. Sutton
The other, the other area that I think you've heard mentioned a couple times and missed even mentioned it from the heritage program. It's just clear plan direction to talk about coordination like well coordinate with the natural heritage program. What does that mean you know does that mean pre scoping does that mean?

7:15:43.690 --> 7:16:4.620
Megan N. Sutton
Field work. Does that mean you know what? What does? What does that include? And I feel like in the draft plan, there was some of that language was there and that that's really helpful. We've actually James have been out on field trips with you recently on Anahola national forests where we've been kind of talking about some of these things and like how do we how do we go about this?

7:16:5.310 --> 7:16:14.440
Megan N. Sutton
And you know, and I think that I just wanna put a fine point on the fact that the partnership, this broad coalition of groups.

7:16:17.140 --> 7:16:32.390
Megan N. Sutton
Breathing the fabric together around all these issues that we're going to be talking about for the next three days, this is one of those issues. And so you know from our perspective, the best resolution would be to adopt the partnership land allocations.

7:16:33.420 --> 7:16:49.900
Megan N. Sutton
Umm, but if not doing that, you know, I think what you've heard today about other remedies about, you
know, putting uh natural heritage areas of, you know, certain categories into certain management areas. We're very we're strongly supportive of that because we feel like it.

7:16:49.980 --> 7:17:5.490
Megan N. Sutton
This is a way to mitigate conflict in the future, and so I just you know that's I think I keep coming back to that point. But I just wanna make sure that it's heard that I see this as a way to resolve conflict in the future.

7:17:8.180 --> 7:17:28.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Megan. Yeah, thank you, Megan. And good focus on solutions. So I hate to cut people off, but I again, I'm trying to respect the the chunks of time we've allocated to each topic here and it's time to shift to wild and scenic rivers eligibility.

7:17:30.580 --> 7:17:37.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Now all I can say is if we have time to catch the last comments on this at the end of this section, we'll try to do that.

7:17:37.860 --> 7:17:38.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Fair enough.

7:17:41.180 --> 7:17:47.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right. Thank you. So setting the stage for this, this last piece on wild and scenic rivers.

7:17:49.850 --> 7:17:51.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, why don't think rivers.

7:17:52.370 --> 7:18:22.520
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Some of the suggested resolutions or recommendation for while I'm sitting river status for Panthertown Creek, Greenland Creek East Fork of the Tuskegee River, North Fork and French Broad River, East and West forks have overflowed Creek and nine additional miles of Fires Creek. Also reclassification of Big Laurel Creek and the West Fork of the Pigeon as scenic rather than recreational.

7:18:22.960 --> 7:18:42.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Three classification of Overflow Creek, Thompson River and White Water River as wild rather than scenic acknowledgement and protection of the ORV of scientific feature for the Chattooga River, ease or remove, ease or remove paddling limits on each tutor river from the forest plan.

7:18:43.680 --> 7:18:49.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Coordinate with other agencies to prevent human discharge of sediment into the Sugar River headwaters and its tributaries.

7:18:51.20 --> 7:18:57.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Adopt A standard requiring monitoring and reporting of chronic erosion caused by whitewater boaters on the Chicago River.

7:18:58.950 --> 7:19:5.180
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Adopt A standard requiring the agency to fix and repair areas where whitewater boaters launch into the river.

7:19:11.140 --> 7:19:11.570
65548879-ddc9-45d5-9149-4d5952eb4d5f
He said.

7:19:6.30 --> 7:19:11.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Adopt A standard prohibiting the forest from allowing any soils to be charged discharged into the river.

7:19:12.630 --> 7:19:19.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Adopt A standard or desired condition to comply with the ANTIDEGRADATION mandate of the Clean Water Act.

7:19:21.550 --> 7:19:32.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So maybe a general question to kick things off is how how would you resolve the difference in opinion about whether these rivers have outstanding the remarkable values in the southern Appalachian?

7:19:34.120 --> 7:19:36.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Nicole, do you want to address that out of the gate?

7:19:41.770 --> 7:19:42.380
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Well.

7:19:51.70 --> 7:19:51.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

7:19:42.460 --> 7:19:52.990
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Uh, what? I'd like to address is an error in the characterization of that list that you just read off, Rick, just as a point of order.
Nicole Hayler (Guest)

Umm, the main body of Overflow Creek starting from the Georgia State line north to where it joins the east and West forks, was inexplicably dropped from wild and scenic eligibility in between the draft EIS and the file EIS.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)

And there's.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)

Virtually now explanation for this in the narrative of the FBI S. So I wanted to just call that out right up right off the bat.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Very good. Thank you. Thank you, Nicole.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

OK.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

How about Kevin Coburn?

Yeah.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)

And of course, as a follow up, it needs to be added back in as as the remedy. OK.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)

Thank you.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)

Sure.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

The remedy? Yeah, I figured as much. But thank you. Thank you for making sure that was clear.
And Kevin Coburn?

Sure.

Would you introduce yourself, Kevin?

Yeah. Kevin Colburn with American whitewater.

I'm the national stewardship director.

So I would like to address the North Fork of the French bread and you ask specifically why.

There's a difference of opinion and eligibility and outstandingly remarkable values.

And I think the big thing here is the Forest Service didn't quite have the experience to understand the recreational value of the river.

It is an absolute white water gem and classic. It was compared to the Upper Nantahala which is a dewatered section of river.

I would just not wild and scenic at all.

And very different experience from the North Port. So that's one big thing.

Umm, I think we could talk about that. There were some reasons given about why the river was found in
eligible like there were power lines and evidence of past logging and these things are both irrelevant and not really wrong in the key reach we're talking about.

7:21:56.290 --> 7:22:7.40
Kevin Colburn - AW (Guest)
And then the upper tuck, I think the Forest Service failed to recognize the significance of Panther town value as a whole and the role to the rivers play in such a unique place.

Kevin Colburn - AW (Guest)
In the context of hydropower development of the entire Tucker CG River watershed, so it's a very unique place in the context of the cashier's area where all these big, beautiful valleys have been developed.

Kevin Colburn - AW (Guest)
And also unique in the context of the river, which has been built for higher power.

Kevin Colburn - AW (Guest)
It's always the sloppy.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
They have an A party behind you, Kevin.

Kevin Colburn - AW (Guest)
Do I have a what behind me?

7:22:33.780 --> 7:22:35.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Party. We're here and we're having a party behind you.

Kevin Colburn - AW (Guest)
I'm at the Public Library in Stanley ID.

7:22:40.710 --> 7:22:43.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So then, so then somebody's not muted, sorry.

7:22:44.150 --> 7:22:46.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I've figured it was someone or cooler. Yeah than here.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you, Kevin, any follow up?
It was hard to hear some of that with the background noise when you talked about Panther count and and in the next part.

So I didn't catch.

And mentioned Panther Town in the next part.

That's Kevin. Are you from Kevin's frozen?

Alright, let's we'll I just wanna mention that.

Kevin might be good to call in if you can hear us. I do record. Wanna recognize? I know.

Several people have had to kind of shift their calendars and things to be able to be on here, so I just want to acknowledge that Kevin had a long planned vacation. I think so appreciate him taking the time.

OK.

Alright, so Kevin, if you, if you unfreeze and have more to offer, raise your hand again please. So we have Bill Floyd in the queue.

You coming, bill? You wanna unmute?

We're not hearing you.
Still muted.

And.

And this is Kevin. I did find a quieter space.

Hello. Good. Hold on a second, we're trying to.

But I'll come back to you, Kevin, but let's see if we can hear from Bill, but you're muted, Bill.

Thank you.

Can you unmute him?

No, you can't. I mean it, no.

OK. Thank you.
bill floyd (Guest)
You you can't hear me, right?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes, we can.

bill floyd (Guest)
OK, so as a gating issue?

bill floyd (Guest)
As I suggested, a regional forest aren't. And Mr Lent yesterday evening. These meetings are not appropriate from the due process standpoint. Mr Lent does not have authority to be acting as the reviewing officer.

bill floyd (Guest)
At at at I wanna make that point everybody on this call, I know the fire service doesn't agree with me, but the regulation is very clear.

bill floyd (Guest)
A provided you.

bill floyd (Guest)
The basis for that that position and I'll leave it at that.

bill floyd (Guest)
Umm.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

bill floyd (Guest)
I don't know what the purpose of this meeting really is, and I know there's a limited amount of time. I know that I'm probably the most lengthy objector of any objector in this LRP process.

bill floyd (Guest)
And I had presumed that we would be using this process to try to resolve the issues that we have instead of changing the name, the subject matter of what the objections are about.
And so I'm really kind of curious about how it is that you think that you're going to resolve objections with somebody that spent seven years working on something.

When you don't even bother to name the objections correctly, my objection that was filed on March 18th.

Literally has 17 very specific objections.

To which the planning rule took and rewarded them in the call them something different.

For example, one of my objections is is that the Forest Service is intentionally misrepresented material facts.

Now what y'all said was.

You made decisions based on incorrect facts. That's what you make the issue out. That's not the issue. The issue is the bar service is repeatedly misrepresented. Critical facts and concealed other information that's critical to the public to have to know what should be done to comply with the law with respect to the wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the Clean Water Act as it applies to the headwaters in North Carolina, only the headwaters in North Carolina. OK, so.

I hear you, OK.

Well, you can't fill fill. We can't catch you when you're talking when you're talking as fast as you're talking, it's just gibberish. It's not helping us.
Do you understand the point that I'm making about my objections?

OK. Hold on, Bill, let's, let's let us answer your question.

With the short amount of time we have in person, we've gotten all the written comments. I guess we understand your process concerns. I guess I would suggest if you could focus on the substantive.

Issues and your proposed resolutions to those substantive issues. I don't wanna dismiss your process things, but probably not the best venue to go through all those today. And when we introduced the meeting this morning, we were real clear about. This is about adding valuable information to what you've already written and sent in.

Correct.

And for.

Any suggest?

That's.

Here today.

Well, and again I don't have time to waste. I wrote the objection in very detailed basis and I don't understand why you're not going through the points that were made and the
recommendations. You changed it all. You wrote what you wanted to write. That's not how it works. I have due process. I have rights. OK. I've tendered objections to you that are very specific. And what the planning team did did is they reworded it the way they wanted to word it.

Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
OK.

bill floyd (Guest)
So that they could avoid it being held accountable. OK now.

Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
OK, we're hearing you.

Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
We're hearing you.

bill floyd (Guest)
So. So I want you to tell me what you think you need to know to be able to comply with the law.

Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
OK, stop. And let's give him time to answer.

Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
Or do you wanna do you wanna?

7:28:30.150 --> 7:28:33.330
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
I appreciate that, bill. And so some of what I've captured.

7:28:34.190 --> 7:28:37.490
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
I think capture all but just some of the thoughts is 1 the.

7:28:38.140 --> 7:28:41.70
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
Wanted to get that out and clear that you feel that I don't have.

7:28:41.820 --> 7:28:44.440
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
The authority to serve as the resolving official.

7:28:45.100 --> 7:28:56.710
Dispatch, NCNF01 -FS
And that we've misrepresented facts and that we've changed the names and the language around your objections and that you have very specific objections and you feel that we've changed those from being held accountable.

7:28:57.610 --> 7:28:58.190
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I think.

7:28:59.50 --> 7:28:59.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
One thing and.

7:29:0.520 --> 7:29:1.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I don't know.

7:29:1.810 --> 7:29:5.510
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It seems like you know you're you're very upset by this, so I don't know if any.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, that's right. I offer would be acceptable to you, but I I would ask.

7:29:12.900 --> 7:29:22.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Kennedy for for you to further help your your comments and your objections have been helpful and you provided a lot of information.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And this is, as I said earlier in the introduction, I don't know if you're on that or not.

7:29:29.20 --> 7:29:33.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But this is an opportunity for me to hear more about the resolutions and I.

7:29:35.250 --> 7:29:36.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I looked at.

7:29:37.770 --> 7:29:43.200
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Areas that I thought needed some more conversation, some more dialogue around, so this isn't.

7:29:44.170 --> 7:29:51.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
A rehash of what you've already provided you've already provided that this is to help further and deepen understanding I can read.
I can try to understand from reading, but there's value in hearing directly from people, so we wanted to provide this opportunity.

Or interaction and a chance to hear and deepen that understanding.

So.

My guess is that that's not a satisfactory.

Well, no. My concern was is that somehow the fire service has perception that objection resolution process is a one way St.

That only you are asking questions.

And I don't. I don't believe that's the spirit of the regulation and I don't think it's the intent of public participation in the LRP planning process.

What has happened consistently for me since 2015?

Is that the far surface is made of collaborative effort and that's pretty clear now because of documents that were released to me on June 22nd, 2022.
bill floyd (Guest)
The deputy chief of the Forest Service, deputy Chief French.

bill floyd (Guest)
Sent me 132 emails.

bill floyd (Guest)
Those emails reveal people working in the Southern Regional Office in Atlanta and the Atlanta and the Asheville Office in North Carolina.

bill floyd (Guest)
Working collaboratively.

bill floyd (Guest)
To shut down my ability to gather information during the LRMP planning process.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, Bill, Bill, this is not appropriate. This is not, this is not the intent of this meeting today. And you're taking time away from those that have have comments that they wanna make on ways to come together around remedies.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You're you're focusing on process and that's not what this is about.

bill floyd (Guest)
Well, I agree with you. I disagree with you. I disagree with me with you respectfully and I wanted to make the point because.

bill floyd (Guest)
Mr Lance said yadda yadda yadda.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

bill floyd (Guest)
And my response back is real simple. Go look at the facts. OK. And here are the facts. Here are the facts. I'm here at the. I'm here at the meaning I.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, no, no, no, no, we've heard Bill.

You know.

Yeah.

bill floyd (Guest)
Excuse me. Excuse me. Quit and opting me. No, this is my objection. Resolution meeting too. OK, I requested it from entitled to it. OK, that's the law.

We can.

bill floyd (Guest)
And if you do not, to me, you're going to find out what the law is. OK, so please listen.

bill floyd (Guest)
I am here. I am here. I am here. I am here. I am here.

bill floyd (Guest)
I need 30 minutes. I need 30.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Can you go? Can you wine Bill. Bill, I'm just gonna let me just ask you, Bill, I need to know that you're gonna wind up now so that we can yield time to others that you're. Can you tell me that you're gonna take a minute more for whatever it is you need. But we need to know how much time so that we can yield it toward you. Can't have 30 minutes.

You can't have 30 minutes.

bill floyd (Guest)
Well, that's your problem. That's your problem.
Well, I guess it's not. We're gonna have to. We're gonna have to mute you, Bill.

Yes, your problem is you cannot. You can't deny me my due process. Ma'am. You can't do it.

Well, we we can.

No, you can't. No, you can't.

Tell me you'll be the voice. Can we mute him?

Not.

Now, now let me ask something because this is this is the constructive part, and you're headed towards the end of the train, one way or another. OK. So I would advise you to be cooperative rather than being obstructed, OK?

Back at you.

I'm here to ask, ask questions about why you have it done, certain things with the objection.

OK. That's a fair question. You can't have remedies if you don't ask the right questions about what the problems are and you have it cited any of the problems that are in my.
Ma.

Objection.

Ohhh, alright. OK, hold on, hold on. But there might be some confusion then that that will come. This is part of the entire process is you will get a detailed response to all your actions with.

I'm not interested in the detailed response and answered. I'm interested in you answering the questions that I have right now about my objection.

I think ohh you want that. That's not the purpose of this meeting, Sir. It's this. This been very well stated. This is.

What what I think?

We'll find out whether it is. We'll find out whether it is. We're gonna find out whether that's the purpose of the meeting. You think it's a one way St.

I don't, I think.

Ohh, not not at all. Not at all, and I don't know if you've been on all day, but.

Don't look at your regulation, the regulation.

Thank you.
So yeah, they'll leave muted you because we can't. We can't continue like this. So we can't hear a thing you're saying you button is on and we're gonna move on to the next voice.

Jason Kim occur.

I'd like to say uh Kevin with American Whitewater had stated.

He mentioned Panthertown Valley requiring some protections with the wild and scenic rivers we're seeing increase in recreational usage of the headwaters of the Tuckasegee River, particularly boaters, or are coming in there. We certainly do have anglers as well. We are part of the Western North Carolina Fly Fishing Trail and certainly our statements have already been shared, but I I'd like to say we do agree with the National Forest Partnership, excuse me, in the Nanhai Piska Forest Partnership where they say that.

Three streams in Panthertown Valley, in an area recognized as a biologically recreational treasure. They're in ecological interest areas, special interest areas. This is the top of our watershed, and we have multiple hydroelectric dams downstream from this particular area, we would like to see the.

Reconsideration to recommend all three of these streams in Panthertown Valley is very unique. People come here for the unique species that only exist in Panthertown Valley. You will not find them in other river watersheds in the area, for example, and we have.

Recognize that our users and the stakeholders that come to Panthertown Valley and recreate their are asking us why it was excluded from the wild and Scenic Rivers designation and Kevin, with white water. American Water can explain much more in detail about the specifics that have gone through in the process, but I appreciate again being able to address this. Thank you.

Thanks, Jason. Thank you, Jason.

Kevin, do you want to continue?
Yes. Can you hear me?

So we can.

You can. OK. Great. Yeah. I just wanted to be available for questions now that I have improved audio and just share that again, I think the North Fork of the French broad is just a really special white water river and that's not really something that's in the forest services experience and expertise to kind of understand what makes a wonderful white water river near the North Fork is close to so many people. It's so beautiful. It runs a lot for free flowing river. It's absolutely classic in terms of.

Of Rapids, there's a lot of interest in designation for this river locally. It's just a real a real delightful kind of recreational staple for paddlers, and I don't judge the Forest Service for not really being able to quite wrap their hands around that because it's maybe not in their Forte. It's not kind of a type of recreation maybe that they have personal experience with, but as an expert, I would. I would love to have that opinion be honored and I'm happy to answer questions moving forward.

Yeah.

Hey Kevin, before when I couldn't hear so well, you mentioned something about Panther Town and another creek and I didn't catch what you said about Panther Town and I didn't catch the name of the other Creek.

OK.

Yeah. Or primary primary interests are in the North Fork of the French Broad, which is probably the other Creek was talking about, which is that waters of the French Broad River, which I was just speaking to. And then pan through town, we see it as really those three streams, pantertown and Greenland creeks flow together and form the upper Tuckaseegee river. So those three are essentially a system.
They're all in one valley. They all get similar use. They share a lot of characteristics. And they're in this kind of special place.

7:37:43.750 --> 7:37:45.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, very good. Thank you.

7:37:46.320 --> 7:37:46.910
25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
Mm-hmm.

7:37:48.50 --> 7:37:49.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanksgiving we can hear you a lot better.

7:37:50.800 --> 7:37:52.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Megan next.

7:37:51.230 --> 7:37:52.470
25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
Good. Sorry about that.

7:37:53.700 --> 7:38:24.890
Megan N. Sutton
Hi folks so my name is Megan Sutton and I'm representing the nanny hello, Piscopo Forest Partnership, and Rick, I just wanna refer back to our conversation from this morning when we were talking about sustainable recreation, because I think this is a component of that. You know that that I kind of alluded to and we were talking about how sustainable recreation be integrated amongst land allocations, designations management, sideboards which.

7:38:25.0 --> 7:38:29.610
Megan N. Sutton
You know, we talked about a number of things, but this is one of those related to designations. So really.

7:38:31.70 --> 7:38:51.760
Megan N. Sutton
Highlighting the importance not only to the paddling community but also to the the significant biological features really of the of three overflow which you've heard about the tech CD which you've heard about, and then this North fork of the French Broad. Those are all important components of our partnership.

Megan N. Sutton
You know, agreements and the way that things have woven together in order to resolve conflict and
make sure that everybody is needs are adequately met or as good as can be. And so I just wanted to put to to highlight that for you so that you knew that we had this broad basis of support for moving these Three Rivers or there's river systems forward as as eligible.

7:39:28.270 --> 7:39:29.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you very much, ma'am.

7:39:30.310 --> 7:39:30.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Apple.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So let's see. Kevin's hand is still up. Did you have something additional?

25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
Apologies, no.

7:39:41.450 --> 7:39:48.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, alright, so so now others on any aspect of wild and scenic rivers.

7:39:49.930 --> 7:39:52.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Enter to interested persons or objectors.

7:39:58.170 --> 7:39:59.740
Megan N. Sutton
Are we going to be talking about this?

7:39:58.450 --> 7:40:0.160
25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
Are we speaking just to eligibility?

7:40:1.140 --> 7:40:2.220
Megan N. Sutton
Yes, this should too.

7:40:1.760 --> 7:40:2.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm sorry.

7:40:4.60 --> 7:40:5.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Yes.
dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OHH yes.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm sorry. I I was jumping the whole.

Chapter 2. That and the eligibility under this one. So. So let's make sure that I'm clear. We're talking not just river eligibility, but the two to the river management paddling and fish habitat issues as well. So OK, so sorry about that. So back to Nicole.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Well, thanks. Just before you leave the eligibility category, I wanted to call out.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Uh.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
The design, you know, the designations for white water and Thompson.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
We feel very strongly that.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
The majority of those rivers.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Could it be Wilder and to not have them recognize as eligible for the, you know, Wild designation and to?

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Bump them down to scenic. Does a severe.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
This job is not justifying you know what's really out there on the ground. You know, we're talking about the escarpment rivers that are rugged, wild, remote. The the very picture of what the act is designed to protect to the highest level.
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
And Randy has been correctly identified, Rick is bump him up to wild for the most part. We we have
some fine tuning you know towards the head waters to be reasonably responsive to scenic needs, but
definitely wild for the most part.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, clear. Very clear. Thank you, Nicole. Thank you.

John Culclasure
Yeah. Yeah, thanks. I just. Yeah, I'm not opposed to while sitting designation of this have concerns about
larger implications for management and there's usually a corridor. But sometimes I feel like that's kind
of overplayed and the media and just like some direction on you know actual hard limits as far as where
management can occur and it also to the friends of panthertown also and to Kevin. And also respectfully
like y'all to work with the local community and Panther Town because it if you designate it wild and
scenic every single boat.

John Culclasure
And it goes down that river and they cannot get off the East fork of the tuck unless they trespass on our
fishing lease. There's no way to go over Corp true falls to get to Upper Tennessee Creek because you'll
die because you land on a rock. So every single boater that comes down that in the fall, more efficient is
trespassing. And that's outside of the navigability issue. So I think you also need to consult with some
local folks on that issue. So thank you.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Anything there?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Don't thank you for that, John.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Back to Kevin.
Yeah. Thanks. I'll echo what Nicole said to you. I think the definitions of what is a wild or scenic river, I think this standards are were over, they were just overplayed a little bit by the Forest Service in determining which things should be wild and scenic versus recreational. Any other experience on the West Fork pigeon and Big Laurel, you're down in the woods. You're not along the road. It's not part of the experience. So it shouldn't be part of the classification. So.

Did I understand that now is an appropriate time to also?

OK, sure. Yeah. So I mean, I think you all know the history here, but right now for the last 10 years or so around seven people a year paddle the upper part of the upper two got there's three reaches and around 35 people a year run the next section downstream. That's sustainable recreation if there were no limits, it might be doubled.

And so maybe you'd have 14 people on the upper section and maybe 70 people over a whole year running the upper sections of the Chattooga.

That would be consistent with the 25 planning role for providing for sustainable recreation. You have 10 years of data where every single paddling trip was logged. All the resources have been in place for years. For this, we really hoped after working on this project, this whole process for 10 years that we would get a fresh look.

From North Carolina that owns and manages these sections of river, there's no reason to maintain these limits. There's been no conflicts. It's been studied extensively. Collecting more data won't tell us...
anything because 10 year old data is worthless. So if you collect data for another five years, you're just going to lose data off the back end from a recreational trend standpoint.

7:45:0.150 --> 7:45:0.680
25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
So.

7:45:1.700 --> 7:45:4.940
25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
I don't really know why the four service hasn't.

7:45:6.440 --> 7:45:20.890
25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
Reconsidered these and eased these limits. I'd actually like to hear from the Forest Service. The justification in the planning documents were very unsatisfying and kind of not helpful. They just said that it was out of scope.

7:45:21.590 --> 7:45:26.10
25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
Umm. And that they need more monitoring data but in monitored for 10 years.

7:45:26.630 --> 7:45:31.10
25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
And you know, it should certainly be in scope. We don't see any reason why it's not.

7:45:37.830 --> 7:45:38.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Definitely.

7:45:38.370 --> 7:45:38.370
25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
And you know, everything gets. It's well. Well, time to take another look at this and use the limits.

7:45:42.480 --> 7:45:43.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Reflect.

7:45:44.870 --> 7:45:48.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There's a beeping. Yeah, the quick he's trying to manage that. There we go.

7:45:49.950 --> 7:45:52.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, there's a yeah town or be bound up. Every could hear that.

7:45:53.630 --> 7:45:54.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.
So. So the basic question is, so there's been seven people per year voting the upper chattooga and sound like would like to see more, more ability for use there and.

Talked about reconsidering and some of what you heard already was that it was out of scope and I don't know if, James, you wanted to address any of that.

Yeah. I thanks, Kevin. I I know this is an important issue for for, for you and many in the in the Community. You know I think.

Umm, the the broader?

Looking at kind of a management plan for the Chattooga and the upper reaches, I think it is, is clearly there's a need there. I think at the end of the day it was more about.

You know.

Being able to look at that full picture in the comprehensive management plan for the for the river and and you know being able to parse out certain portions of that or being able to look at that. And so we've been pretty consistent for a long time that.

You know, we know that there's a need to look at that, but we're not gonna be able to dig into the to the management plan for the to the river during the plan revision process. I know that's not a very satisfying.

Uh, satisfying answer, but it's, you know, I don't think we see the ability to kind of parse out the that, that use piece from from from digging into the to the full picture.
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Of that.

Can I respond to that quickly?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, well, if this wanted to add 1 pieces.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The monitoring that was done and I'm trying to remember.

There's a 2018. Was it where the 2012 decision called for doing a use surveys and equating that to?

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know the the parking they come up with an index for use and that that monitoring was done. And so there's for that piece of the.

The solitude part, there's really 11.

Peace and time that that monitoring was done and there was a call for, you know, wind two repeat that and and would that be in five years what would that be? So I just wanted to add that as part of the part of the explanation.

Behind when you talked about the the data and everything, and I think it was 2018 that those surveys were done and that was called for in the 2012 decision to create an index for the solitude piece. And that's where some of the front country issues were noted in that work, particularly at the Ellicott Rock Wilderness.

So Kevin.

Can I respond to this?
Yes.

Yeah, two things change. You mentioned not wanting to open the CRMP. Or deal with this outside of the CRMP there is no CRMP. The forest plan is the CRMP. That was a decision made.

By the Forest Service to not have a comprehensive river management plan for the Chattooga and instead have each forest Plan B the CRMP. So this is it. This is our shot. You you are updating the CRMP when you issue a New Forest plan, you are making a brand new decision to continue these limits based on flow based on season based on geography that are unparalleled.

You know, they're just, they don't exist anywhere else in the country. And then, you know, regarding that 2017 and 2018 monitoring, you're you're right. They looked more broadly at a broad perspective of users, which are not tracked. They actually did the analysis, couldn't find any kayakers like we are zero according to the official monitoring. So they actually went and did a paddlers that they had permits for.

You know in the the few things they've found were like there were conflicts with loud music and barking dogs four times, and that solitude was generally being met. But the bigger issue here is that 7 versus 14 people is not gonna change solitude on the chattooga, the use and the chattooga is day again. Camping, fishing, boating is like the spec on the flea on the dog, on top of the mountain as far as recreation use goes. So.

Thinking that somehow you can turn the knob on kayaking and change the solitude or any other experiences in the approach to.

Is. It's nonsensical at given the relatively small scale of that use. Thank you.

Thank you, Kevin.
Alright. Thanks Kevin. Let's move to Megan.

There.

And so, you know from the partnerships perspective, I think this has.

Followed by pound.

Some similarities with what we heard from the rock climbers this morning. I know that you know 3/4 supervisors ago a decision was made not to include the Chattooga in the forest Plan and that you all have kind of stuck with that, which is a little bit different from rock climbing because that's really something that, you know deferring.

No.

Participant.

A rock climbing management plan happened over the course of time, but the paddling community has been part of this since the beginning and I think it's just it just feels really unsatisfying. And I I hear that I hear what you're saying. But in order to meet our interests needs it. It feels really hard to hear the after the investment of time and and energy, as you all have done as well on the part of the partners to not have this be included.

So I just wanna name that for you all, because I do feel like that it's it's very it's as Kevin has said, it's very unsatisfying.

Umm and the this is making a decision about the tuga.
Megan N. Sutton
Whether.

You know, it's kind of by default it is making a decision. And so just acknowledging that it is making a decision.

And I think it's important.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Megan.

Yeah, good. Cold. OK, Nicole.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Uh, yeah. I just also wanted to name another issue as part of this discussion.

And it doesn't have to do with uh paddling, and I do support the revisitation in that in that realm too, but it has to do with Land Management allocations. James, you probably remember we sent you a letter a couple years ago.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
About.

Nicole Hayler (Guest)
It's a allocation along the strategy that needs to be changed from scenic to wild due to four service acquisition.

Uh, so in between Norton Mill Creek and Green Creek and due to the Forest Services successful land acquisition program, there's not private land in there anymore. And so we need to elevate the protection on that section of river to wild.

And that was disregarded as part of the planning process inappropriately, I believe.
7:53:33.590 --> 7:53:33.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

7:53:40.200 --> 7:53:40.430
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right.

7:53:45.800 --> 7:53:57.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good afternoon. 20 minutes left. Yeah, I'm good. So yeah, thanks. Got that, Nicole Land Management allocations, we required the private so scenic needed to be changed to a while.

7:53:59.300 --> 7:54:2.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. So Kevin, back in the queue.

7:54:3.800 --> 7:54:5.470
25ead64d-e3a1-49c4-92f4-fe53362b55b3
Thanks. Yeah, just one.

7:54:4.160 --> 7:54:5.710
1c9799b4-4bfb-4dc3-9706-e4b142f78a78
I'm sorry. Excuse me.

7:54:6.370 --> 7:54:7.60
1c9799b4-4bfb-4dc3-9706-e4b142f78a78
Excuse me.

7:54:8.180 --> 7:54:9.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, I'm sorry.

7:54:8.360 --> 7:54:17.780
1c9799b4-4bfb-4dc3-9706-e4b142f78a78
I would like to participate. I would like to participate. You've had a private conversation with Kevin Culver, and I've been patiently waiting. I would like to participate. I've raised my hand 14 times.

7:54:18.620 --> 7:54:19.970
1c9799b4-4bfb-4dc3-9706-e4b142f78a78
Please allow me to prison.

7:54:20.740 --> 7:54:29.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Your bill, you're allowed to participate if you if you follow the objectives of this meeting, which are to focus on solutions and additional information.

7:54:27.240 --> 7:54:44.500
1c9799b4-4bfb-4dc3-9706-e4b142f78a78
Well, great, great. Let's let's follow the objectives of the meeting, because we're going to end up in court. So let's follow the objects in the meeting, but you're keep not allowing me to speak at an appropriate time. OK, my hand is ready as you keep going back to Kevin Colbert and Kevin Kolbert and Kevin Coburn, this isn't a private meeting for Kevin Colburn. And you.

OK, great.

And you're making in a meeting for Kevin Colburn. Now, I'll be quiet. I'd like to speak to a couple of issues that Mr. Corbyn raised.

The Forest Service is totally disregarded. All the data that's in the science. In the record already.

The riverbank has been documented, has having been destroyed by paddler steel launching into the river. Those photographs were put into the record years ago.

Somebody from the Forest Service went down there and made it a very serious repair job. They took two by they took 6 by 6 square posts and pegged them into the side of the bank where the bank had collapsed from people having to seal launch to get around the strainers that are in the stream.
So all this discussion about monitoring part cars at a parking lot has nothing to do with protecting the outstanding, remarkable values of this river. It has nothing to do with complying with the Clean Water Act antidegradation mandate.

So we’ve got to stop listening to what Mr Colburn has to say about how he wants to make the boat or paradise on the Chattooga it’s not what’s appropriate the the the only issue that’s appropriate for this far service to be worrying about.

Is preserving the one outstanding biological capacity of this water.

She sustained outstanding numeric densities and biomass of all three species of trout.

Have this this river, 40 years from Ellicott Rock all the way up.

The fish aren’t there. The study was done in 16. You’ve ignored that. You don’t even comment about the study that was done in 16 bit DEQ. You don’t compare it to the results of your 1992 ninety six. You have no science. You’re not using the best available science. So when we talk about Mr Pope.

This is all personal attack and one of our ground rules is no personal attack. Please speak to the issue.

Get to the issues.

This is not a personal attack. This is about science. No, I'm talking about the science. I'm talking about the science. I'm not talking about anybody. I'm talking about the fact that the the meeting has been a meeting between Kevin Colburn and you. There's no attack there. That's a fact. OK, now my point that it's just made that you're.
I did what did I just tell you?

Yeah, keep going.

No, not the issue with trying.

I told you that you're not using the science. I didn't. I said that you haven't used the science. What science did that point to you that you've ignored?

You've ignored the study that was done in 16. You've ignored the study that was done in 1992. Ninety six. You've ignored the fact that the boaters destroyed the bank. And then you went in and fixed it. But you didn't tell you didn't tell the public about that.

That is a material fact.

As a material fact that you went and spent money to fix it, so please explain to me why you haven't told the public about that.

OK. So well, yeah, thanks Bill. So really.

One of the key in on what you talked about is when we were talking about the the, the, the solitude, so that that's not the point, it's about the damage that's occurring to the bank and the sedimentation that's occurring there.

And I am not familiar with the the project that you're talking about with the bank, but can find out more about that. But the the main at the heart of what you're bringing up is.
Although we may be talking about monitoring and cars in the parking lot.

God, that our eyes not on the ball there. You know the where where we need to be looking at is at the damage that's occurring to the banks of the Chattooga from the the use there that's occurred over the last 10 years.

Am I catching that OK?

You're partly there. My other comment would be miss, Mr Colburn cited all the paddling permits.

I introduced into the into the administrative record every single one of those paddling permits that signed by people.

And I commented about the fact that those records themselves demonstrate that paddlers have been have been paddling unlawfully. They're paddling when the water isn't high enough, they're paddling on days when they're not supposed to be in there. And yet there's never been any form of enforcement of the rules. Again, we've got our eye on the completely wrong thing. This is the one of Three Rivers in the state of North Carolina classified as an outstanding resource, water and a wild and scenic river. OK. But we seem to just ignore that, and we seem to ignore the administrative records.

Explain why this river was named as an outstanding resource. Water in 1989 after it was first designated as a Wild and Scenic River in 1974. Jimmy Carter, when he was when he was governor of Georgia, who was an avid fisherman who is a part of the Raven County TU chapter.

Was responsible for getting this river designated as Wild and Scenic River in 1976. OK.
And if you go look at the administrative records very, very, very clear about what was so special about
the North Carolina headwaters of the river.

The distinction is so obvious that a blind man could see it OK, and it's that.

The rivers biological capacity to sustain, meaning the gravels, the stone flies that are in the river, the
high quality of the water in terms of its chemistry.

It isn't suitable for for voting. Voting is a recreational use and the and the the wild and Scenic Rivers
Act is very, very specific about a discrete and non discretionary duty at the far service continues to
ignore.

You don't. Even you won't even mention it in your in your planning documents and that is.

In such administration, primary emphasis shall be placed on protecting the scientific features of the
river.

That biological capacity is the quintessential scientific feature of those North Carolina headwaters of
the.

OK.

And the the that.

Yes, yes, yes.

So they'll bill. Can I just put ask you to pause one second? This is this is very useful. This is very useful. I
just wanted you to take a breath so we can Rick and hear you and respond if you have some any
response or.
So, so the idea of a resolution is.

Needing to focus on the biological going back to that administrative record from the beginning and digging into that and making sure that the reasons for that designation on the North, especially the North Carolina portion of the river that we are not losing.

The point about the biological and you mentioned that the recreational is a use, but the reason why that was designated had everything to do with the biological, you know having the gravel, the stone flies, the species of fish, the you know, the, the whole, the whole components that were up there. And so you want us to go back and.

Address that.

Back to bill.

Well, I think it's more accurate to say. You aren't complying with the law, so why didn't seeing it represent OK? The point is recreational uses are not a part of the five categories of special categories of esthetic, scenic, historic, archaeological, and scientific features that we receive. Primary emphasis, protection. OK.

The primary at this is means you put most of your money, your time and effort to doing that particular thing, OK.

You aren't complying with the law, so why didn't seeing it represent OK? The point is recreational uses are not a part of the five categories of special categories of esthetic, scenic, historic, archaeological, and scientific features that we receive. Primary emphasis, protection. OK.

The primary at this is means you put most of your money, your time and effort to doing that particular thing, OK.

And the protection of the scientific feature means you have to protect the reproductive capacity of that river to sustain those numbers of fish. They aren't there anymore. OK? Because and it's not all your fault. I've acknowledged that several times. It's not all your fault, but I find it dismissive that you all of a sudden now, seven years later, saying your naming the Chattooga is the only priority watershed in the entire Nantahala Pisgah National Forest. The only priority watershed. OK, I find that I find that so obscene that it's not even funny. I came to y'all seven years ago and said.
I will help you find the $2,000,000 that's gonna cost to suck this settlement out and restore the gravels I met with Ken Hardy at my cabin with Alan Nicholas.

And subsequent to that, what happened was y'all started trying to shut down my information gathering because I was collecting the information was going to be able to point to the fact that you aren't using the best available scientific information. OK, back to the point that I'm making, OK.

You haven't paid any attention to the data that's out there.

And.

You know, my interest is real simple. I'm here to fix the fish habitat and get the fish back where they are. I'm not here wasting my seven years of time and a lot of my wife's patience. My wife's patience, OK, which is about the most valuable thing you can have.

Screwing around with this, OK.

But I am animated because I am tired for seven years here and excuses, excuses, excuses and then finally, seven years down the road, y'all put in the little slither in your in your LRP that this is a priority watershed.

But no, we're gonna plan how we're gonna do it in the future. That's not what the law requires. The law requires you to act right now, and we're going to get to that eventually. I would prefer to be on the same side of the rock, pushing it with you up the hill, then pushing it down the hill on you.

But you all have given me do choice and and so you know what we need to do is you need to go back
and look and study what you’ve been given on page 24 of my objections and starting there, I give you the road map. What you need to do. And I’ve given you the, the, the technology that’s out there. I even named the people that can do it. What you do is go get the vacuum and technology is actually been used in the Savannah River basin by the Forest Service further downstream near the Savannah where the Savannah dumps into the taglit.

OK. Or somewhere down there. OK, so I've given you recommendations. I've said I'm here to help you find the money to make it happen.

And all we seem to focus on is how much boating we can have on the river. Boating should never have been there. The 4th Circuit Court appeals has been very, very clear with what it said.

Boating is not an interest, it has to be protected.

Despite all this noise for since 2005, that's the bottom line. We shouldn't be having any boating until the fishery has been reestablished and every penny that's put into this river should be going towards reestablishing the fishery.

And in terms of the yeah.

I'm listening. I'm hearing.

OK, bill, hold on. Hold on. Bill, I feels like you're repeating your point if you're repeating your points. I think we've heard them.

OK, bill, hold on. Hold on. Bill, I feels like you're repeating your point if you're repeating your points. I think we've heard them.

Is there anything anything else?
OK, alright, good enough. I agree. I agree. No, that's fine. I'll stand by.

If you would, if you would please give me the card receipt. I raise my hand to ask me to participate. Thank you.

I would definitely do that now because you've been really constructive in this last five minutes. So very, very helpful. Thank you, bill. Thank thank you for that and.

And so yeah, I think I think I've got it.

Along with everything else you've provided, so this is very helpful to us that you have any questions or anything. OK. And I think there's some other hands up if we wanted to circle around back-to-back to Kevin and he last thought, Kevin?

Sure. Yeah, a couple things.

First of all, I just want to follow up on Bill a little bit, you know, fully support his goals of reducing sedimentation down to natural background levels. You know, recreations of fishing or phishing as a recreation used to just like boating. They're both have value. They both have a place on the river.

You know, I think the idea that, you know, 7 to 30 people telling the river is causing any meaningful erosion is something that's not possible. You know, we generally walk down the river. We're actually required to put on it specific places that are hard in, we put on the river and paddle down stream. You know, fishermen go in and out of the river and hike up the river and do all kinds of stuff, probably far more. I just. I wouldn't wanna get confused. Anyone to think that paddling was a source of significant
erosion? That isn't, you know, just background at this point. But I really like to focus just quickly on the 2012 planning rule. You know, the last time this issue was revisited was 2012.

And then the planning rule came out and the planning rule is a little bit different. You know, it requires that we rely on the best available science relying on literally the the.

Management for the Tortuga right now was based on one descent in 2007 that was studied. That's it. One descent, and then a whole bunch of predictions. So we know so much more now the best available science is, you know, a decade of monitoring.

You know, public support has changed just the whole issue has evolved where we now know it's it's not an issue like paddling is not an issue on that page 2, it may be a political issue for some folks, but it is absolutely not a biophysical issue, is not a social issue. It's not a problem.

The planning rule tells us to provide for sustainable recreation. I think it's sustainable. I think every reasonable person would look at this small amount of use and say it's sustainable, requires the best available science, and it envisions a planning process that monitors and adapts and amends and moves forward based on real time information, incrementally improving the management of the forest, not pushing things 20 years down the road to do big lump changes. This is a perfect opportunity to do an incremental improvement.

By changing some or all of these limits that are unnecessary to better provide for sustainable recreation.
I would like to respond. Please.

Just wait a minute. We want to hear those counter viewpoints.

Take them in, respect them and not not.

Go any further so I'm I would appreciate that you're each offering your different viewpoints and I think that's what this is all about. So Bill is there something new in what you wanna say?

First of all, recreational use of the river is not prioritized. Use of this particular body of water. OK, it's very clear we keep missing the point, OK.

We heard you on that bill.

You whether.

Yeah, we heard that's not new. Is there any?

Well, I'm trying to respond to the point that the gentleman made, OK. He brought it up again so.
We don't need to go a point by counterpoint with Kevin. If there's some additional.

Things that you haven't already said.

The we understand that you all have a differing opinion on some of these, but if there's.

No, no, not at all.

Not at all. We're not telling you that at all.

Right, But what's what's going on, right? What's going on? Mr Malone's right. Now is you're trying to run me down, which is not purpose of this meeting. I'm trying to be constructive. And you're telling me that what I have to say is not relevant or it's redundant. And I disagree with you. Right. OK, well, then, please. Then stop, then stop saying that because he just said he just said what he said, which is that I was going to point counterpoint to Mr Colburn.

Right. I'm trying to point to the law. OK, that's all I care about.

And I've outlined it for you.

That new? Is that something that you haven't offered already? Is that something that you haven't already said? We're looking for something new.

Why don't you turn to page 24 of my objection. Do you have my objection there?

Thank you.
I don't.

Do you have it sitting there? You don't even have my objection there. This is my objection. Resolution process. You don't? Objection. You don't have object.


OK, well please pull it out and turn to page 24.

Make your final bill bill make point, and we're gonna close. We're about at the end of the day, so you'll have the last voice, OK?

Well.

I see where this is headed.

We're headed to judge what Frank Whitney and Western District Court. And we're headed there for a lot of reasons.

And some of you guys that are sitting in those chairs right now.

You better start thinking about whether you've exceeded your official authority and moved into another area. Again, what happened was I received certain documents on June 22nd, 2022 that are very revealing. I'm interested in trying to solve this problem, but this experience today is an example of how y'all have continued to try to shut me down. Tell me I'm telling you irrelevant things. Then go back and talk to Mr Calvin about what he wants. OK. You provided him with a de facto veto over how this plan was going to be done. On September 6th, 2017. It's in writing.
OK, now you can say you don't believe it, but you go back and look because you're gonna find out that that's the case and everything you've done since then. Subsequent proves the point. OK, now back to the closing point.

You aren't complying with the law.

This river is supposed to be managed under two things, the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Clean water.

The Clean Water Act has a provision in it called the ANTIDEGRADATION mandate. You can go look it up. I'm not gonna quote it till you today, OK?

The purpose for why the river was reclassified as an outstanding resource water in 1988 had nothing to do with paddling whatsoever. Neither did it have anything to do with my ability to go catch fish.

They could restrict the fishing on the river and still accomplish the objective of the water, which was to preserve the outstanding biological capacity to sustain numeric outstanding numeric densities and biomass of naturally reproducing assemblies of rainbow, brown and brook trout, all three species.

So what the Antidegradation mandate says is that we can't allow any non temporary diminishment in the functional capacity of that particular use of the river. That's what this is going to be about, OK. And y'all can claim that we talk. You can claim that the anti that the the part of the wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the non degradation part of the wild and Scenic Rivers Act says something different, but it doesn't really. OK. This is a sub categorized designated uses of RW water. Quality of this river.
Clothes on. I'll close on that. I've offered once. I'll offer twice. I'll offer three times to go find the 2,000,000 bucks that we need to suck the settlement out to restore the gravels and reestablish the fisheries. But we're not going to do it by accommodating somebody that has no standing. That the 4th Circuit has said clearly has no standing to be on this river. They're not. They're not. They're not entitled to have your catering to their needs.

And whatever they say, it's just noise. Thank you.


Going through that with us.

So the time is up for today.

How would the the last few minutes we wanna just?

I'll wrap and close.

You know how you want to handle that?

OK. Yeah.

One again I started started at the beginning of the day and and say again here it's.
Thank you. Thank you so much for your time. This is your time that you're spending with us and you put a lot of thought. You put a lot of effort and again a lot of care, a lot of caring into this and.

A lot. We cover a wide range of things today.

My head's gonna be swimming, not processing everything.

And going over things in my head, which is, which is part of the purpose of this is, yeah.

I can read things, but I just even though this is virtual, having some amount of interaction and hearing your voice and hearing, hearing the passion behind it, hearing the thoughtfulness behind it, hearing everything had to offer is very, very, very valuable to me. So thank you. Thank you for putting your voices into the room. Thank you for your patience too as we.

Well, I know you're there was probably things you wanted to get into the room and we had to wait. And again, we didn't have many technical difficulties, but thank you for working with the technology and working through all that.

Yeah. And so with all this dialogue in mind, I think it'll help me when I go back and look at.

Yeah, the objections.

It'll give me some insights. It'll give me some, you know, additional thoughts. This helps helps me process things and it's good to see you know where there may be some opportunities.

For for resolution and again we'll, we'll be really digging into that because the the plan is very well integrated and a lot of work has gone into it and you know one thing is if we if we pull on one part of it,
we don't want something to unravel later. So a high degree of care will go into looking at everything and seeing how everything.

8:16:11.290 --> 8:16:24.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It's not weaves together as we go through this, we've got two more days to of of objection, resolutions going through, going through and hearing and discussing.

8:16:25.580 --> 8:16:27.260
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then then then we've got a lot.

8:16:28.90 --> 8:16:47.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
A lot of work to do. There's been a lot of work that's been put into the plan. A lot of your work that's been put in the plan and and we're not there yet. There's more work to be done and I appreciate so much that you know, you're you're part of the effort. You're part of the team and thank you so much for that, I.

8:16:47.940 --> 8:16:51.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I was thinking at the beginning of the day, maybe I'd summarize some things.

8:16:53.550 --> 8:16:57.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But I don't know if I can do that and it really give justice to that.

8:16:58.870 --> 8:17:15.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I you probably saw that I was taking a lot of notes that helps my memory joggers like I'll be able to go back through this and I really wanna pull out those opportunities for resolution opportunities and other questions that I may have that I wanna go back into the documents and dig in a little bit more.

8:17:16.710 --> 8:17:21.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So unless there's something I'm missing, that's that's kind of where I'm at.

8:17:24.340 --> 8:17:24.690
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Go ahead.

8:17:24.950 --> 8:17:31.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Just notice that are not going to be oh oh, what's gonna happen? Ohh, thanks. Thanks, Jody. Jody mentioned that.

8:17:32.300 --> 8:17:54.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, keep forgetting you're looking at the screen that some some of you may just be joining for today
and not not with us the rest of the time. So again, thank you if you're if you're with us today and you're not with us on on the future segments of this mornings and afternoons. Thank you. Thank you for your time and your help.

8:17:54.850 --> 8:18:2.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For our forest planning effort and tomorrow morning we send on soils and roads.

8:18:3.720 --> 8:18:12.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The afternoon we spent on force management and ecological integrity, you'll notice that in your gender, just a queue, that change. Do you have any?

8:18:13.690 --> 8:18:18.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Final thoughts, right? Just thanks for for everyone that, that's.

8:18:18.360 --> 8:18:26.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh contributed to this, and throughout it, you know, I think the focus on recreation and and these special places this afternoon.

8:18:27.930 --> 8:18:45.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Are is really key? We know how that the vast majority of the public interacts with the with the, with the forest, through recreation and being in these special places. So appreciate that that dialogue today and yeah, for those that we won't see tomorrow. Thank you. And I'm sure we'll see a lot of you tomorrow in the next day.

8:18:46.610 --> 8:19:12.190
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And one last point for particularly for those that are dropping off for the rest of the week, that just a reminder that this recording of the session that we had today and we'll have tomorrow the next day will be available on the website forced website that in a week or two and then also look forward to Rick's final response in the letter and associated documents that will come out later this fall.

Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So those are the follow-ups.

8:19:16.920 --> 8:19:17.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Anything else?

8:19:19.410 --> 8:19:22.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, thank you again and.
And we start at what time? 8:30 in the morning, 30 in the morning and sign on a little bit early.

So if you could be on what 5-10 minutes or team will open up at 8:15 fifteen so we can make sure all of the technologies up and running before we kick things off at 8:30. Anything else from the support in the room?

Have a good evening, folks.