

Nantahala and Pisgah Forest Plan Objections: Interested Persons

July 2022

Interested Persons Request	Organization	Topics Interested In	Explanation
Luke Cannon		Impact on headwaters of the Ivy River, including potential increased flooding and sediment loads in streams; impact on soil quality and stability; lack of proper assessment for rare and endangered species; impact on old growth and mature forest and soil quality; fragmentation of contiguous forest habitat; impact on recreational experiences and viewshed; impact on rare and uncommon plants.	I support the objections of the Forest Keepers and I Heart Pisgah to take the old growth and other acres of forest surrounding Craggy, Snowball Mountain and the headwaters of the Ivy River/Big Ivy, out of Matrix and to permanently preserve it as wilderness area.
Martha Brimm		Bird-specific wildlife rehabilitator, bird advocate, member of Audubon, NC. Supports Curtis Smalling and Audubon submitted in March, as well as objections filed by Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership.	
Melissa Coe		I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan fails to clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest.	
Gina Diggs		I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan doesn't clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest.	
Don Lendle		I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan doesn't clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest.	
Sue Hayden		I support a management program that increases biodiversity and reduces unnecessary resource extraction. The Forest should be used to mitigate climate change and protect pollinators, bird populations, and the flora, decomposers, and fauna. Eradication of excessive deer populations and feral cats which overgraze native plants and kill birds and other wildlife should be prioritized. I support more access to foraging of wild edibles including mushrooms and edible wild plants and the promotion of this as a hobby. I support more public events in the Forest and field trips for kids to explore the Forest. Any contract given to private persons for extraction should be open and subject to adherence to strict requirements to reclaim the land with simultaneous water monitoring.	
Will Jared Matthews		I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan doesn't clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest.	
Gina Diggs		I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan doesn't clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest.	
Eli Celli		I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan doesn't clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest.	
Michael Sullivan		I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan doesn't clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest.	
Juliana Henderson			

Kim Porter	The USFS did not address the interests which the people of NC overwhelmingly commented on – that the Pisgah-Nantahala Forest Plan should decrease timber harvests and strengthen protection for many areas, including old-growth forests, special recreation areas, wilderness study areas, and areas known for rare species, and therefore increase conservation areas recommended by local conservationists, recreationists, and biologists, and increase opportunities for carbon storage and human powered recreational opportunities.	The final plan doesn't reflect the interests of the public, who have overwhelmingly supported more and stronger protections for Pisgah-Nantahala. Instead, the plan prioritizes logging and fails to protect old-growth forests, rare species and clean water. The Pisgah-Nantahala is the country's most popular national forest; nearly 5.2 million people visited it last year. The forest provides drinking water for cities, businesses and communities across the Southeast. Under the plan, over half of the forest - 540,000 acres - will be open to logging, and the plan quadruples the acres of forests that would be cut down annually. This is unacceptable. The plan fails to protect most of the forest's important recreation and conservation areas. It removes protections for 100,000 acres of Wilderness Inventory Areas and places 45,000 acres of North Carolina Natural Heritage Areas in logging-priority designations. The plan also allows 40,000 acres of old-growth forests to be logged. The plan also excludes over a quarter-million acres of mature, intact forest from its old-growth network to accommodate a massive increase in timber harvests, which will also have significant impacts on rare and endangered species. At least 20 rare species have most of their habitat placed in logging-priority designations. Significant portions of the Appalachian Trail, Art Loeb Trail, Bartram Trail, Benton Mackaye Trail and Mountains to Sea Trail corridors will now be open to logging. The climate and carbon-storage benefits of mature, intact forests are largely neglected in favor of increased timber harvests. Our publicly owned national forests are far more valuable standing and protecting drinking water, clean air, scenic views, iconic trails and old-growth forests. Over 92% of comments on the draft plan supported more permanently protected areas for the Pisgah-Nantahala.
Misty Buchanan	Special Interest Areas, Natural Heritage Natural Areas, Coordination with the Natural Heritage Program, Species of Conservation Concern, and aquatic habitats.	The Natural Heritage Program is available to provide information and answer any questions that may arise from discussions with interested persons or response to objections that involve Special Interest Areas, Natural Heritage Natural Areas, Natural Heritage data, Species of Conservation Concern, aquatic habitats, or guidelines or objectives for coordinating with the Natural Heritage Program for maintenance of biodiversity and ecological integrity.
Michael Cheek, Greg Smith; Sean Brogan; Ron Myers	Tier 1 and Tier 2 target levels and efforts related to increasing active forest management (ex. prescribed burning, thinning, final harvests) on the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests. North Carolina Forest Service Any recreation issues brought forward by The Access Fund, American Whitewater, BackCountry Horseman of North Carolina, Southern Appalachian Mineral Society, SORBA/IMBA, and Carolina Mountain Club.	The NC Forest Service, in general, encourages increases to the proposed Tier 1 and Tier 2 target levels associated with the application of active forest management practices (ex. prescribed burning; thinning, final harvests). I want to offer my support to all of the organizations mentioned above with the exception of the Carolina Mountain Club. I feel that the recommendations made by the USFS are more than adequate in addressing their issues.
Julie White Bill Floyd	All topics	All Topics
Nick Biemiller	<p>Active management - Active forest management; - Management area allocations; - Wilderness Area and Wilderness Inventory Area designations; - Forest landscape pattern, connectivity, and wildlife habitat; - Monitoring of the Forest Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regeneration harvests and young forest conditions; - Plant conservation and animal diversity through coarse-filter/fine-filter approach; - Impacts from roads and road building; - Vulnerable wildlife and species recovery - Cutting of old growth forests, "old-growth network", and existing old growth; - Crop tree management; - Wild & Scenic River designations; - Any issue relating to Forest Plan and Environmental Impact Statement vegetation models, including Spectrum and NRV modeling - The role of scale in disturbance, disturbance return interval, and disturbance size; - Natural disturbance and gap phase dynamics; - Landfire and Bps - Climate change and forest carbon; - Monitoring data and best available science; - Protection and management of rare and unique habitats; - Species of conservation concern and federally listed species - State Natural Heritage Natural Areas; - The Chattooga River; - Craggy/Big Ivy; - I Heart Pisgah Key Conservation Areas and Mountain Treasures; - Protected areas - Logging on steep slopes; - Appalachian Trail and other trail corridors; - Waterways, streams (perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral), and riparian management zones; - All-lands strategies and broader landscape of ownerships - Mycorrhizal fungi networks; - Logging or timber harvests; - Herbicide use; - Natural disturbance; - Amphibian and reptile conservation; - Rare and high-quality habitats and their special elements of diversity - Suitable and unsuitable management areas; - Ecological restoration and disturbance dependent species; - Uncharacteristic vegetation; - Restoring structural diversity; - Spruce-fir restoration - Wildlife management; - Tier 2 Active Management Objectives, Land Allocations, and "triggers"; - Landscape-level progress towards NRV; - Open forest woodlands; - Forestry Best Management Practices - Comparisons of Draft Forest Plan Alternatives; - Sustained Yield Limit, NFMA, ESA, and the Planning Rule; - Maintenance and restoration of ecological integrity; - Ecosse and NRV issues; - Listed species; - Nonnative invasive plant control 	The Ruffed Grouse Society & American Woodcock Society (RGS & AWS) are interested in being involved in the resolution discussions for all objections that relate to the aforementioned issues as they relate to our interests and organization's mission to unite conservationists to improve wildlife habitat and forest health.
Kyle Briggs, Andrea Leslie and Ryan Jacobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Application and use of models to determine historical, current, and future forest disturbance, ecozone characteristics, etc. •Coarse filter vs. fine filter approach to wildlife objectives •Old growth forest identification, allocation, and management •Woodland management, allocation, and habitat •Young forest management, patch size, definition, allocation, and habitat •Prescribed burns •Timber harvest methods and calculations •Use of herbicides on the Forest •Management area reallocations, including proposed Wilderness •Special Interest Area management •Big Ivy/Craggy Mountain Forest Scenic Area •Protection of ephemeral stream channels •Streamside zone widths •Road building and access •Peregrine Falcon nesting site management •Scale of monitoring - disturbance, young forest 	NC Wildlife Resources Commission (NCWRC) is charged with management, regulation, protection and conservation of wildlife resources and inland fisheries in North Carolina. On the Nantahala-Pisgah National Forest itself, NCWRC partners with the Forest Service to manage wildlife and their habitats. Therefore, NCWRC has an interest in being part of discussions to resolve objection topics that may influence the conservation and management of wildlife species and their habitats. For many of the objection topics named above, there are multiple objectors with different objections; rather than stating support or opposition for a certain objection, NCWRC prefers to note its general interest in the topic.
Deirdre Perot	IMBA/Sorba regards clarification of USFS intent on verbiage for horses & bikes staying on designated trails. Carolina Mountain Club's objection regarding "multi use trail policies" not addressed in the Land Management plan.	BCH of NC is an "equally affected party" to those USFS standards. The objection that IMBA/Sorba submitted is mirrored in our objection & fully supported by BCH of NC. The suggested relief/remedy was worked out jointly between the two organization in our knowledge of discussions with the USFS regarding their intent over the last 9 yrs. As the representative for BCH of NC, I have participated in both the NP Partnership & the Stakeholders Forum as the equestrian representative in the Recreation interest group. At no time during the 10 years of my involvement did the representatives from CMC come up with any constructive policies for increasing "safety" on trails other than displacement of other user groups. I oppose the objections of CMC. I feel they are attempting to pass the responsibility for "safety" onto the USFS. The best possible outcome for sustainable trail systems in the USFS would be for all user groups to come together and collaborate for the most successful ways forward. Further the USFS's draft final plan requires that all "new" trails or trail proposals be 'ecologically, socially and financially sustainable'. Social sustainability would be where user conflict would be addressed, collaboratively. I would welcome further interaction with CMC to try to work on that, collaboratively to present the USFS with suggestions that would work for all user groups.
Deirdre Perot	Carolina Mountain Club's objection regarding "multi use trail policies" and Procedures in the LMP for the Nantahala and Pisgah NFs.	I do not support the objection filed by CMC that will restrict multi-use trail opportunities for mountain bikers. SORBA and IMBA have participated in the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership for 10 years and submitted comments in June of 2020.
Terry Palmeri	Southern Off-Road Bicycle Association and IMBA Southeast Region Executive Director	I am a botanist, plant pathologist, plant propagator, native plant nursery owner and resident of Big Ivy. My work is focused on the propagation of native plant species. Many forest species are at-risk due to changes in climate and pressures from logging, development, and overharvest, and thus are becoming more difficult to find. The final Plan's Alternative E weakens protection for our national forest and it's flora dn fauna overall; as a result, the rich biological diversity of the region is threatened.
Manley Fuller	<p>We are in support of the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. I have been voted as the Partnership's alternate lead objector if Megan Sutton TNC the lead objector was unable to participate in some portion of the Objections proceedings. I would like to observe any of the Forest Plan objections meetings. The North Carolina Wildlife Federation previously joined with and submitted comments to the Forest Service through the NP Forest Partnership comments on the Nantahala Pisgah Draft Forest Plan submitted in June 2020.</p> <p>The North Carolina Wildlife Federation has been actively engaged with the Partnership in addressing a number of National Forest issues including young forests, old growth, open forests and forest openings, forest habitat diversity, recreational management, fish and wildlife management, increased use of fire where appropriate, invasive species control, habitat restoration, sustainable timber management, stream side buffers and aquatic and terrestrial wildlife connectivity among others.</p> <p>We believe adoption of the Partnerships recommendations will reduce conflicts with the Plan and on the ground projects as well. We agree with the Partnerships recommendations to cap the acreage of old growth network at 255,000 acres with cap and trade provisions and trade out lower quality old growth within the old growth network for higher quality old growth stands that are documented in the timber base acreage recommended in the Plan Revisions. Another area where we would like clear standards to spell out in greater detail how the Forest Service and the NC Natural Heritage Program will cooperate prior and during Projects which contain NC Natural Heritage sites. We are interested in issues raised by other objectors concerning forest openings, natural disturbance and modeling to name several. Also interested in objections filed by: • American Whitewater; • Audubon North Carolina; • Center for Biological Diversity; • Chattooga Conservancy; • Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council; • North Carolina Forestry Association; • Ruffed Grouse Society & American Woodcock Society; • Southern Environmental Law Center, The Wilderness Society, MountainTrue, Defenders of Wildlife, The Sierra Club; Also in support of the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership objection and remedies.</p>	<p>American Whitewater Issue 1: Eligibility of 4 additional streams for Wild and Scenic River Classifications. We support American Whitewater recommendations as remedy. Audubon North Carolina Issue 1: Forest Landscape Pattern, Connectivity, and Wildlife: We support requested remedy. • Issue 2: Monitoring Plan: We support requested remedy. Center for Biological Diversity • Issue 1: Regeneration Harvests: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. • Issue 2: Conserve Plant and Animal Diversity: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. • Issue 3: Impacts from Roads: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. • Issue 4: Viability of Vulnerable Wildlife: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. Chattooga Conservancy • Issue 1 and 2: Old Growth Forests: We support the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership's old growth patch network with a Cap-and-Trade system to be implemented at the project level. • Issue 3: Crop Tree Management: We support the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership's requested remedy regarding Natural Heritage Natural Areas. • Issue 5: Overflow Creek: We support the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership's requested remedy regarding engine Wild and Scenic Rivers. • Issue 6: Mobile: We would like to participate in deliberations as an interested party. • Issue 7: Climate Change: We support the Forest Plan more directly addressing the effects of climate change and the remedy for this issue is nuanced. • Issue 8: Monitoring Program: We support the development of a robust monitoring program that sets assumptions and creates an adaptive management framework. Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council • Issue: Ephemeral stream buffers: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. North Carolina Forestry Association • Issue 1: PWSQ and PFSQ: Remedy should be nuanced, as ecological restoration work towards desired conditions could be impacted by the requested relief. • Issue 2: Old Growth Network: We support the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership's old growth patch network with a Cap-and-Trade system to be implemented at the project level. • Issue 3: Best Management Practices for stream buffers: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. • Issue 4: Open Woodland Acres: Generally, we support the requested relief, with some nuance added. Ruffed Grouse Society & American Woodcock Society • Issue 1: Spectrum model and Young Forest Creation: Remedy should be nuanced as any changes to the models will also impact other interests. • Issue 2: NRV model: Young and Open Forest and Natural Disturbances. We like to be a part of any resolution of this issue. • Issue 4: Anthropogenic Disturbance Inclusion in Modeling: We would like to be a part of any resolution of this issue. • Issue 6: Inconsistencies: Remedy should be nuanced as any clarifications may impact other interests. • Issue 5: Old Growth Forest: We support the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership's old growth patch network with a Cap-and-Trade system to be implemented at the project level. • Issue 6: Open Forest Woodlands: Remedy should be nuanced as any changes to the models will likely also impact other interests. • Issue 7: Group Selection Treatments: Remedy should be nuanced as any changes to the models will also impact other interests. • Issue 8: Prioritization of Desired Conditions: Remedy should be nuanced, and some interests may lose out if there is equal prioritization. • Issue 9: Open Forest Woodland Objective: Generally, we support the requested relief, with some nuance added. • Issue 10: Timber Volume Outputs: Remedy should be nuanced, as ecological restoration work towards desired conditions could be impacted by the requested relief. • Issue 11: Ephemeral Stream Protection: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. Southern Environmental Law Center, The Wilderness Society, Mountain True, Defenders of Wildlife, The Sierra Club • Cross-Cutting Remedies (Allocations, Triggers, Priority Treatments): We support the requested remedies through the work of the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Additional Remedies: Remedies adopted should be nuanced and appropriately balanced as to their impacts across all interests.</p>

Sam Evans	Southern Environmental Law Center	Access Fund - Climbing Management - Support; American Whitewater - Determination of eligible WSR and level of eligibility and responsibility to update analysis re Chattooga River; Audubon Society NC - NRV and Monitoring; Back Country Horseman of American - Rec demand and trail/overland travel closure; Buncombe County - Craggy, CBD - Need for and future levels of young forest/all lands/old growth/species composition/species protection (esp. salamanders, birds, plants)/roads/soil and erosion/ephemeral streams/BMPs/carbon and climate/salamanders; Chattooga Conservancy - Chattooga watershed/old growth/NHNAs/modeling/analytical flaws/climate change/WSR eligibility and level/Carbon; Cherokee County - MA allocations; City of Asheville - Craggy, Clay County - MA Allocations; Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council - SMZs and ephemeral streams; Friends of Panthertown - MA allocations/appropriateness of management types to eczones; Graham County - MA area components, public input on Alternative E, impediments to project delivery; Greg Warren - Recreation Opportunity Spectrum; Nantahala-Pisgah Forest Partnership - Each and every issue raised; NC Forestry Ass'n - Emphasis on mesic forest logging, old growth, open forests; Nick Holshouser - water quality and timber; Ruffed Grouse Soc'y and American Woodcock Soc'y - modeling and analysis, ephemeral streams; SORBA - recreation demand and trail/overland travel closure; Southern Appalachian Mineral Soc'y - Clarity re ground penetrating tools; Southern Appalachian Wilderness Stewards - MA allocations and wilderness evaluation and recommendation.	
Jane Thomas		I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership.	Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan doesn't clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest."
Megan Sutton	The Nature Conservancy of North Carolina	Audubon North Carolina; Center for Biological Diversity; Chattooga Conservancy; Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council; North Carolina Forestry Association; Ruffed Grouse Society & American Woodcock Society; Southern Environmental Law Center, The Wilderness Society, MountainTrue, Defenders of Wildlife, The Sierra Club	Audubon North Carolina Issue 1: Forest Landscape Pattern, Connectivity, and Wildlife: We support requested remedy. Issue 2: Monitoring Plan: We support requested remedy. Center for Biological Diversity Issue 1: Regeneration Harvests: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. Issue 2: Conserve Plant and Animal Diversity: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. Issue 3: Impacts from Roads: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. Issue 4: Viability of Vulnerable Wildlife: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. Chattooga Conservancy Issue 1 and 2: Old Growth Forests: We support the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership's old growth patch network with a Cap-and-Trade system to be implemented at the project level. Issue 3: Crip Tree Management: We support the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership's requested remedy regarding Natural Heritage Natural Areas; Issue 5: Overflow Creek: We support the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership's requested remedy regarding eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers. Issue 6: Model: As Landfire is based at The Nature Conservancy, and as many of the NRV models are built on the foundation of Landfire outputs, we would like to be a part of any resolution of this issue. Issue 7: Climate Change: We support the Forest Plan more directly addressing the effects of climate change and the remedy for this issue is nuanced. Issue 8: Monitoring Program: We support the development of a robust monitoring program that tests assumptions and creates an adaptive management framework. Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council Issue: Ephemeral stream buffers: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. North Carolina Forestry Association Issue 1: FWSO and FWSO: Remedy should be nuanced, as ecological restoration work towards desired conditions could be impacted by the requested relief. Issue 2: Old Growth Network: We support the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership's old growth patch network with a Cap-and-Trade system to be implemented at the project level. Issue 3: Best Management Practices for stream buffers: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue. Issue 4: Open Woodland Acres: Generally, we support the requested relief, with some nuance added and biomass removed. Ruffed Grouse Society & American Woodcock Society Issue 1: Spectrum model and Young Forest Creation: Remedy should be nuanced as any changes to the models will also impact other interests; Issue 2: NRV model, Young and Open Forest and Natural Disturbances: As Landfire is based at The Nature Conservancy, and as many of the NRV models are built on the foundation of Landfire outputs, we would like to be a part of any resolution of this issue; Issue 3: Anthropogenic Disturbance Inclusion in Modeling: As Landfire is based at The Nature Conservancy, and as many of the NRV models are built on the foundation of Landfire outputs, we would like to be a part of any resolution of this issue; Issue 4: Inconsistencies: Remedy should be nuanced as any clarifications may impact other interests; Issue 5: Old Growth Forest: We support the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership's old growth patch network with a Cap-and-Trade system to be implemented at the project level. Issue 6: Open Forest Woodlands: Remedy should be nuanced as any changes to the models will likely also impact other interests. Creating and maintaining woodland structure takes significant time and multiple entries, and therefore it is questionable whether they can be achieved at a meaningful scale, if it is a shifting mosaic across the landscape. Issue 7: Group Selection Treatments: Remedy should be nuanced at any changes to the models will also impact other interests; Issue 8: Prioritization of Desired Conditions: Remedy should be nuanced, and some interests may lose out if there is equal prioritization; Issue 9: Open Forest Woodland Objective: Generally, we support the requested relief, with some nuance added and biomass removed. Issue 10: Timber Volume Outputs: Remedy should be nuanced, as ecological restoration work towards desired conditions could be impacted by the requested relief. Issue 11: Ephemeral Stream Protection: Remedy should be nuanced as there are conflicting perspectives on this issue Southern Environmental Law Center, The Wilderness Society, Mountain True, Defenders of Wildlife, The Sierra Club: Cross-Cutting Remedies (Allocations, Triggers, Priority Treatments): We support the requested remedies through the work of the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Additional Remedies: Remedies adopted should be nuanced and appropriately balanced as to their impacts across all interests.
Natalie Nicklett		Protection of old-growth remaining forests; prohibit logging in the Appalachian Trail viewshed; prohibit logging on steep slopes; protect the proposed Craggy National Scenic Area.	I spend a lot of time in the Big Ivy. I also run a school for land-based living, and the Big Ivy is a contributor to the attraction of students to our school.
Drew Ball	Appalachian Trail Conservancy	Anything related to the Appalachian Trail, The Appalachian Trail Conservancy, forest-wide standards for scenery management, the Roan Mountain Management Area, and Congressionally Designated Wilderness and proposed wilderness areas within the Appalachian Trail Management Area or Appalachian Trail Viewshed.	The Appalachian National Scenic Trail (ANST or A.T.) was begun in 1922, initially completed in 1937 and designated as the first National Scenic Trail in 1968, at which time the A.T. became a unit of the National Park System. It is managed under a unique partnership between the public and private sectors led by the Appalachian Trail Conservancy. Established in 1925, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy (ATC) leads the effort to protect, maintain and celebrate the A.T. We are part of a unique cooperative-management system, working with numbers of local, state, and federal partners to ensure greater protections for the Trail. The mission of the Appalachian Trail Conservancy is to protect, manage, and advocate for the Appalachian National Scenic Trail. Nearly half of the A.T. is located on USDA Forest Service administered lands, and the A.T. passes through six other national forests in USFS regions 8 and 9. As a result of designation as a National Scenic Trail, many acres of the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests have been acquired to provide a right-of-way and "corridor" for the A.T. to fulfill Congressional intent; this designation also resulted in a 1984 Department of the Interior delegation of day-to-day management responsibility to ATC for the A.T. ATC coordinates the involvement of the volunteers of the 30 federated A.T. clubs and four A.T. clubs have responsibility for management and maintenance of the A.T. on the Nantahala or Pisgah National Forests: the Nantahala Hiking Club and the Smoky Mountains Hiking Club in the NNF, and the Carolina Mountain Club and the Tennessee Eastman Hiking and Canoeing Club in the PNF. With that in mind, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy has a strong interest and responsibility as an interested party to any objection resolution discussions related to the Appalachian Trail, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy, forest-wide standards for scenery management, the Roan Mountain Management Area, and Congressionally Designated Wilderness and proposed wilderness areas within the Appalachian Trail Management Area or Appalachian Trail Viewshed. It is ATC's goal to help ensure consistency between forest plans, and to ensure clear guidance is provided within the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests Land Management Plan to ensure that Visual Quality Objectives (VQOs) for the A.T. can be met when timber harvesting and other activities are proposed.
Will Harlan	I Heart Pisgah	The I Heart Pisgah coalition is interested in the Buncombe County's objection, and its members will be affected by the resolution of the objection.	I Heart Pisgah is specifically interested in is specifically interested in the protection of all of Craggy National Scenic Area, rare species and species of conservation concern; listed species and the Endangered Species Act; old-growth forests; wilderness and WIAs; North Carolina Natural Heritage Areas; water quality; roads; soils and slopes; and carbon storage and climate.
Will Harlan	I Heart Pisgah	The I Heart Pisgah coalition is interested in the City of Asheville's objection, and its members will be affected by the resolution of the objection.	I Heart Pisgah is specifically interested in is specifically interested in the protection of all of Craggy National Scenic Area, rare species and species of conservation concern; listed species and the Endangered Species Act; old-growth forests; wilderness and WIAs; North Carolina Natural Heritage Areas; water quality; roads; soils and slopes; and carbon storage and climate.
Ryland Bowman		I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership.	I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan doesn't clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest.
Nicole Hayler	Chattooga Conservancy	I am requesting to participate in any resolution discussions between the USDA Forest Service's reviewing official(s) and the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC) et al. for issues stated in SELC's objection, including: natural range of variability (NRV) for species composition; modeling (Spectrum and ST SIM); land management allocations; improving/restoring ecological conditions; at risk species; 2012 Planning Rule; non native invasive species (NNS); old growth; wilderness inventory areas; monitoring; water quality; soils; climate change; carbon storage.	The Chattooga Conservancy has an organizational interest in the proper and lawful management of public lands in the Nantahala Pisgah National Forest. We share and support the specific concerns named above and as disclosed in SELC et al.'s objection, and their timely and meaningful resolution.
Joseph Owle/Michael LaVoie	Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians	Nantahala and Pisgah Forest Planning Process	The EBCI is supportive of the Nantahala and Pisgah Forest Management Plan revision, specifically the areas addressing the Trail of Tears corridor, inclusion of traditional ecological knowledge and practices from indigenous tribes, prescription burns, planned timber harvesting, and other management activities near tribal lands. The EBCI would like to be considered in an "interested party" in order to participate in the resolution to any objections associated with any of the listed, or not listed, concerns above.
Travis Hutchins	Northwest North Carolina Mountain Bike Alliance	I am concerned about the Carolina Mountain Club's objections concerning the procedure for determining and development of Multi-use Trail policies for the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests.	I do not support the objection filed by the Carolina Mountain club that will restrict multi-use trail opportunities for mountain bikers.
Timothy Downs		I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan doesn't clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest.	I am a birdwatcher, bird advocate, and member of Audubon North Carolina. I support the objections that Curtis Smalling and Audubon North Carolina submitted in March, as well as the objections filed by the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. Specifically, the plan misses opportunities for greater and more focused habitat restoration. The plan doesn't clarify which kinds of habitat management can take place in different places on the forests. By leaving these decisions to be made for individual projects, the plan is inviting more conflict and less certainty. The plan also misses opportunities to improve coordination among partners as we tackle difficult management decisions in the future. This will only make it more difficult for forest managers and groups like Audubon to respond as the forest changes, whether it's due to climate change, natural disasters, or human pressures. The plan also misses opportunities to take a more holistic approach toward monitoring changes in the forest. What happens on neighboring lands next to the forest matters for birds and people. If bird habitat is being create or degraded nearby, that should impact what kinds of habitat management happen on the forest.
Kevin Colburn	American Whitewater	I am interested in participating in resolution discussions regarding the following issues: Wild and Scenic River Eligibility, Chattooga River Management, and Recreational Management.	Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership Objection: As a Partnership member, American Whitewater is fully supportive of the Partnership's objection. We have worked for eight-plus years with the Partnership to offer the Forest Service recommendations for exemplary, productive, popular, and low-conflict management, which we hope will be adopted to a greater extent through the objection process. We are interested in participating to support all interests in this objection, and to share helpful information as needed regarding our areas of expertise. Our own comments and objections share requested relief with the Partnership objection regarding Wild and Scenic River eligibility and Chattooga River management. - Friends of Panthertown Objection: Our interest in this objection is limited to the request for additional consideration of the eligibility of Greenland Creek, Panthertown Creek, and the upper Tuckasee River for Wild and Scenic River protection. We support this request, we made the same request in numerous comments and our own objection, and we find the factual basis for the request provided by the organization's comments compelling. - Southern Environmental Law Center Objection: This objection raises issues and requests relief related to our cross-interest recommendations as a member of the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership. We are generally supportive of this objection as it supports the Partnership recommendations, and we may be able to offer place-based context and subject matter expertise that is valuable to the resolution process. - Carolina Mountain Club Objection: This objection raises issues and requests relief related to our recreational recommendations as a member of the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership, and we would like to participate to better understand this objection and its ramifications. - Access Fund Objection: This objection raises issues and requests relief consistent with our recommendations as a member of the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership, and we support this objection. - IMBA Objection: This objection raises issues and requests relief consistent with our recommendations as a member of the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Partnership, and we support this objection. - William Floyd Objection: While not put forth as requested relief, this objection mentions dredging of the Chattooga River and padding limits, and makes various false claims regarding our organization and padding, including that padding is a significant source of erosion and that paddlers seek the removal of a natural log jam. We oppose additional limits on padding. We are interested in reducing sedimentation in general on the Forest, and may be able to contribute meaningfully to conversations on that topic.

Nicholas Holshouser	<p>I am requesting participation as an interested party for the following objections submitted in regard to the Nantahala Pisgah Forest Plan Revision. I filed eligible objections related to riparian buffers (aka Streamside management zones) and the sustained yield calculations. I am interested in all other objections which contain a reference to these topics.</p> <p>Objection: Mountain Biking access Organization: SCRBA / IMBA - Issue: I fully support the plan decision and disagree that biking access should EVER be allowed on non-designated trails. There are more than enough designated bike legal trails and roads available. Further, I believe the USFS should more vigorously enforce the current and future restrictions. Explanation of Interest: As a frequent user of the forest I am aware of the conflicts between bikers and hikers and also aware of the rampant use of illegal trails by mountain bikers and the damage mountain bikers cause. Support or Oppose: Strongly oppose the objection, support the USFS plan.</p> <p>Objection: Wilderness Designations, Organization: Southern Appalachian Wilderness Stewards - Issue: Improper dismissal of several wilderness inventory areas, including Black Mountains, Central Top, and Tusquitee Bald. Explanation of Interest: I supported Alternative C which called for more wilderness. Support or Oppose: I oppose the plan decision and agree with the objector that these areas were improperly excluded.</p> <p>Objection: Organization: Buffer Grove Society & American Woodcock Society - Issue: Among many organizations the RGS&AWS had issues with the Spectrum modeling and NWV. It is challenging for anyone to fully understand the modeling because it was so inconsistently done. The data in the plan is presented based on different models, different units, different terms - it is utterly confusing. I support all objections regarding the NWV and Spectrum models - not specifically related to specific results but because so many objections are related to inconsistencies in the modeling. Explanation of Interest: I am opposed to many of their objections but support some. I am specifically opposed to Issue 9, allocation of Old Growth. It should be larger not smaller. I disagree that more young forest should be prioritized. I strongly disagree with the requested relief for Issue 10, Timber Harvest Amounts, specifically 8 - Commercial Timber Harvest should not be used because it is "most cost effective". Commercial Timber Harvest has many external costs (carbon release, roads, etc...). Issue 11: Ephemeral Stream Protection - I do not support any elimination of protections on ephemeral streams. I actually support stronger protections than the plan specifies and agree with SELC on this issue. BMPs are only a MIMIMUM standard and do not guarantee water quality protection. Support or Oppose: I am opposed to most of the RGS&AWS requested relief.</p> <p>Objection: PWIS and PTIS - Organization: North Carolina Forestry Association - Issue: PWIS and PTIS are too low. Too much Old Growth. Explanation of Interest: I believe both PWIS and PTIS are significantly too high and per my objection the B&I and modeling of them were erroneous. I believe that Old Growth is too low in the plan, not too high. I am opposed to their objection 3 regarding elimination of buffers on ephemeral streams. Buffers should be increased not reduced. Support or Oppose: I strongly oppose all the objections raised by NCFA. I would like to also express my disagreement with their statement "As presented in NCFA Comments on the Draft EIS, there is an extremely robust local market for small diameter wood that supports the pulp and paper industry, and regional biomass power boilers, consuming well over 2 million tons of small diameter wood fiber annually". There is no such local market and it is nothing short of insanity to consider that the Nantahala and Pisgah Forests should be used to supply an environmentally damaging market such as biomass.</p> <p>Objection: NP Forest Partnership Organization: NP Forest Partnership Issue: All. Explanation of Interest: I am interested in how the USFS and NFPF collaborate on the resolution of the combined objections. As a citizen I have counted on the partnership to represent all parties and interests. Support or Oppose: I support some and oppose others. What I see in their objection is that the USFS has divided the group by choosing to ignore the core recommendations of the group. It is important that in resolving the groups objections the USFS does not favor one member over another.</p> <p>Objection: Wildlife and Ecological Restoration Organization: Mountain Trail - Issue: All. Explanation of Interest: I strongly support all the objections of Mountain Trail and would like to participate/observe in the resolution process. Support or Oppose: Support</p> <p>Objection: Heart Pisgah Organization: I Heart Pisgah - Issue: Timber Harvest Levels, Logging on Steep Slopes, Appalachian Trail view shed, evaluation of carbon impacts, Ephemeral stream protections, accurate and consistent all-lands approach, PARCA. Explanation of Interest: All of these objections I support and am interested in as a concerned citizen. Support or Oppose: Support</p> <p>Objection: County objections to wilderness, scenic rivers, timber harvests Organization: Graham County, Clay County, Cherokee County - Issue: No additional wilderness or scenic rivers in Graham County. Explanation of Interest: Graham, Clay, and Cherokee counties have a narrow and self-serving objection related to tax income from timber harvest and loss of tourism. This is short sighted and ignores that the forests are owned by all citizens and the interests of the county are not the greatest consideration. I strongly oppose more timber harvest simply to generate tax revenue for any county. These objections further ignore that wilderness and wild/scenic rivers are beneficial to tourism not detrimental. Support or Oppose: I strongly oppose the Graham, Clay, and Cherokee County objections and believe there should be more wilderness and wild river designations.</p> <p>Objection: Panthertown Issues Organization: Friends of Panthertown - Issue: Special Interest Area, Prescribed burns in SIA, weak protections for rare and endangered plants and animals, bog areas, wild and scenic rivers, stream buffers. Explanation of Interest: I strongly support increased protection of resources and plants/ animals. More wild and scenic rivers, restrictions on burning in SIA. Support or Oppose: I support Friends of Panthertown objections.</p> <p>Objection: Big Ivy Organization: Friends of Big Ivy - Issue: Timber harvest levels, ephemeral stream buffers, logging on Appalachian Trail corridor, road building, protection of NC Natural Heritage Areas, PARCA. Explanation of Interest: concerned citizen Support or Oppose: Support</p> <p>Objection: Ephemeral Streams - Organization: Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council Issue: Ephemeral Streams, Explanation of Interest: concerned citizen, riparian buffers are under-protected already. Support or Oppose: Oppose</p> <p>Objection: Old Growth, Crop Tree management, Wilderness designations, Wild and Scenic Rivers, inaccurate modeling. Organization: Chattooga Conservancy Issue: All issues cited. Explanation of Interest: concerned citizen Support or Oppose: Support</p> <p>Objection: conservation of plant and animal diversity, timber harvest levels, roads impacts Organization: Center for Biological Diversity Issue: timber harvest are too high and roads impacts are understated. Insufficient provisions for ensuring plant and wildlife diversity and conservation, understating road impacts. Explanation of Interest: concerned citizen Support or Oppose: support.</p> <p>Objection: multi-use trails, trail system. Organization: Carolina Mountain Club, Issue: Trail system, trail safety, user conflicts. Explanation of Interest: hiker and concerned citizen Support or Oppose: Support.</p> <p>Objection: trail use of non-designated trails Organization: Back Country Horsemen - Issue: "REC-11 Equestrian (Horse, Stock, pack, and saddle) and bicycle use is only allowed on system trails designated for those uses, and on open or gated system roads. Explanation of Interest: As a hiker and concerned citizen I believe the USFS should more consistently enforce trail use as designated. I believe it would set a dangerous (especially for hikers) precedent to permit use of non-designated trails for horse/bike use. I do believe that the USFS should prioritize improvements of the trail network and consider appropriate designations, but there should be no allowance for use contrary to trail designation. Support or Oppose: Strongly Oppose</p> <p>Objection: Canopy corridors, unfragmented forests, Organization: Audubon Society, Issue: desired conditions and connectivity of the forest landscape for wildlife. Explanation of Interest: concerned citizen. Support or Oppose: support</p> <p>Objection: Wild and Scenic Rivers, North Fork French Broad, Access Organization: American Whitewater - Issue: wild and scenic rivers. Explanation of Interest: concerned citizen, especially regarding North Fork French Broad and Tanawase Creek, should be considered and should not be in Matrix. Chattooga access, Support or Oppose: support.</p> <p>Objection: Timber harvests Organization: Kim Porter - Issue: Timber harvest levels not justified. Explanation of Interest: concerned citizen. Support or Oppose: support.</p> <p>Objection: Timber harvests Organization: Cynthia Simmons - Issue: timber harvest too high, insufficient protection of plants and wildlife, lack of protection for natural heritage areas. Explanation of Interest: concerned citizen Support or Oppose: support</p> <p>Objection: Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Organization: Greg Warren - Issue: The plan lacks sufficient detail, analysis is improper or wrong, interpretation of USFS policy are wrong, roads in backcountry areas, Appalachian Scenic Trail allowed management practices. Explanation of Interest: concerned citizen and strongly opposed to more road building. Support or Oppose: support.</p> <p>I am further interested in all of the objections filed by Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC) on behalf of multiple parties, including MountainFly, the Sierra Club, The Wilderness Society, and Defenders of Wildlife. These organizations raise important issues with the plan and the science (or lack thereof) behind the plan.</p> <p>As a concerned citizen I am interested in how the USFS managed the objection resolution process, how the USFS balances the interests of all parties and how the resolutions are considered as a whole. I am less than satisfied with the USFS planning process and have a keen interest in following through to the end in my observation. I will continue to use and enjoy these forests for the next two decades and have a strong interest in the management and stewardship of this incredible natural treasure.</p>	
John Culclasure	Timber harvest objectives and vegetation management, young forest, roads, recommended Wilderness, special designations, scenery resource management and scenic corridors, Wild and Scenic - eligible, Natural Heritage Areas, Appalachian National Scenic Trail corridor, heritage corridors, old growth, ecological interest areas, and ephemeral streams.	I did not object to the FEIS, but after seeing the objections, I want to participate as an Interested Person to support maintaining access for sportsmen and women and to support active management for the benefit of wildlife and forest health. I am particularly concerned about special designations and related mapping that removes management flexibility, including specific areas on the forest important to hunters and anglers.
John Hatcher	Projected Wood Sale Quantity and Projected Timber Sale Quantity; Old growth network; best management practices; open woodland acres and young forest patch size; the natural range of variation model; the spectrum model; transportation and access issues; increasing active forest management on the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests to achieve Tier 1 and Tier 2 target levels; wilderness area designations; recreation	The North Carolina Forestry Association (NCFCA) works to ensure healthy, productive and sustainable forests. The NCFCA believes that increasing active forest management on the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests can provide clean air, clean water, abundant wildlife habitat, a myriad of recreational opportunities and good paying jobs in and around surrounding communities in western North Carolina.