

STAKEHOLDERS FORUM FOR THE NANTAHALA & PISGAH PLAN REVISION

PISGAH GEOGRAPHIC AREA FOCUS

SMALL GROUP GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW

Alice Cohen – Facilitator

William Davis – Note Taker

STAKEHOLDERS IN GROUP: GARY PETERS, SUSAN FLETCHER, MORGAN SUMMERVILLE, JOSH KELLY, DAVID WHITMIRE, ZACHARY LESCH-HUIE

EASTERN ESCARPMENT GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 5:00 P.M.

1. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

What resonates:

- Landscape description is right.
- Recreational opportunities are well accounted for in general. Great that there is a mention of adjacent communities.
- On community health, economic health is captured. But someone reading it might think economic health and not public health (specifically last sentence of third paragraph).

On goals:

Like how it calls out woodland restoration – driest portion of N&P and has a need for controlled burns. Needs more about proximity to RDU/Triad/Charlotte.

- Have more problems with number of people, as far as streams, roads, passage. Environmental problems because of this.
- Unfamiliar with ecozones and types of forests.
- No mention of trout fishing in goals
- Goals seem underbuilt compared to rest of description
- Goals in resiliency need some kind of recreational category – sites need to rehabed.
- Goals does not mention timber harvest specifically.

- What are the opportunities for American chestnut restoration? Mass production for wildlife primarily, forest volume a distant second.

- Scaling back the rhododendron proliferation along stream corridors. Reversing the acidification of soils adjacent to and leaching into streams. Creating a plant composition conducive to detritus and woody debris that encourages aquatic insect diversity & abundance and therefore carping capacity (fish), recreation opportunity (fishing), etc.

- Maintain open woodland and talks about game species. Other species (non-game) are not mentioned.

- Linville Gorge are well served by goals. Other places such as Wilson Creek are not mentioned, also no mention of Linville dolomite area.

- Understands the balance, but there need to be more places foregrounded that people will think are missing.

- Whole lot of green – game of exclusion – lot of big issues that forest health should drive. Without roads and timber suitability, hard to conceptualize.

- Add table mountain pine in this area as underrepresented on forest. Might be worthwhile to mention as special constituent in pine oak heath.

- Access for disabled hunters. Note Brown Mountain OHV area as an area for this in goals.

2. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

- Hope that ability to work within the landscape is a driver – would like to do a lot of work within the brown (on map).

- In 90s and 00s, most controversial timber sale was in Blowing Rock (Globe 1 and Globe 2 timber sale). Needs to be in institutional knowledge – very politically connected community.

- Reducing fire hazard in wildland urban interface should be a goal.

3. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

- Missing piece is scenery aspects of this. Without seeing scenic layer, does not know what will be affected. Big management area could be totally off limits if AT or Parkway.

- Maple Sally Road not mapped as interface. Would like to know why.

- Inventory recreation sites/acres.

4. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- Sees everybody's input on this map.

5. What questions do you have?

BLACK MOUNTAINS GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 5:25 P.M.

1. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

- A lot of trout streams in this area. Major attraction and anglers need access.
- Pleased it talks about connecting people to land and discusses manufacturing, wood products, timber harvest, and mineral extraction.
- Really thorough.

Goals:

- Hard as local contractor does not see a lot of opportunity to do timber work.
- Acknowledge climbing in narrative description (Shaker Den, Corner Rock)
- Big Ivy – climbing areas
- Places to be managed for unique features – Maintain dispersed recreation opportunities of Corner Rock.
- Partnership – Mention partner orgs by calling out example uses/interests – mtn. biking, climbing, Trout Unlimited, etc.
- Whatever timber management is, it should be clear.
- Listing some example organizations in partnership opportunities (rock climbing, mountain bike – call out specific groups).
- This one same a lot of the same things in Enhancing and Restoring Resiliency but the map contrasts (false narrative).
- “If you want the timber sales to end, we’re on a good trajectory.”
- Likes that it has spruce. Here and Balsam are where you have spruce. Might be good to be more specific about best opportunities.
- Need something on prescribed fire. Mackey, Woods, and Heartbreak Ridge could benefit from fire.
- Rough grouse – most areas are at elevations above species range but narrative said this is the best opportunity for hunting.

2. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

- There is a lot of green. Discussion about Big Ivy – some concern about being about of bounds for timber production.

- If same map that is going to be shown public, needs more landmarks.

3. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

- With all roadless and backcountry, needs to be more direction on roads and backcountry.

- One thing that is missing is woodland conditions that you see in other one.

- Backcountry management said controlled burns would be used to create hot fires. Not sure about singling out backcountry for this, but should be mentioned in interface and matrix. A lot of roadless areas are high elevation areas that do not naturally burn.

- If you can harvest timber, best not to take it out by fire.

- Need for more of a mosaic layer.

- In Big Ivy, 5548 needs to be excluded because there is the desire for mountain bike trails (Josh).

4. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

5. What questions do you have?

BALD MOUNTAINS GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 6:00 P.M.

1. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

- Concentrated winter use. Winter rec is popular on Roan area.

- Waterville Lake is one of the few with no public access. Public boat access to Waterville is a priority.

- Should be a few more goals for water quality.

- Whatever elk goals you are doing, make them bigger.

- Elk River Falls jumping came up.

- More fragmented ownerships, connectivity of forest and habitats is important. When you look along state line, lot of breaks in FS ownership. Particularly elk need to be able to migrate north.

- Connectivity of Cherokee NF, especially for hunters. Add Cherokee NF to context map/context in general.

2. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

- It's a quilt.

- Access is huge for recreation connectivity in conjunction with Cherokee NF.

- Spell out timber suitability.

-

3. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

4. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- This area has more an opportunity with partners/adjacent land owners. Wyden and Stevens funds can apply.

- Land trusts and ATC.

5. What questions do you have?

PISGAH LEDGE GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 6:35 P.M.

1. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

- Where wildlife management began, first game preserve in history of U.S.

Goals

- Timber suitability clarification.

- This one more than other GAs has best opportunities to achieve balanced habitat conditions because of management areas.

- Very pleased with Pisgah Ledge MAs.

- Like to see rock climbing community help goal in other GAs. “Work with climbing communities to identify new locations of rare species.” Needs to be in Black Mountains Eastern Escarpment.
- Finest trout fishing in North Carolina.
- Add language about sorely needed prescribed fire program.
- On Yellowgap, wildlife viewing goal needed. Add to other MAs as well.
- Opportunities for chestnut reintroduction.
- Strategy for retaining trail mileage as a goal. Nice to get specificity about important of retaining trails and roads in this GA.
- Mention special use camps and Outward Bound. Discrete enough thing to have a goal – i.e. user conflict and impact issues. (also on Grandfather).
- Balance needs of permitted users with other users.
 - Daniel Ridge, concerns about scenic objectives.

2. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

3. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

4. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- Two areas ripe – Cedar Rock and Daniel Ridge – roadbuilding especially. Parts where timber harvest is possible. Directly impacts hikers, hunters, forest products, anglers, rock climbers in Cedar Rock, outfitters.
- Need to do a project that shows we can all get along. CLR approach is the way to go.
- Whatever recreational use, opportunity to demonstrate best possible collaboration.

5. What questions do you have?

- In description, “Pisgah’s climbing is nationally recognized as equal or more so than Grandfather GA.
- PRO WILDERNESS RESOLUTIONS FROM BUNCOMBE, FRANKLIN, AND HIGHLANDS MAY NOT BE ON DOCUMENTATION.

NORTH SLOPE GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 7:20 P.M. (BILL HODGE REPLACED GARY PETERS)

1. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

Goals:

- Places to be managed... - Needs more language about addressing visitation.
- Another place elk could head. Does not know if connectivity at Lickstone Ridge supports this.
- Loves northern flying squirrel goal.
- Wildlife habitat goal gives very little work with.
- If whole Lickstone Ridge area is wilderness, then how can goals be achieved?
- If wants solitude, need to enforce decibel limit south of GA.
- 97h road – Middle Prong is important for restoration of brook trout. IF recommended for wilderness, this is importance for resource restoration.
- Opposed to expanding wilderness. Historical logging area.
- We will be furthering the discussion with the local hunting clubs for that area and return those thoughts (FWCC).
- The county positions both for and against is not easily seen on maps for public

2. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

3. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

4. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- Upslope of 97 is an area of concern – nice stuff that doesn't need restoration.

5. What questions do you have?

STAKEHOLDERS FORUM FOR THE NANTAHALA & PISGAH PLAN REVISION

PISGAH GEOGRAPHIC AREA FOCUS

SMALL GROUP GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW

Ben Irej – Facilitator

Heather Luczak – Note Taker

STAKEHOLDERS IN GROUP: MEGAN SUTTON, HUGH IRWIN, FRED HARDIN, GORDON WARBURTON, CHRIS COXEN, KEVIN COLBURN, ANDREA LESLIE

EASTERN ESCARPMENT

6. What questions do you have?
 - a. How will interface differ from matrix in regards to scenery?
 - b. How are eligible rivers reflected – they are not depicted on the map as an MA
 - c. Check the NCWRC backcountry designation in Dobson Knob area

7. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?
 - The resiliency goals, similar to what the CFLRP has been working on
 - The description of restoring resiliency and the goals
 - Aquatic goal of focusing restoration in the John’s River watershed – a lot of sedimentation and other issues in that watershed
 - A goal about increasing sustainable mtn biking, reducing mtn biking in the WSAs, and providing opportunities in the eastern part of the forest
 - Issues with eroding mtn biking trails in Wilson Creek (and other areas)
 - Like the focus on T&E species, and Carolina hemlock, and shortleaf
 - Good to recognize the issue of NNIS in wilderness

8. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?
 - Have some problems with some of the wilderness inventory areas that are in matrix (Hugh) (Dobson Knob Area, western addition to Linville, portion of Harpers Creek, portion of Sugar Cove, portions of Wilson Creek)
 - Like that roadless areas that went into backcountry (Hugh) (portion of Dobson Knob, portion of Sugar Cove)
 - Generally impressed with the distribution of MAs. Good blend of protected and managed areas
 - Issue with backcountry portion in upper Sugar Cove (Gordon)

- Issue with part of Dobson Knob
 - Concern that Gragg Prong is in matrix. If it's not eligible WSR then it should be in backcountry (Kevin)
 - Would like to see current burn units on the maps - Megan (controlled burns)
 - Would like to see current active timber mgmt. displayed on maps
 - Concerns about where we already have IRAs and moving those into recommended wilderness areas. would like to leave the option of management on the table
9. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA? (Difficulty interpreting this question)
- This area is the closest to metro areas, and provides a lot of opps for sportsmen, need to emphasize providing opps for hunters.
 - Old growth and natural areas are both embedded in matrix and interface, there is interest in the sideboards for plan components pertaining to these. What restoration means in the different MAs.
 - A need to provide criteria for identifying and managing Old Growth at the project level
 - Want to know where the scenery impacts are in this GA and how these overlay with MAs
10. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?
- Old growth
 - Increasing capacity and utilize partnerships to increase controlled burning
 - Opps for ecological restoration and where that occurs in different MAs
 - How do you prioritize work/management - ex. Stewardship contract opps.
 - CFLRP
 - Different views in Sugar Cove, Harpers Creek and Lost Cove (in terms of Mtn biking)
 - A lot of room for developing an aquatic restoration plan to address sediment sources from mtn biking, hiking trails, roads. Need to think broadly about the John's River watershed.
 - Whether IRAs are recommended for wilderness or not

BLACK MOUNTAINS GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 5:25 P.M.

1. What questions do you have?
- Question of clarification on goal b) under 'enhancing and restoring resiliency'.
2. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?
- Like that spruce-fir restoration is a priority
 - Concern/Question the goal for restoration of Rich cove ecozones for wildlife, feel that Old Growth is a priority in rich cove ecozone

- Like the goal for restoration in rich cove ecozones b/c it emphasizes younger structure
 - Would like to see a watershed action plan for Big Ivy and Dillingham creek, look at recommendations of the priority watershed working group recommendations (Andrea)
 - Would like more on emphasis on enhancing rich cove ecozone/old growth in Big Ivy
3. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?
- Question about the SIA in Big Ivy, how was this expanded from prior MA?
 - Point of contention in the Big Ivy area regarding the need for ruffed grouse mgmt. (Gordon)
 - Does this distribution of mgt areas provide diversity of mgmt. options?
 - WUI area south of Mackey Mtn, along NFS boundary, look at opps for controlled burns
4. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?
- With limited access in this area, the FS should take advantage of any opps to do active mgmt. in areas that are accessible. Emphasize treatment in areas that you can access
 - A need for criteria in plan components for how mgmt. plays out in interface and matrix
 - Focus in this area should be on restoration.
 - Think about compatibility of MAs around eligible WSRs
5. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?
- Restoration in rich cove ecozones
 - See a lot of roads in roadless areas
 - Look closely at areas that are accessible for mgmt.
 - The expanded SIA in Big Ivy – discuss what could be named for botanical, zoological. Do we want to included Ruffed Grouse
 - Discuss Big Ivy for potential wildlife mgmt. opps
 - Balancing visual concerns with treatments
 - What does ecological restoration look like?
 - Opps for collaboration around WUI and fire threats

BALD MOUNTAINS GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 6:00 P.M.

1. What questions do you have?
- How was the AT corridor identified? – based on visibility from AT.
 - Question about MA allocation in Pigeon R. Gorge Area, Paint Creek, Bluff Mtn. – interested in the larger area around Bluff (Hugh)
 - How are the SIAs going to be defined and described what would be allowed in this area?

2. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?
 - Connecting the Cherokee NF, like that it's included
 - Totally appropriate to have a focus on Elk
 - Goal C resonates, huge opps for high elevation wildlife species in this GA
 - Like the focus on enhancing and restoring resiliency and maintaining and increasing bald areas
 - Opps to do more outreach education related to fires in the area and the ecological benefits around how wildfires are managed
 - Not seeing anything that mentions managing white tailed deer habitat
 - Interesting that grassy balds are not mentioned under Places – add grassy bald back into description
 - Providing clean and abundant water – think there are a number of road erosion and sedimentation issues in this area, particularly around Harmon Den – could be a goal, working with partners
 - Love that the Nolichucky Gorge is in backcountry (Kevin)

3. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?
 - Good
 - Bluff Mtn?
 - Pigeon River is up for relicensing in 2035 - need plan direction to get involved in this discussion

4. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?
 - Want more clarification on SIA management
 - Like how the MAs are distributed in relation to bald mgmt
 - Look at consistency with Cherokee NF management
 - Tremendous interest in Bald Mtn area from bear hunters
 - Black bear mgmt. needs to be discussed in this GA
 - Well done!!

5. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?
 - Roan Mtn stewardship – continue and enhance engagement for bald restoration/maintenance
 - Elk management as they move through this area
 - Great area to blend recreation and wildlife viewing, and education about habitat mgmt.
 - Suggest that this is a GA that the group agrees on!!! This GA could be used as an example of successful collaboration

PISGAH LEDGE GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 6:35 P.M.

1. What questions do you have?

2. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?
 - Like that its focused on oak and a range of forest conditions in oak
 - Like the Acknowledgement of restoration opps in off-site white pine
 - Would add hydrological restoration to bog goal
 - Like the goals in Bent Creek, would love to see emphasis on explaining/interpreting restoration in Bent Creek area
 - Support compatible recreation in Bent Crk in addition to research
 - Like the utilizing the Cradle of Forestry to demonstrate restoration forestry practices – there is a lot of room to do this in Cradle
 - Like the emphasis on sustaining and improving aquatic habitat in Mills River watershed – listed species that are at risk due to sedimentation and pesticides. There’s a watershed restoration effort in the Mills R. partnership that the forest could look at cooperating with
 - Because there’s so much trail use there are a lot of eroding trails – A LOT of opps for stream restoration
 - Would like to see more restoration in this GA
 - Would like to see a goal for spruce restoration

3. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?
 - An optimal blend of MAs
 - Concerns about Daniel Ridge and Cedar Rock Areas (Hugh) specifically SNHAs in the area and Old Growth and scenic qualities
 - A lot of interest in the Daniel Ridge and Cedar Rock areas being backcountry

4. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?
 - Enormous interest in deer hunting in this area – huge demand for this here
 - A good place to merge recreation interests with wildlife viewing – opps for interpretation and educational outreach
 - Issue of hellbender population in Davidson being healthy and harassment of hellbenders – need for education

5. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- Cedar Rock and Daniel Ridge, and west fork of the French Broad – potentially agreement on backcountry designation here
- Concern about building new system roads in interface and matrix areas that are primarily unroaded and Equal concern that area becoming default roadless areas by not actively managing
- Need recognition of recreational values around 276 corridor and associated climbing areas
- When thinking about decommissioning roads, think about future mgmt. needs including fire mgmt.
- Opps for management and restoration in Cradle of Forestry
- The issue of trail reconstruction in highly visited areas
- Spruce restoration in area south of Shining Rock, Sam Knob Area

NORTH SLOPE GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 7:20 P.M.

1. What questions do you have?
 - Goals seem more wildlife centric and less emphasis on NRV compared to other GA narratives.
 - Is there 'Limit for acceptable change' for Shining Rock Wilderness?

2. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?
 - Goal 'a' – restoration outside of wilderness
 - Understand heavier restoration east of 97, but along Lickstone Ridge (very rugged and steep) – focus should be on ecological restoration to get to NRV
 - Need something more action oriented about managing heavy use
 - Include something about Leave No Trace ethics

3. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?
 - Like the distribution of MAs as it is depicted
 -

4. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?
 - Questions about what guides management in matrix (Hugh) Don't see the plan components that clarify this yet

5. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- Opps for partnerships for active restoration in conjunction with NCWRC, east of 97 on Cold Mtn Gamelands
- Overlap in agreement around restoration opportunities throughout GA
- Prescribed fire opps in Shining Rock Wilderness

STAKEHOLDERS FORUM FOR THE NANTAHALA & PISGAH PLAN REVISION

PISGAH GEOGRAPHIC AREA FOCUS

SMALL GROUP GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW

Karen DiBari – Facilitator

Susan Parker – Note Taker

EASTERN ESCARPMENT GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 5:25 P.M.

GROUP MEMBERS: RUTH HARTZLER, JULIE WHITE, BILL YARBOROUGH, BILL HODGE, JD, AND BILL KANE

11. What questions do you have?
12. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?
 - a. Limited trail (horse & bike) access – appreciate that there is a goal for this.
 - b. Goals are aggressive for prescribed burns. Is this goal be achieved?
 - c. Goal for restoration – refer to MA direction.
13. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?
 - a. Timber production allowance is still unclear.
 - b. Where is there more opportunity for backcountry?
14. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?
 - a. Limited roads in Backcountry – is this necessary?
15. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?
 - a. Areas that are in matrix and are also ok with wildlife management (NC Wildlife Commission) as backcountry; can there be collaboration to become backcountry MA.
 - b. Examine the specific recreation opportunities/area?
 - c. Harper Creek/Lost Cove should not be recommended for wilderness so there can be connectivity of mountain bike trails. Looking for long “backpacking” biking trails. More of the access issues is related to lower area (Harper Creek). Look at the areas that are not in the wilderness study areas but are in the same general area.
 - d. Look at connectivity across the entire GA for trails.

BLACK MOUNTAINS GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 5:25 P.M.

16. What questions do you have?

17. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

a. Unique backcountry (high alpine) goal under connecting people to the land.

18. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

a. What is the management direction for Special Interest Areas? For Big Ivy primarily driven by scenery and botanicals.

19. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

20. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

a. Black Mountain trail sustainability collaboration to maintain them.

BALD MOUNTAINS GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 6:00 P.M.

6. What questions do you have?

7. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

8. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

9. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

10. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- a. Bald Mountain wilderness recommendation with exclusion of AT – CMC and SAWS.
- b. Elk reintroduction. Collaboration outside of the forest plan.

PISGAH LEDGE GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 6:35 P.M.

6. What questions do you have?

7. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

- Art Loeb trail – National Recreation Trail; should this be in the MA list?

8. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

9. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

10. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- Daniel Ridge (NCWRC) – move from matrix to backcountry or recreational special interest area.
- Collaboration on how the restoration goals for entire GA will be achieved.

NORTH SLOPE GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 7:20 P.M.

6. What questions do you have?

7. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

- a. Stream and aquatics restoration.

8. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

9. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

10. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?
 - a. Collaboration on how the restoration goals for non-wilderness areas will be achieved. May need to be more aggressive, intensive, and should be more balanced management.

STAKEHOLDERS FORUM FOR THE NANTAHALA & PISGAH PLAN REVISION

PISGAH GEOGRAPHIC AREA FOCUS

SMALL GROUP GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW

Mark Shelley – Facilitator

Larry Hayden – Note Taker

STAKEHOLDERS IN GROUP: DEIRDRE, JIM, RYAN, LANG, BEN, ROB, SAM

EASTERN ESCARPMENT GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 4:35 P.M.

21. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

- Restoration goals are on target. Especially considering CFLRP.
- Hemlocks—are any alive. Carolina in the gorge-some treated. Restoring Hemlock?
- Wood products: no discussion of utilizing the wood products industry as a partner for achieving restoration activities.
- Are the goals for restoration –could all the forestwide objectives for restoration all occur here in this GA?? As there are many opportunities here.
- Connection with adjacent landowners –can bring in other private landowners; but specifically state lands are being restored adjacent to national forest in this GA.
- To do controlled burns, must collaborate with adjacent communities in the wilderness WUI
- Wildlife abundance, improve wildlife habitat, and wildlife habitat diversity are important for this GA.
- How are each GA restoration goals being packaged (aggregated) at the forestwide scale. (Note: GA goals have not yet been merged)
- The process should establish goals based on needs and then figure what you actually do.
- Eastern and northern areas – Boone fork/Wilson creek / Blowing rock area needs additional collaboration on recreation
- But should also have wildlife work in those areas cited above.

22. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

- Upper Globe area –proximity to roads between the backcountry vs Interface areas should be examined

- Some areas make sense as backcountry but shows up as Interface, eg west side of Linville Wilderness
- There is a lot of MATRIX -- a lot going on (potential activities) in this MA
- A lot in Matrix –but a lot of areas in the Matrix will have a similar feel to backcountry
- Some plan components need to be adjusted--but in later meetings
- Is there a spectrum of Interface.? Interface buffer could adjust based on differences in road use and road type.
- Scenery may hash out more with a buffer that is adjusted
- Linville extension—are there wildlife openings in there? If so, would that affect the wilderness recommendation? Is there a helispot?

23. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

- With midcountry, we would concentrate on restoration –and not rotational harvest in some areas.
- West side of Linville—should that be interface or backcountry?
- The MA concept is mostly okay—some plan standards or criteria to treat some Interface areas differently
- Proportion is okay, but the distribution might change

24. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- The idea of more criteria for Interface and Matrix
- Mtn bike recreation discussion in Lost Cove, Harper Creek
- Boone fork area, need collaboration to support some development, Mtn bike, horses, and also the thunderhole area
- Go through public open houses before collaborating on the wilderness areas that are proposed to be analyzed in alternatives
- Upper Globe area (Thunderhole) needs collaboration—more granular plan components for Interface and Matrix.

25. Any more questions?

- Point of collaboration---west of Linville. FS cannot do anything on the west side of Linville—maybe use the WRC recommendation for backcountry.

BLACK MOUNTAINS GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 5:45 P.M.

1. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?
 - Its all IRA –so nothing you can do...
 - Superlative area, large tracts of OG, rare species, spruce fir forest intact in the nation
 - Highest concentration of roadless, some of the wildest areas we have.
 - Landscape has adjacent protected areas.—eg Asheville watershed, full connectivity east to west
 - Buncombe horse range trail should be addressed (parking)
 - Hunters have said Big Ivy is a good grouse hunting area
 - Dotted line for wilderness in Big Ivy, but this is not broken out about Buncombe County resolution
 - A serious wilderness proposal wraps around the road in Big Ivy
 - Map legend—combine both SIAs in Big Ivy for clarity

2. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?
 - Lot of Green. Not many opportunities. Niels Creek makes sense. Mill Creek roads, all make sense.
 - Small matrix slivers in southwest corner—does this make sense?

3. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?
 - More granular standards in interface and matrix – lost cove ridge, green knob area – specific for restoration
 - Big Ivy area is important for grouse habitat.

4. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?
 - Big Ivy is important for collaboration—the matrix and interface will have a lot of public pushback
 - There is a lot of existing old growth. This is the most contentious area.
 - Recreation trail locations in Big Ivy have issues and need to be fixed –using equipment.
 - Would equipment for fixing trails in Big Ivy create more impacts?
 - Shope Creek area: closest to Asheville, lots of different users. Could have restoration and recreation together.

5. Any more questions?

- Access issue for the Buncombe horse range ---parking!!

BALD MOUNTAINS GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 6:00 P.M.

11. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

- How is Appalachian trail mapped out?
- The trail unites this whole area.
- Partner with Cherokee NF is OK. Eg. proposed wilderness on joining each side
- Highest deer populations but in the smallest area
- Migratory corridor, elk, deer, and important botanicals
- Some of the best red oak timber—in Rich Mtn area and Long Arm and 12 mile strip
- Look at the BALDS in conjunction with the Cherokee in evaluating wilderness recommendations
- Narrative represents the difference between the restoration opportunities in the South vs the North

12. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

- Seems appropriate.

13. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

- Seems appropriate

14. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- Horse and bike opps from Hot Springs, Paint Rock, Bluff Mtn—including Shut In Road
- Cross Boundary opportunities with GSMNP, Cherokee NF, Appalachian Trail
- Restoration potential in North part of the Pigeon River Gorge.

15. Any more questions?

PISGAH LEDGE GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 6:45 P.M.

11. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

- Need to address stand with offsite poplar dominance –missing in this GA, (eg. Neverending Road)
- Perhaps addressing offsite Maple as well as poplar.
- Need to address chestnut restoration for this GA
- Does not specifically address access, such as the Turkey Pen area, but access needs to be addressed GA wide
- Opportunities for demonstration areas, specifically for viewing wildlife and wildlife habitat practices
- Also include demo areas for pollinator habitat.
- Within Interface—should focus on opportunities for education—should be the emphasis of Interface in this GA
- Transylvania has a strong Natural Resources Council—partner with them—they will have recommendations

12. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

- Where Matrix aligns properly with goals.
- Interface looks pretty good
- Cedar Rock and Daniel Ridge needs a relook. Should be evaluated for backcountry—WRC has them recommended for backcountry.
- Cathy Creek area is another area that needs a relook but it has a lot different feel than Daniels Ridge and Cedar Rock
- Potential SIA in Cedar Rock??

13. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

Feel of matrix-centric GA in a highly recreation – some components in Matrix could be different in this GA. Eg, some seasonal road openings.

- Special emphasis in the Interface lands—(maybe some special components)

14. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- Daniel Ridge and Cedar Rock (backcountry)
- Restoration in North Mills area.
- Cedar Rock: Brevard wants it managed for reduced fuel load; as a result of the 2016 fires in other areas. Adjacent private land between Brevard and the Forest needs fuel reduction as well.

15. Any more questions?

NORTH SLOPE GEOGRAPHIC AREA REVIEW, 7:30 P.M.

11. What resonates with you about the geographic area (GA) narrative? Are the GA goals the right ones? What do you think about the goals of the GA?

- Adjacent ESH on private and state lands should be considered
- Like this area as a separate GA. Was Champion land. With a railroad grade
- 2 goals for veg mgt—more opps along the road in Lickstone but not on this upslope
- Some of the matrix will not be accessed due to slope considerations
- 97d road is shown on the map, but does not exist on the ground
- Need to incorporate coordination with adjacent lands eg Waynesville watershed
- Wilderness proposal for all of Lickstone does not make sense—but some addition to existing IRA would make sense
- White pine restoration opps are prevalent in Lickstone

12. What do you think about the distribution of management areas (MA)?

- Seems appropriate, but points to some additions to recreation for potential Interface in some areas.

- Opening some roads could be appropriate, so Interface could change over the life of the plan.

13. What feedback do you have on management area direction that affects this GA?

14. What are places that are ripe for collaborative discussion?

- Backcountry extension on Shining Rock—could it be recommended as Wilderness
- Collaborate with partners (EG SAWS) to educate people about the impacts of overuse of Shining Rock Wilderness (Emphsize in goals).

15. Any more questions?