

From: [Amelia Burnette](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Cc: [Berner, Ruth -FS](#); [Luczak, Heather L -FS](#); [DJ Gerken](#); [Patrick Hunter](#); [Sam Evans](#); josh@wnca.org; [Bob Gale \(Bob@wnca.org\)](#); [Ben Prater](#); [Hugh Irwin \(hugh_irwin@twc.org\)](mailto:hugh_irwin@twc.org); [Laura LaFleur](#)
Subject: Comments - Draft inventory & special designations
Date: Monday, May 19, 2014 4:01:54 PM
Attachments: [2014-05-19 NPNF Designations.pdf](#)

Please find attached our comments on the Pisgah-Nantahala draft inventory of potential additions to wilderness (process and inventory list) and special designations criteria discussed at the April 2014 public meeting. Thanks for considering our comments, and please do not hesitate to contact us with questions.

Amelia

Amelia Burnette
Senior Attorney
Southern Environmental Law Center
22 S. Pack Square, Suite 700
Asheville, North Carolina 28801-3494
828-258-2023 tel
828-258-2024 fax
aburnette@selcnc.org
SouthernEnvironment.org

From: edtaylor@comporium.net
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Comments on Nantahala and Pisgah Land Management Plan
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 6:54:40 PM

I am concerned over any proposal to increase the percentage of forest land managed as wilderness and road-less in a preservation mode of operation. Public lands are for public use and such proposal would restrict the public from its own property at the whim of the Forest Service. Also the economic impact of restricting more federal lands from timber harvest could impact local economies which are already depressed. The Forest Service does not have a stellar record of forest management at present which is unlikely to improve with additional responsibilities. Too much public forest land already has some sort of restrictive use designation and to add even would be a move in the wrong direction.

Sincerely,

Ed Taylor
Retired Engineer
Brevard, NC

From: [K W Brett](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Designated forest
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 10:52:54 AM

Please don't designate more land into entities that assure that the real owners CAN'T UTILIZE them in the time honored traditions. These traditions include hunting, gathering, fishing, and camping in addition to the more recent pastimes of viewing from a motorized vehicle. Thanks for listening to the views of the diverse population that actually own the land that you manage. Bill Brett, Franklin, NC.

Sent from my iPhone

From: jeff@jeffjohnsonstimmerframes.com
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Designation Input
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 10:57:30 AM

- 1) At this time, we do not support more wilderness areas or further designated areas. In addition to the designated wilderness areas (70,000 acres) and wilderness study areas (27,000 acres) , there 33 Inventoried Roadless Areas (152,000 acres) for a total of nearly 250,000 acres or 25% of the National Forest Lands. If you add in 40% (USFS estimate) of the old growth designation that does not overlap with the above (68,000 acres), the total is 317,000 acres or almost one third of the forest that is essentially wilderness. There is another third of the forest where management is restricted or prohibited. (don't forget the Smoky Park also – 500,000 acres). The biggest need is to ensure that areas still exist where management can occur and not to place any further restrictions on these areas.

- 2) Scenery. Without knowing the specifics of the new scenery system, we are concerned about the large number of roads and waterways proposed to be concern level 1 or 2. We recommend that all of these be reclassified as concern level 3.

Thank you,

Jeff Johnson

From: [Kyle Brown](#)
To: [FS-NFNCPlanRevision](#)
Cc: [David Whitmire](#); [Leonard Harwood](#)
Subject: Designations and Scenery Management Comments
Date: Tuesday, May 13, 2014 3:47:28 PM
Attachments: [Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council Designations and Scenery Management.pdf](#)

Heather,

Please find attached comments provided by the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council in regards to designations and scenery management.

Regards,
Kyle Brown

From: [Gary Peters](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Designations
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2014 5:53:55 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

These comments are directed at the rather general descriptions and proposals floated at the April 17th meeting, and what is posted on the NF website.

1. By in large, the discussion of designating wilderness areas, wilderness study areas, backcountry areas, special interest areas, old growth areas, etc., etc. is an unnecessary effort on the Nantahala Pisgah NF's. Currently the forest is actively harvesting <1000 acres per year and has for many, many years. With 1.2+ million acres administered by the Forest Service on these two NF's, that translates into over a 1000 year rotation; if every acre was available to harvest. We all know that all acres are not available for various reasons but even if 50% (for the sake of discussion) were available, it would be in excess of a 500 year rotation, hardly a threat in the Appalachian mountains to any species of wildlife, ecosystem, or plant known to mankind. New designations are a moot point, and actually counterproductive for wildlife (all kinds), recreation (all kinds), and administration (all kinds).
2. The one sure fired way to 'change' a specific site that you are attempting to 'protect' is to draw a line around it and name it. No more. Make this Forest Plan revision be the one that sets a new standard for ecosystem restoration and protection on public lands. It's not drawing lines, or naming sites. Despite their intended purpose, such activities are ultimately, although benign, unwittingly self serving for an incredibly small number of individuals.
3. The arbitrary use of a '20 year' window into the past is almost laughable. There is no basis other than expedience, that would cause such an analysis to 'pollute' the wilderness system in this way. It is imperative that mountain culture and traditional uses that have existed for hundreds of years on this land be recognized, celebrated, and are far more important than struggling to find a way to make areas to satisfy an exercise in planning.
4. Do not make this planning exercise of a roadless area review become a vehicle to prevent the Forest from responding to natural, or necessary changes to benefit wildlife (all kinds), recreation (all kinds), public safety (all kinds), and fire prevention and control.

Gary M. Peters
Biologist for the Carolinas
email: gpeters@nwtf.net
cell: 803 665-7126



National Wild Turkey Federation

770 Augusta Road | Edgefield, SC 29824

803-637-3106 - Direct Line | www.nwtf.org

803-637-0034 – Fax



This communication is intended by the sender and proper recipient(s) to be confidential, intended only for the proper recipient(s) and may contain information that is confidential or proprietary. If you are not the intended recipient(s), you are notified that the dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you receive this message in error, or are not the proper recipient(s), please notify the sender at either the e-mail address or telephone number above and delete the e-mail from your computer or return the fax to the sender. Thank you.

From: [Jim Phillips](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: DIVERSTY!
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 10:23:07 AM

Greetings,

I'd like to comment on further special designations and scenery management. With current designated wilderness areas (70,000 acres) and wilderness study areas (27,000 acres) , there 33 Inventoried Roadless Areas (152,000 acres) for a total of nearly 250,000 acres. In addition, 40% (USFS estimate) of the old growth designation that does not overlap with the above (68,000 acres), the current total is roughly 317,000 acres. One third of the National Forests in North Carolina are now wilderness by default.

An additional 1/3 of the remaining forests are restricted or prohibited from management. Now chip in the possibility of scenery management etc. and what will be left? I urge you good folks to consider that National Forests should be managed for **diversity**. With zero early succession designations, all Forest Service lands are arguably old growth instead of vibrant, productive areas that could benefit wildlife and rural economies desperate for opportunity.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jim Phillips
Burnsville, NC 28714
828-208-3800

From: [Stull, Lauren B -FS](#)
To: [Luczak, Heather L -FS](#)
Subject: Fw: Cherokee County's Opposition to Additional Designated Wilderness Areas in Graham County
Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 8:47:16 AM
Attachments: [Opposition of Designation of Additional Wilderness Areas in Graham County.pdf](#)

From: FS-Tusquitee RD
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 08:44 AM
To: Stull, Lauren B -FS
Subject: FW: Cherokee County's Opposition to Additional Designated Wilderness Areas in Graham County

Lauren,
This was in Tusquitee's inbox.

From: Maria Hass [mailto:maria.hass@cherokeecounty-nc.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 5:10 PM
To: FS-Tusquitee RD
Subject: Cherokee County's Opposition to Additional Designated Wilderness Areas in Graham County

Lauren,

Please see the attached, as I believe that today is the last day for public comment. I have also faxed this to Senator Hagan and Senator Burr.

Maria

Maria Hass
Assistant County Manager
Asst. Clerk to the Board
Cherokee County
75 Peachtree Street, Suite 210
Murphy, NC 28906
Office-828-837-5527 ext 814
Fax-828-837-9684
Cell-828-557-1649
maria.hass@cherokeecounty-nc.gov

"Your reputation and integrity are everything. Follow through on what you say you're going to do. Your credibility can only be built over time, and it is built from the history of your words and actions." — Maria Razumich-Zec

Disclaimer: Pursuant to the Freedom of Information-Privacy Acts (FOIPA) and North Carolina General Statutes Chapter 132, Public Records; this electronic mail message and any attachments hereto, as well as any electronic mail messages(s) sent in response to it may be considered public record and as such subject to request and review by anyone at any time.

From: [Leonard Harwood](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2014 12:01:52 PM
Attachments: [Kristin M.doc](#)

From: [Jim Gray](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Cc: "[David Whitmire](#)"; gpeters@nwtf.net; "[Rob Lanning](#)"; "[Adrienne Pauletta](#)"; "[Beacher Franks](#)"; "[Bill](#)"; "[Bill](#)"; "[Bill Kane](#)"; "[Brad Dodson](#)"; "[Bruce Gatta](#)"; "[Bryan Henn](#)"; "[Chip Laughton](#)"; "[Chole Trexler](#)"; "[Colton Fries](#)"; "[Curtis Bradley](#)"; "[Daniel McNeely](#)"; "[Stewart, J. David](#)"; "[devin gentry](#)"; "[Don Henderson](#)"; "[Don Mallicoat](#)"; "[Doreen Miller](#)"; "[Jeff Johnson](#)"; "[Jim Bode](#)"; "[Jim Gray](#)"; "[Jim Phillips](#)"; "[Joffrey W Brooks](#)"; "[John Culclasure](#)"; "[John Miko](#)"; "[Jordon Hotchkiss](#)"; "[Leonard Harwood](#)"; "[Linda Ordiway](#)"; "[Marc Bischof](#)"; "[Mark Rogers](#)"; "[Monte Seehorn](#)"; "[Ray Hoxit](#)"; "[Jacobs, Ryan J](#)"; "[Sarah Riddle](#)"; "[Steve Faust](#)"; "[Steve Henson](#)"; "[Wait, Anthony L.](#)"; "[Tucker Hobbs](#)"; "[Tyler Ross](#)"; dwells1929@gmail.com; SRobbins@pheasantsforever.org; [Marc Bischof](#); [Jim Bode](#)
Subject: Nantahala/Pisgah Plan Revision
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 8:32:34 PM

This is another response to a deadline by the Forest Service to comment on the Nantahala/Pisgah National Forest Plan Revision. It seems that no matter how many times we respond to the Forest Service deadlines for comments, they simply publish another document and set another deadline. I am very opposed to the designation of additional areas that are excluded to management of timber, by whatever means - special designation, designation as "scenery", etc.

The National Forests should function as a reserve of timber to meet the nation's needs for forest products. A secondary purpose should be to provide an area where recreation, preservation of species, enhancement of wildlife and enjoyment of the natural environment can occur. If the primary and secondary purposes coincide, then we have achieved a multiplier effect. This multiplier effect occurs when timber is cut, early successional habitat replaces the mature forest and wildlife multiplies many times over in the newly productive forest. This effect does not occur when vast areas of the forest are set aside in any of the designations that prevent timber cutting and forest enhancement for the benefit of wildlife. The current process of adding to the inventory of designated areas where no forest management can occur due to special classifications or designation as "scenery" makes less and less of the forest available for management to benefit wildlife as the years progress.

My opinion is that the Forest Service is making their own jobs much easier by designating vast areas that can no longer be considered for timber cutting. It is much easier to sit back and let the trees grow than it is to estimate timber for cutting, manage/build/maintain forest roads, monitor timber cutting operations, etc. I also believe that the Forest Service is siding with, colluding with and favoring environmentalist groups that are pressing for the elimination of timber cutting. By these actions the Forest Service is directly eliminating many jobs for timber products workers in Western North Carolina. The timber products industry is an important part of the culture of Western North Carolina and the Forest Service is involved in destroying this culture. The Forest Service is also damaging wildlife populations by allowing more and more forest to transition to mature growth forest.

I close by imploring you to resist the efforts of the environmentalist groups, to resist the efforts of protectionists within the Forest Service and to manage the national forests as they have been historically managed – for the benefit of jobs, culture, wildlife, watersheds, species preservation and recreational interests that benefit from a broad mix of multiple age forests. The National Parks are there for the preservationists and protectionists.

Sincerely,
Jim Gray
84 Soaring Eagle Dr.
Franklin, NC 28734
828-349-9735

From: [Harper, Craig A](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: NC Plan Revision
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 9:57:18 AM

Supervisor Bail,

I would like to submit a comment for the NC Plan Revision. I do not believe designating additional acreage as wilderness would be in the best interest of our natural resources or public use. I believe allowing more proactive management as determined by USDA-Forest Service biologists as well as biologists with the NC Wildlife Resources Commission is most needed for the greatest number of species and ecosystem management. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Harper, Professor / Extension Wildlife Specialist
University of Tennessee
Department of Forestry, Wildlife, and Fisheries
2431 Joe Johnson Drive, Knoxville, TN 37996
(865) 974-7346
charper@utk.edu

From: [Danna Brown](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Opposition to Wilderness Expansion
Date: Monday, May 05, 2014 9:12:54 AM

I would like to respectfully voice my extreme opposition to the idea of expanding Wilderness designation in Pisgah. This designation is unnecessary and unfairly targets mountain biking. Mountain bikers are a great asset to Western North Carolina because by definition we are lovers of the forest. Plans that arbitrarily exclude us from areas that are greatly loved and nationally renown can only impact the region negatively.

Thank you,

Danna S. Brown, C.P.A.
Corporate Controller
JPS Industries, Inc.
(864) 239-3918

The preceding e-mail message (including any attachments) is confidential and may be privileged or constitute non-public information. If you have received this message in error or are not the proper recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful. Thank you.

From: [Jeff McDaris](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Pisgah and Nantahala Forest Land Management Plan
Date: Wednesday, April 30, 2014 7:41:39 AM

Attention: Ms. Kristen Bail
Forest Supervisor
National Forests in NC

Dear. Ms. Bail,

I am writing out of concern regarding the proposed Land Management Plan Revision for the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests. I am concerned that the suggested wilderness or no road portions would potentially increase the economic challenges facing Transylvania County. Our county already has a significant percentage of its land in state or national forest. In addition, the remaining private land is greatly limited by both flood plain issues or steep slopes. We have struggled here economically far longer than the currently accepted dates of the state and national economic downturn, and it is likely we will take much longer to emerge from its effects locally.

Managed forestland supports a wide range of diverse wildlife and timber harvest proceeds benefit our schools. A wilderness classification could further slow our ability to recover from this recession. Our schools have faced dwindling enrollment and a limited ability of local government to compensate public education in this tight economy. I wholeheartedly support and appreciate the benefits of recreational management and protecting our natural resources. I also believe there is a balanced win-win potential by not inhibiting our ability to live and flourish here with designations that have not been thoroughly vetted for economic impact.

A "hands off" wilderness designation may be unnecessary unless such an area is truly unique and with rare environmental concerns that cannot be protected in a smart and manageable way that benefits both the environment and economic development. Any proposal that recommends additional designated Wilderness areas or other management-prohibited areas in Transylvania County and western North Carolina should be delayed until the full ramifications and options are vetted and examined. This needs to involve all parties, and in particular local concerns.

Jobs that allow families to earn enough to be able to live and work (and send their children to public schools) should be an integral part of any decision made.

The goal in our forest lands should be conservation and sustainability and the way to achieve that is through a working and well managed forest. I believe that if plans are applied and maintained in a manner that benefits the local economy and includes a well constructed forest management approach (including timber harvest and management) it will protect natural resources. Please consider a move in this direction.

Sincerely,
Jeff McDaris

Jeff McDaris, Ed.D.
Superintendent
Transylvania County Schools

"Where teaching everyone takes everyone!"

All email correspondence to and from this address is subject to NC Public Records law, which may result in monitoring and disclosure to third parties, including law enforcement.

From: [Bucky Galloway](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Pisgah and Nantahala National Forest Plan revision
Date: Wednesday, April 30, 2014 7:00:30 AM

Ms. Bail,

As a life long resident of WNC and an avid outdoorsman, I have seen the adverse effects that have been caused by the lackluster management of the Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests. Back when there was a proactive management plan where timber harvests were a critical part of that plan, wildlife such as deer, turkey, grouse, woodcock, etc. seem to flourish throughout. Since selective timbering has ceased in the National Forests, the diversity and sheer numbers of wildlife species has been greatly reduced. Increasing the percentage of "wilderness" and "roadless" designations within the forests WILL do nothing but legitimize the lackluster forest management practices of the last 30 years and will continue to lead to the further demise of several critical wildlife species struggling to hang on in this part of WNC.

In reality, well established and effective forest management practices stopped being a standard practice in WNC when activist groups/tree huggers started a barrage of complaints back in the 70's and 80's. So in effect, the activists now have control of how our forests are managed and not the trained professionals that have the experience and knowledge to do what is best to optimize wildlife and plant diversity in the Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests. The citizens of NC and the US do not need activist puppets to manage our national forests. We need trained and experienced biologists, wildlife experts, and timber specialists that utilize well established forest management practices that have been proven to be beneficial for the diversity of wildlife and plant species, and have proven to provide a positive economic impact in our local communities.

It is the role of the US Forest Service to look after the best interests of ALL National Forest stakeholders/taxpayers and not just the minute vocal minority that wants to protect trees at all costs, no matter what the impact it causes on wildlife numbers and diversity and no matter what the impact it has on the hundreds of thousands of WNC residents and tourists that visit these two national forests each year. It is time for the US Forest Service to step up to the plate and represent all stakeholders(local residents, NF visitors, handicapped NF visitors, local businesses, state & county governments, schools, hunters, fishermen, etc.)

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on these proposed Land Management Plan Revisions for the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests. It is my plea that any decision regarding these two national forests will take in consideration ALL beneficiaries and users of these invaluable national resources.

Thanks for your time.

David Galloway

From: [Leonard Harwood](#)
To: [Dewey Wells](#); [Jim Gray](#)
Cc: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#); [David Whitmire](#); [gpeters@nwtf.net](#); [Rob Lanning](#); [Adrienne Pauletta](#); [Beacher Franks](#); [Bill](#); [Bill Kane](#); [Brad Dodson](#); [Bruce Gatta](#); [Bryan Henn](#); [Chip Laughton](#); [Chole Trexler](#); [Colton Fries](#); [Curtis Bradley](#); [Daniel McNeely](#); [Stewart, J. David](#); [devin gentry](#); [Don Henderson](#); [Don Mallicoat](#); [Doreen Miller](#); [Jeff Johnson](#); [Jim Bode](#); [Jim Phillips](#); [Joffrey W Brooks](#); [John Culclasure](#); [John Miko](#); [Jordan Hotchkiss](#); [Linda Ordiway](#); [Marc Bischof](#); [Mark Rogers](#); [Monte Seehorn](#); [Ray Hoxit](#); [Jacobs, Ryan J](#); [Sarah Riddle](#); [Steve Faust](#); [Steve Henson](#); [Wait, Anthony L.](#); [Tucker Hobbs](#); [Tyler Ross](#); [SRobbins@pheasantsforever.org](#)
Subject: Re: Nantahala/Pisgah Plan Revision
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2014 1:29:55 PM

Dewey, I agree. Not only must we unite, but have a cohesive message addressing many issues. I know the dems will try and tare apart anything put forth, and I understand the delay for this reason, however, we can't wait too late.

On Thursday, May 15, 2014 12:45 PM, Dewey Wells <dwells1929@gmail.com> wrote:

Great letter, Jim!

The key to having properly balanced National Forest management is top leadership not subservient to selfish extremists, and that could come about in 2016. The various factions within the GOP must unite to win that election.

On Wed, May 14, 2014 at 8:31 PM, Jim Gray <jimg513@frontier.com> wrote:

This is another response to a deadline by the Forest Service to comment on the Nantahala/Pisgah National Forest Plan Revision. It seems that no matter how many times we respond to the Forest Service deadlines for comments, they simply publish another document and set another deadline. I am very opposed to the designation of additional areas that are excluded to management of timber, by whatever means - special designation, designation as "scenery", etc.

The National Forests should function as a reserve of timber to meet the nation's needs for forest products. A secondary purpose should be to provide an area where recreation, preservation of species, enhancement of wildlife and enjoyment of the natural environment can occur. If the primary and secondary purposes coincide, then we have achieved a multiplier effect. This multiplier effect occurs when timber is cut, early successional habitat replaces the mature forest and wildlife multiplies many times over in the newly productive forest. This effect does not occur when vast areas of the forest are set aside in any of the designations that prevent timber cutting and forest enhancement for the benefit of wildlife. The current process of adding to the inventory of designated areas where no forest management can occur due to special classifications or designation as "scenery" makes less and less of the forest available for management to benefit wildlife as the years progress.

My opinion is that the Forest Service is making their own jobs much easier by designating vast areas that can no longer be considered for timber cutting. It is

much easier to sit back and let the trees grow than it is to estimate timber for cutting, manage/build/maintain forest roads, monitor timber cutting operations, etc. I also believe that the Forest Service is siding with, colluding with and favoring environmentalist groups that are pressing for the elimination of timber cutting. By these actions the Forest Service is directly eliminating many jobs for timber products workers in Western North Carolina. The timber products industry is an important part of the culture of Western North Carolina and the Forest Service is involved in destroying this culture. The Forest Service is also damaging wildlife populations by allowing more and more forest to transition to mature growth forest.

I close by imploring you to resist the efforts of the environmentalist groups, to resist the efforts of protectionists within the Forest Service and to manage the national forests as they have been historically managed – for the benefit of jobs, culture, wildlife, watersheds, species preservation and recreational interests that benefit from a broad mix of multiple age forests. The National Parks are there for the preservationists and protectionists.

Sincerely,
Jim Gray
84 Soaring Eagle Dr.
Franklin, NC 28734
[828-349-9735](tel:828-349-9735)

From: [Dewey Wells](#)
To: [Jim Gray](#)
Cc: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#); [David Whitmire](#); [gpeters@nwtf.net](#); [Rob Lanning](#); [Adrienne Pauletta](#); [Beacher Franks](#); [Bill](#); [Bill Kane](#); [Brad Dodson](#); [Bruce Gatta](#); [Bryan Henn](#); [Chip Laughton](#); [Chole Trexler](#); [Colton Fries](#); [Curtis Bradley](#); [Daniel McNeely](#); [Stewart, J. David](#); [devin gentry](#); [Don Henderson](#); [Don Mallicoat](#); [Doreen Miller](#); [Jeff Johnson](#); [Jim Bode](#); [Jim Phillips](#); [Joffrey W Brooks](#); [John Culclasure](#); [John Miko](#); [Jordan Hotchkiss](#); [Leonard Harwood](#); [Linda Ordiway](#); [Marc Bischof](#); [Mark Rogers](#); [Monte Seehorn](#); [Ray Hoxit](#); [Jacobs, Ryan J](#); [Sarah Riddle](#); [Steve Faust](#); [Steve Henson](#); [Wait, Anthony L.](#); [Tucker Hobbs](#); [Tyler Ross](#); [SRobbins@pheasantsforever.org](#)
Subject: Re: Nantahala/Pisgah Plan Revision
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2014 12:45:31 PM

Great letter, Jim!

The key to having properly balanced National Forest management is top leadership not subservient to selfish extremists, and that could come about in 2016. The various factions within the GOP must unite to win that election.

On Wed, May 14, 2014 at 8:31 PM, Jim Gray <jimg513@frontier.com> wrote:

This is another response to a deadline by the Forest Service to comment on the Nantahala/Pisgah National Forest Plan Revision. It seems that no matter how many times we respond to the Forest Service deadlines for comments, they simply publish another document and set another deadline. I am very opposed to the designation of additional areas that are excluded to management of timber, by whatever means - special designation, designation as "scenery", etc.

The National Forests should function as a reserve of timber to meet the nation's needs for forest products. A secondary purpose should be to provide an area where recreation, preservation of species, enhancement of wildlife and enjoyment of the natural environment can occur. If the primary and secondary purposes coincide, then we have achieved a multiplier effect. This multiplier effect occurs when timber is cut, early successional habitat replaces the mature forest and wildlife multiplies many times over in the newly productive forest. This effect does not occur when vast areas of the forest are set aside in any of the designations that prevent timber cutting and forest enhancement for the benefit of wildlife. The current process of adding to the inventory of designated areas where no forest management can occur due to special classifications or designation as "scenery" makes less and less of the forest available for management to benefit wildlife as the years progress.

My opinion is that the Forest Service is making their own jobs much easier by designating vast areas that can no longer be considered for timber cutting. It is much easier to sit back and let the trees grow than it is to estimate timber for cutting, manage/build/maintain forest roads, monitor timber cutting operations,

etc. I also believe that the Forest Service is siding with, colluding with and favoring environmentalist groups that are pressing for the elimination of timber cutting. By these actions the Forest Service is directly eliminating many jobs for timber products workers in Western North Carolina. The timber products industry is an important part of the culture of Western North Carolina and the Forest Service is involved in destroying this culture. The Forest Service is also damaging wildlife populations by allowing more and more forest to transition to mature growth forest.

I close by imploring you to resist the efforts of the environmentalist groups, to resist the efforts of protectionists within the Forest Service and to manage the national forests as they have been historically managed – for the benefit of jobs, culture, wildlife, watersheds, species preservation and recreational interests that benefit from a broad mix of multiple age forests. The National Parks are there for the preservationists and protectionists.

Sincerely,

Jim Gray

84 Soaring Eagle Dr.

Franklin, NC 28734

[828-349-9735](tel:828-349-9735)

From: [Linda Ordiway](#)
To: [Leonard Harwood](#)
Cc: [Dewey Wells](#); [Jim Gray](#); [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#); [David Whitmire](#); [gpeters@nwtf.net](#); [Rob Lanning](#); [Adrienne Pauletta](#); [Beacher Franks](#); [Bill](#); [Bill Kane](#); [Brad Dodson](#); [Bruce Gatta](#); [Bryan Henn](#); [Chip Laughton](#); [Chole Trexler](#); [Colton Fries](#); [Curtis Bradley](#); [Daniel McNeely](#); [Stewart J. David](#); [devin gentry](#); [Don Henderson](#); [Don Mallicoat](#); [Doreen Miller](#); [Jeff Johnson](#); [Jim Bode](#); [Jim Phillips](#); [Joffrey W Brooks](#); [John Culclasure](#); [John Miko](#); [Jordon Hotchkiss](#); [Marc Bischof](#); [Mark Rogers](#); [Monte Seehorn](#); [Ray Hoxit](#); [Jacobs, Ryan J](#); [Sarah Riddle](#); [Steve Faust](#); [Steve Henson](#); [Wait, Anthony L.](#); [Tucker Hobbs](#); [Tyler Ross](#); [SRobbins@pheasantsforever.org](#); [Linda Ordiway](#)
Subject: Re: Nantahala/Pisgah Plan Revision
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2014 4:47:09 PM
Attachments: [RGS scenery comments .pdf](#)

All - see attached for my comments on wilderness, designated areas, and scenery. I feel the letters I have seen are very strong and extremely well done. The message this group has generated and spread is far reaching and well formulated. Keep the focus. I appreciate the assistance from those with local knowledge.
Thank you
Linda

On Thu, May 15, 2014 at 1:29 PM, Leonard Harwood <lcharwood@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dewey, I agree. Not only must we unite, but have a cohesive message addressing many issues. I know the dems will try and tare apart anything put forth, and I understand the delay for this reason, however, we can't wait too late.

On Thursday, May 15, 2014 12:45 PM, Dewey Wells <dwells1929@gmail.com> wrote:

Great letter, Jim!

The key to having properly balanced National Forest management is top leadership not subservient to selfish extremists, and that could come about in 2016. The various factions within the GOP must unite to win that election.

On Wed, May 14, 2014 at 8:31 PM, Jim Gray <jimg513@frontier.com> wrote:

This is another response to a deadline by the Forest Service to comment on the Nantahala/Pisgah National Forest Plan Revision. It seems that no matter how many times we respond to the Forest Service deadlines for comments, they simply publish another document and set another deadline. I am very opposed to the designation of additional areas that are excluded to management of timber, by whatever means - special designation, designation as "scenery", etc.

The National Forests should function as a reserve of timber to meet the nation's needs for forest products. A secondary purpose should be to provide an area where recreation, preservation of species, enhancement of wildlife and enjoyment

of the natural environment can occur. If the primary and secondary purposes coincide, then we have achieved a multiplier effect. This multiplier effect occurs when timber is cut, early successional habitat replaces the mature forest and wildlife multiplies many times over in the newly productive forest. This effect does not occur when vast areas of the forest are set aside in any of the designations that prevent timber cutting and forest enhancement for the benefit of wildlife. The current process of adding to the inventory of designated areas where no forest management can occur due to special classifications or designation as "scenery" makes less and less of the forest available for management to benefit wildlife as the years progress.

My opinion is that the Forest Service is making their own jobs much easier by designating vast areas that can no longer be considered for timber cutting. It is much easier to sit back and let the trees grow than it is to estimate timber for cutting, manage/build/maintain forest roads, monitor timber cutting operations, etc. I also believe that the Forest Service is siding with, colluding with and favoring environmentalist groups that are pressing for the elimination of timber cutting. By these actions the Forest Service is directly eliminating many jobs for timber products workers in Western North Carolina. The timber products industry is an important part of the culture of Western North Carolina and the Forest Service is involved in destroying this culture. The Forest Service is also damaging wildlife populations by allowing more and more forest to transition to mature growth forest.

I close by imploring you to resist the efforts of the environmentalist groups, to resist the efforts of protectionists within the Forest Service and to manage the national forests as they have been historically managed – for the benefit of jobs, culture, wildlife, watersheds, species preservation and recreational interests that benefit from a broad mix of multiple age forests. The National Parks are there for the preservationists and protectionists.

Sincerely,
Jim Gray
84 Soaring Eagle Dr.
Franklin, NC 28734
828-349-9735

--

Linda D. Ordiway PhD
Ruffed Grouse Society
Regional Biologist: Mid-Atlantic
Bradford PA

412-720-6034 C

From: [Jim Gray](#)
To: ["Linda Ordiway"](#); ["Leonard Harwood"](#)
Cc: ["Dewey Wells"](#); [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#); ["David Whitmire"](#); [gpeters@nwtf.net](#); ["Rob Lanning"](#); ["Adrienne Pauletta"](#); ["Beacher Franks"](#); ["Bill"](#); ["Bill"](#); ["Bill Kane"](#); ["Brad Dodson"](#); ["Bruce Gatta"](#); ["Bryan Henn"](#); ["Chip Laughton"](#); ["Chole Trexler"](#); ["Colton Fries"](#); ["Curtis Bradley"](#); ["Daniel McNeely"](#); ["Stewart, J. David"](#); ["devin gentry"](#); ["Don Henderson"](#); ["Don Mallicoat"](#); ["Doreen Miller"](#); ["Jeff Johnson"](#); ["Jim Bode"](#); ["Jim Phillips"](#); ["Joffrey W Brooks"](#); ["John Culclasure"](#); ["John Miko"](#); ["Jordon Hotchkiss"](#); ["Marc Bischof"](#); ["Mark Rogers"](#); ["Monte Seehorn"](#); ["Ray Hoxit"](#); ["Jacobs, Ryan J"](#); ["Sarah Riddle"](#); ["Steve Faust"](#); ["Steve Henson"](#); ["Wait, Anthony L."](#); ["Tucker Hobbs"](#); ["Tyler Ross"](#); [SRobbins@pheasantsforever.org](#); ["Linda Ordiway"](#)
Subject: RE: Nantahala/Pisgah Plan Revision
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2014 9:10:22 PM

Thanks Linda,

Good letter. Keep up the good work. By the way – I will be out of the loop until sometime in the fall, so you guys continue to carry the torch. I will occasionally have some email contact – but don't know the extent yet. I will not be available for any meetings.

Best,

Jim Gray

From: Linda Ordiway [mailto:lordiwayrgs@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2014 4:47 PM

To: Leonard Harwood

Cc: Dewey Wells; Jim Gray; ncplanrevision@fs.fed.us; David Whitmire; gpeters@nwtf.net; Rob Lanning; Adrienne Pauletta; Beacher Franks; Bill; Bill; Bill Kane; Brad Dodson; Bruce Gatta; Bryan Henn; Chip Laughton; Chole Trexler; Colton Fries; Curtis Bradley; Daniel McNeely; Stewart, J. David; devin gentry; Don Henderson; Don Mallicoat; Doreen Miller; Jeff Johnson; Jim Bode; Jim Phillips; Joffrey W Brooks; John Culclasure; John Miko; Jordon Hotchkiss; Marc Bischof; Mark Rogers; Monte Seehorn; Ray Hoxit; Jacobs, Ryan J; Sarah Riddle; Steve Faust; Steve Henson; Wait, Anthony L.; Tucker Hobbs; Tyler Ross; SRobbins@pheasantsforever.org; Linda Ordiway

Subject: Re: Nantahala/Pisgah Plan Revision

All - see attached for my comments on wilderness, designated areas, and scenery. I feel the letters I have seen are very strong and extremely well done. The message this group has generated and spread is far reaching and well formulated.

Keep the focus. I appreciate the assistance from those with local knowledge.

Thank you

Linda

On Thu, May 15, 2014 at 1:29 PM, Leonard Harwood <lcharwood@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dewey, I agree. Not only must we unite, but have a cohesive message addressing many issues. I know the dems will try and tare apart anything put forth, and I understand the delay for this reason, however, we can't wait too late.

On Thursday, May 15, 2014 12:45 PM, Dewey Wells <dwells1929@gmail.com> wrote:

Great letter, Jim!

The key to having properly balanced National Forest management is top leadership not subservient to selfish extremists, and that could come about in 2016.

The various factions within the GOP must unite to win that election.

On Wed, May 14, 2014 at 8:31 PM, Jim Gray <jimg513@frontier.com> wrote:

This is another response to a deadline by the Forest Service to comment on the Nantahala/Pisgah National Forest Plan Revision. It seems that no matter how many times we respond to the Forest Service deadlines for comments, they simply publish another document and set another deadline. I am very opposed to the designation of additional areas that are excluded to management of timber, by whatever means - special designation, designation as "scenery", etc.

The National Forests should function as a reserve of timber to meet the nation's needs for forest products. A secondary purpose should be to provide an area where recreation, preservation of species, enhancement of wildlife and enjoyment of the natural environment can occur. If the primary and secondary purposes coincide, then we have achieved a multiplier effect. This multiplier effect occurs when timber is cut, early successional habitat replaces the mature forest and wildlife multiplies many times over in the newly productive forest. This effect does not occur when vast areas of the forest are set aside in any of the designations that prevent timber cutting and forest enhancement for the benefit of wildlife. The current process of adding to the inventory of designated areas where no forest management can occur due to special classifications or designation as "scenery" makes less and less of the forest available for management to benefit wildlife as the years progress.

My opinion is that the Forest Service is making their own jobs much easier by designating vast areas that can no longer be considered for timber cutting. It is much easier to sit back and let the trees grow than it is to estimate timber for cutting, manage/build/maintain forest roads, monitor timber cutting operations, etc. I also believe that the Forest Service is siding with, colluding with and favoring environmentalist groups that are pressing for the elimination of timber cutting. By these actions the Forest Service is directly eliminating many jobs for timber products workers in Western North Carolina. The timber products industry is an important part of the culture of Western North Carolina and the Forest Service is involved in destroying this culture. The Forest Service is also damaging wildlife populations by allowing more and more forest to transition to mature growth forest.

I close by imploring you to resist the efforts of the environmentalist groups, to resist the efforts of protectionists within the Forest Service and to manage the national forests as they have been historically managed – for the benefit of jobs, culture, wildlife, watersheds, species preservation and recreational interests that benefit from a broad mix of multiple age forests. The National Parks are there for the preservationists and protectionists.

Sincerely,
Jim Gray
84 Soaring Eagle Dr.
Franklin, NC 28734
828-349-9735

--

Linda D. Ordiway PhD
Ruffed Grouse Society
Regional Biologist: Mid-Atlantic
Bradford PA
412-720-6034 C

From: [Linda Ordiway](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Ruffed Grouse Society Wilderness, scenery, DA
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2014 4:39:32 PM
Attachments: [RGS scenery comments .docx](#)

See attached file

Thank you

Linda

Linda D. Ordiway PhD
Regional Biologist
Ruffed Grouse Society
412-720-6034

From: [Joffrey Brooks](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: scenery inputn form
Date: Tuesday, May 13, 2014 10:16:32 AM
Attachments: [scenery_input_form_completed.pdf](#)

From: [Gary Peters](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Scenery Inventory and assumptions
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 8:41:22 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Without specific information on scenery levels it is impossible to offer any detailed comments at this time. The assumptions posted on the website, and discussions at the April 17th meeting were, and are general, philosophical, and cursory at best. Being at least the third scenery inventory system that has been tried and replaced in the last 20 years or so in the Forest Service, the odds are not good that this system will last either. Considering the current stage of the planning process on the Nantahala Pisgah NF's, here are some thoughts for you to consider;

1. It is disturbing that this scenery management system doesn't seem to promote, or at least recognize the value of active management to create, maintain, or enhance elements of the visible landscape. It is rather naïve to assume that a snapshot of 'today' of a particular place, or all places of concern level 1, or 2 will persist for any longer than the next unexpected natural catastrophe, or the inevitable march of succession to the next logical mix of composition or structure (and a change in visual qualities).
2. Local cultures and traditional uses, and users of the Forest depend on activities that create opportunities for characteristics that lend themselves to views that are pleasing and increase the likelihood that encounters with wildlife are frequent enough to be memorable; from songbirds to deer, bear, and turkey.
3. Why are waterways and roads singled out? They have absolutely nothing in common with designated areas (congressional or administrative). What activities are permitted in these areas are critical to the wildlife that exist there and the uses that occur there. Separate, do not lump, when it comes to sweeping guidelines being put forth such as these for scenery management.
4. You missed the inclusion of hunters anywhere in your posted documents on scenery management. I would be interested in how you collected your use numbers and how you broke them out by activity.
5. There is too much information missing on details for scenery management classes, concern levels, and other criteria describing just what activities are permitted, required, or necessary. This 'system' should not be a vehicle for prohibiting management activities on the Nantahala Pisgah NF.

Gary M. Peters
Biologist for the Carolinas
email: gpeters@nwtf.net
cell: 803 665-7126



National Wild Turkey Federation

770 Augusta Road | Edgefield, SC 29824

803-637-3106 - Direct Line | www.nwtf.org

803-637-0034 – Fax



This communication is intended by the sender and proper recipient(s) to be confidential, intended only for the proper recipient(s) and may contain information that is confidential or proprietary. If you are not the intended recipient(s), you are notified that the dissemination, distribution or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you receive this message in error, or are not the proper recipient(s), please notify the sender at either the e-mail address or telephone number above and delete the e-mail from your computer or return the fax to the sender. Thank you.

From: [Kyle Brown](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Scenery Management and Designations
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2014 5:02:18 PM
Attachments: [Scenery Input Form.pdf](#)

Please see attached for my Initial Scenery Inventory Constituent Input Form for the Pisgah-Nantahala Plan revision. You will notice I have indicated a concern level of 3 for all districts on the Forests. This is not necessarily due to the fact that I feel scenery should be a low priority in all areas of the Forests. Rather, I simply cannot give a higher scenery concern level than 3 at this point when I do not know how these concern levels will ultimately impact management decisions. For instance, would a consensus concern level 1 for a particular location absolutely bar certain active management practices, such as prescribed burning? In other words, I need a better understanding from the Forest Service about the implications of choosing different concern levels. While I value the scenery of our Forests, I would like to see a better balance between scenery and active management for wildlife habitat and timber production (though these activities are not necessarily mutually exclusive in my opinion).

Concerning designations, I do not consider additional restrictive designations on our Forests to be the best decision for management. We are already in a situation where active management is restricted in some form or another on the vast majority of our Forests. Additional designations will only lead to additional restrictions and complexity of management.

Ultimately, I support the positions of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission and the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council on these issues.

Regards,
Kyle Brown

828-442-2674

101 Pine Forest Dr.
Weaverville, NC 28787

From: [Tyler Ross](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Scenery management
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2014 4:03:44 PM
Attachments: [SouthernAppLetterHeadScenery.doc](#)

Attached is the Southern Appalachian Branch of the Quality Deer Management Associations recommendations in regard to Scenery Management and our national forest.

Tyler

From: [Marc Bischof](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Statement on Designations Status
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 12:10:26 PM

I would like to take this opportunity to again underline the desires of our sportsmen and sportswomen concerning the Nantahala and Pisgah Forest Management Plan Revision. Although I'm an individual and do not speak officially for any organization, I can assure you that my statements echo the voice and support of a very large number of these persons.

Our concern is that 'designations' have resulted in an insurmountable obstacle to wildlife habitat creation and restoration as well as sound forest management practices. As well, on attending the FS meeting in Asheville last month I was very concerned that in the presentation of the scenic designation material, there were many roads up for consideration. I believe and fear that such a designation will translate into additional large areas being stamped as OFF LIMITS to measures that would create or improve wildlife habitat as well as forestry measures needed for the continuing health of our NF lands.

I do not believe that the goals of sportsmen and those of 'environmentalists' necessarily need to be at odds. Remember, sportsmen are keenly interested in the health of our wild places as well as that of their inhabitants. We ARE environmentalists who understand how lack of management adversely impacts wildlife. Unfortunately, our self professed environmentalists appear unwilling to believe and see how their 'protectionist' approach is decimating our wildlife and allowing the deterioration of our forests. Because of this and until a forest plan can be devised that is flexible enough to allow sound and ecologically sensitive management practices to be undertaken, I stand firmly opposed to providing any designated status to any further lands, roadways or waterways.

While at last months meeting I was seated at a table with Forest Service personnel, Wildlife Commission personnel, a representative for a conservancy and an attorney for a conservancy. As I expressed the need for wildlife management/habitat creation by sound timber cutting practices that would lead to ESH it was met with disagreement. I was asked by the attorney, who I felt should determine what management would occur. I answered him by stating "the trained professionals of the Forest Service and NCWRC". He responded stating he did not trust these entities to perform and oversee these measures. Although not telling him at the time, as a result of being dumbfounded by his statement, I should have replied that I trust them far more than any organization whose focus is so narrowed as to be concerned only with visual components to the exclusion of wildlife and long term forest health.

Sincerely,
Marc Bischof
Franklin, NC

From: [Besler, Doug A.](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Cc: [Jacobs, Ryan J.](#); [Stewart, J. David.](#); [Paoletta, Adrienne.](#); [Weeks, Kendrick C.](#); [Warburton, Gordon S.](#); [Cox, David R.](#)
Subject: USFS Designation & Scenery Management Workshop Comments
Date: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 8:53:59 AM
Attachments: [scenery input form completed.pdf](#)
[USFS Designations&SceneryWorkshop_WRC Comments \(17April2014\).pdf](#)

Please accept the attached comments from the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission.

Thanks,

Doug

Doug Besler
Mountain Region Fisheries Supervisor
North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission
645 Fish Hatchery Rd.
Marion, NC 28752
828-659-8684 Ext. 221 (Office)
919-818-7886 (Mobile)
doug.besler@ncwildlife.org

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: [John W. Culclasure](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Wilderness and Scenery comments
Date: Friday, May 16, 2014 12:18:04 AM
Attachments: [Wilderness comments.docx](#)

Attached.

Thank you,

John Culclasure

From: [Joffrey Brooks](#)
To: [FS-NFsNCPlanRevision](#)
Subject: Wilderness designations and scenery designations on National Forests.
Date: Tuesday, May 13, 2014 10:09:45 AM

- 1) I am strongly opposed to any more wilderness designations on any National Forests in North Carolina. I also oppose any extensions of existing Wilderness areas as currently designated. The main reason for this opposition is the negative effects on wildlife habitat and wildlife populations that are important economically (hunting) and other species (non-game such as certain songbird species) which are experiencing declines due to a lack of important forest habitat types (mostly early forest successional habitat).
- 2) The scenery designations are another means to create “de facto wilderness designation” where no forestry activity can take place. This along with other “special designations” such as “old growth” add to the wilderness advocates efforts to make sure there are NO vegetation management activities occurring anywhere in the National Forests. Since they cannot get wilderness designations through Congress (the way it is supposed to occur), they intend to make sure the rest of the forest is shut down to any type of vegetation management especially timber harvest. I oppose designation of any areas as “special scenic areas”.
- 3) In any consideration of the entire “landscape” of forests in western North Carolina, it is especially important to note that the Great Smoky Mountain National Park is the largest “wilderness area” in western North Carolina consisting of over 530,000 acres in both N.C. and Tennessee. There are also state parks and city or town watersheds and some private land holdings that are also managed as “wilderness areas” where no vegetation management or wildlife management is allowed. Many wilderness advocates believe these areas are the ideal way wilderness should be managed. (Strict access rules, no human manipulation of wildlife habitats or populations). Unfortunately for hunters, this includes no hunting and I believe this is the next step many wilderness proponents would like to see implemented.