0:0:0.0 --> 0:0:0.790
Smalling, Curtis
For conflicts.

0:0:4.30 --> 0:0:15.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So do you want to proceed without you to making your remarks? I can reiterate the the goals and the the process. This sure, yeah, I think I think that that sounds good.

0:0:16.620 --> 0:0:27.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And yeah, we'll just make sure we we see introduce everyone around. Yeah, no, I'll, I'll cover a few points since the just to make sure we refresh, OK. So do you wanna start with that?

0:0:28.540 --> 0:0:33.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sure. Yeah, I'll, I'll start. And what I'll do is I I've got, I've got my notes.

0:0:35.270 --> 0:0:38.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Just in case we had a lot of new people because I need to say.

0:0:39.840 --> 0:0:52.580
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Pretty much the same exact thing again for the benefit of the new folks. So what I'm gonna do is as I look through my notes, I'm going to pick pick what I think's appropriate. So if you could bear with me a little bit because it maybe some.

0:0:53.400 --> 0:0:55.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
From our pauses and get gap.

0:0:56.180 --> 0:0:59.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, but First off again.

0:0:59.780 --> 0:1:2.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you so much for for being here.

0:1:4.630 --> 0:1:8.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
As I mentioned a couple times yesterday this this is.

0:1:9.200 --> 0:1:17.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That this is a a big chunk of your time, a big commitment that you've made not only over these days, but over the time that this plan is being worked on.

0:1:19.110 --> 0:1:22.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, but really thank you for bringing forward your objections.

0:1:23.620 --> 0:1:26.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Of reflecting on yesterday and.

0:1:26.820 --> 0:1:31.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, just just really impressed with how important.

0:1:31.830 --> 0:1:50.630
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All of this is and what we do, and this part of the process, it's not a standalone thing. It's a continuation of the work that's been doing and we invite, you know, we we we give instructions in our letter of how how to object because we want to, we want to hear from folks and we've got a very open.

0:1:51.30 --> 0:2:3.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, open process and there's a lot of collaboration on this, so just really, really honored, honored to be with this whole group, the whole team that's worked on this.

0:2:4.100 --> 0:2:13.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Everyone out there that's joining us now that has an interest and and a passion and a love for for these National Forest system lands.

0:2:15.290 --> 0:2:15.680
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And.

0:2:16.630 --> 0:2:31.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know that there's people here for the entire three days and some just joining for today, some some may be coming and going, but I think yesterday we pretty much everybody was on the whole time and I see a lot of the same faces today. So again thank you.

0:2:32.300 --> 0:2:32.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And.

0:2:33.710 --> 0:2:34.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.

0:2:35.670 --> 0:2:45.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

We've got another packed agenda. Appreciate the request to see if we can revisit some of the wilderness discussion. We'll we'll keep that in mind and.

0:2:46.570 --> 0:2:49.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
See where we can give that adequate attention?

0:2:50.270 --> 0:2:51.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And.

0:2:52.580 --> 0:3:6.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
As I mentioned yesterday, I I'm not inexperienced with the Pisgah and and they have a horse, they've been here and worked just down the road from James for for a number of years of the floor supervisor in South Carolina.

0:3:7.670 --> 0:3:22.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But what I really wanted to cover in the introduction is this to refresh and touch stone touch the base with what I mentioned when we talked about the wildernesses. Really, really focusing on the the resolutions, the remedies.

0:3:23.50 --> 0:3:23.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
This meeting is.

0:3:24.850 --> 0:3:34.980
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
To help me fully understand the some of the more, some of the more complex issues raised, we've got all of your objections. We've got teams.

0:3:35.550 --> 0:3:38.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh people combing through them.

0:3:39.30 --> 0:4:7.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Assessing them, going back to the documents, finding everything. If if you know, say, an injection says you didn't say such and such, we're going back in the document and finding, you know, whether we did or not. And probably more often than not all the places that we did say those things. And did we address this adequately. So all that is being being worked on and there's been a lot of time devoted to it so.

0:4:8.920 --> 0:4:16.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Really, the valuable use of our time is to to focus on those potential remedies and any context that you do need to provide.

0:4:17.410 --> 0:4:22.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, just just to bring us into tune with that potential remedy that resolution.

0:4:24.280 --> 0:4:24.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And.

0:4:28.860 --> 0:4:34.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Of course, we've had a lot of objections. We've got a lot of a lot of people involved. And then.

0:4:35.300 --> 0:4:37.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Along with the with my review.

0:4:38.770 --> 0:4:50.380
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And the objections team review and we've got I mentioned interdisciplinary subject matter experts and we've we've tapped people from across the country to to help us with this help work through it.

0:4:51.590 --> 0:4:52.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And they're looking at the.

0:4:53.560 --> 0:5:1.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You're looking at the revised plan, the environmental impact statement, the draft record of decision and the project record.

0:5:1.960 --> 0:5:7.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And a big part of what they're doing is ensuring all their current laws, regulations, policies have been that.

0:5:8.880 --> 0:5:11.720
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And from there, they're going to provide me with recommendations.

0:5:12.520 --> 0:5:28.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
On whether changes are warranted to improve the analysis, the plan itself and final decision, and also what you're helping me with is you're you're keeping me in on those those places that remedies are are needed as well just like that, that team is doing.

0:5:29.840 --> 0:5:34.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So it's gonna be it's thorough, thorough review of all of this.

0:5:35.460 --> 0:5:44.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And one thing I wanted to make sure I mentioned is I've already exercised my discretion to extend the 90 day review period.

0:5:45.340 --> 0:5:55.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But given the complexity and the importance of this, everything we've got to do really felt that time was necessary to fully consider the issues raised.

0:5:56.720 --> 0:6:0.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Another thing I need to mention is after after this meeting.

0:6:1.500 --> 0:6:3.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Will be pulling together all this information.

0:6:4.880 --> 0:6:16.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Who went through everything we've talked about here, along with everything you've submitted, all that review and then I'll be issuing my my final written response to to the objectors.

0:6:17.970 --> 0:6:31.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And the response will reflect my findings from the review of the objections again, including those current laws, regulations, policy agency directions, the remedies you proposed, and the discussions we're having here this week.

0:6:33.10 --> 0:6:35.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And that that will.

0:6:36.360 --> 0:6:43.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So that may include instructions that I have back to James for changes that I've I find necessary.

0:6:44.150 --> 0:6:44.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And that.

0:6:45.750 --> 0:6:48.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Written response will address all of the issues raised.

0:6:50.90 --> 0:6:56.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And as permitted by our regulations and all issue, one response to all the objectors and interested persons.

0:6:57.730 --> 0:7:0.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And combining the issues under general topic areas.

0:7:1.380 --> 0:7:7.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Another thing I need to mention here is my my response will be the final U.S. Department of Agriculture.

0:7:8.630 --> 0:7:10.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
My final decision.

0:7:10.740 --> 0:7:14.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Of the Department of Agriculture regarding your objections.

0:7:16.750 --> 0:7:17.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So.

0:7:19.250 --> 0:7:19.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Again.

0:7:20.890 --> 0:7:47.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Really really helped me hearing from you yesterday and and through it all. You know, I could. It really came through loud and clear that deep passion care and your expertise, your love of the forest, your knowledge of the forest and really appreciate that that that I said I I mentioned yesterday and I I can read things but for me just how I how I how I process things it's it's.

0:7:49.40 --> 0:7:53.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I really value hearing, hearing your voices and hear your.

0:7:54.400 --> 0:7:56.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You're what you have to say.

0:7:56.770 --> 0:8:6.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It wrote. As I said, it deepens my understanding. It helps me process things and you know, so over the night. And then as I as I was waking up this morning.

0:8:6.950 --> 0:8:11.30
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh running through things through my head of, you know, trying to.

0:8:11.890 --> 0:8:25.870
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Trying to process everything, I've taken a lot of notes and I'm looking forward-looking forward to today and tomorrow I said this is a very valuable part of the process and greatly appreciate your time.

0:8:26.820 --> 0:8:57.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
With that, I'll turn it over again. OK, thank you. So I'm Nancy Walters. I'm serving as your facilitator today. And what that means to me is setting the environment for it to be a safe place for you to any of you who wants to offer some content to do so and also to provide the structure so that we can have constructive dialogue. I just wanna remind you that we are recording today and.

0:8:57.400 --> 0:9:10.30
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
By the fact that you're here in this meeting, you're agreeing to be reported, and that reporting serves a purpose of transparency for all of you on the line, and also anybody who wants to access the the transcript and recording.

0:9:10.880 --> 0:9:14.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right, But recording is available as well as the transcript or just the transcript.

0:9:15.350 --> 0:9:18.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Both both recording and transcript ably available.

0:9:19.660 --> 0:9:25.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Horse website weeks to come, so just wanted to make sure you are aware of that.

0:9:26.260 --> 0:9:29.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I also just wanted to highlight that we are not.

0:9:30.880 --> 0:9:38.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We don't have a chat box here to use today, and the only function that we're using is the raised hand function.

0:9:38.900 --> 0:9:49.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hang on you to let us know when you wanna enter in the dialogue by raising your hand. That'll queue us as to. To who? Who we can call on.

0:9:53.800 --> 0:10:9.630
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yesterday I think for the most part we had constructive dialogue and it was really useful and I really appreciate how you entered in and offered your additions to the objections you filed.

0:10:10.590 --> 0:10:11.980
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We, we.

0:10:12.980 --> 0:10:13.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Said.

0:10:14.490 --> 0:10:16.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yesterday, how?

0:10:17.730 --> 0:10:32.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We want this to not be a public forum type of meeting. That's one way communication to Rick, but we want it to be a dialogue with Rick. And so for you to, as he said, come with specific.

0:10:33.50 --> 0:10:56.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh comments that add value to the written objections that you've already submitted, and specifically focusing on the resolutions. And just a reminder that you either give you, you're an objector or an interested person, you received a document called at at a glance, along with the agenda, and in that at a glance are the all the all the suggested resolutions that.

0:10:57.700 --> 0:11:9.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Rick will be reviewing at the at the beginning of each topic, so you've been follow through with that if you want to. Another reminder, this is this meeting is open to the to the public.

0:11:10.590 --> 0:11:19.100
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But only the interested persons and the formal objectors are gonna be asked to engage with your voice today.

0:11:19.790 --> 0:11:34.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So that's one of the the ground rules. And as you saw yesterday, it was my attempt to try to help facilitate the threads of conversation that we were having within each issue.

0:11:34.690 --> 0:11:37.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh. Allowing folks to follow that thread.

0:11:39.140 --> 0:11:53.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And at the same time helping to move from perspective to perspective so that we could hear from all of you that came to speak. So again I'll try to balance that and make it as conversational as we can using this virtual platform.

0:11:55.980 --> 0:11:56.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm.

0:11:58.190 --> 0:11:58.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So.

0:11:59.360 --> 0:12:11.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Rick will introduce each topic like he did yesterday and the topics that we're gonna cover this morning are the big topic of soil and water, with the subtopics of riparian management zones.

0:12:12.630 --> 0:12:13.690
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Seed slopes.

0:12:14.440 --> 0:12:26.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Dial protection, sedimentation and water quality and then a just a half an hour on roads before we bring for lunch. Do you wanna share that agenda for the rest of the time?

0:12:27.850 --> 0:12:28.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sure.

0:12:29.470 --> 0:12:35.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I didn't. No, I don't want a lot of order, so I'm giving her another challenge and we get we want to.

0:12:38.90 --> 0:12:41.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
After after I run through where we're going with the agenda.

0:12:42.100 --> 0:12:43.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We'll take a look at who's in this room.

0:12:45.700 --> 0:12:53.990
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So 11 morning. Yeah. So a soil and water in the morning and roads and then break for lunch at 11:30 back.

0:12:55.230 --> 0:13:1.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Back at 12:30 to cover the a number of subtopics under the forest management and ecological integrity.

0:13:2.470 --> 0:13:31.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Theme the NRV or early several habitat old growth Timbers, a suitability and harvest and fire and fuels before we close at 5. So that's what we that's yesterday what we tried to do was stay true to the blocks of time, knowing that people are coming and going and may come just for one piece. So we wanna try to try to do that and to the best of our ability to make sure we cover what we can within each block.

0:13:33.780 --> 0:13:50.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So let's let's take a look. I I wanna note that it's not just Rick and James and I in the room. We're we're in the supervisor's office conference room and there are a number of support people in the room with us. So Shelly's gonna do a little pan and let you know who else is here.

0:13:55.200 --> 0:14:0.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hi, I'm Shelley Kelly, executive assistant here at the National Forest in North Carolina.

0:14:1.300 --> 0:14:5.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Morning, everyone. Heatherly tech that for sniper coordinator and force objections coordinator.

0:14:11.660 --> 0:14:13.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, hello. Hello.

0:14:15.110 --> 0:14:17.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good morning. I'm Michelle Aldridge. I'm the planning team leader.

0:14:18.460 --> 0:14:20.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good morning, Debbie Anderson objections coordinator.

0:14:24.310 --> 0:14:28.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good morning to Quincy Gordon, Regional objections coordinated by the Southern region.

0:14:30.320 --> 0:14:40.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right. So and there's this, there's the TV screen. You see that? That's what we're looking at. And and we've got an owl, the owl technology here on this table that allows you to.

0:14:41.530 --> 0:14:56.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hear us and see us better than if we were just looking in our computers. But it also makes it look like we're not looking at you when we're looking at you on the screen. So that's that's what's going in there. Wow, we are looking at you.

0:14:57.610 --> 0:14:59.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Just looks a little weird.

0:15:0.320 --> 0:15:1.510
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So OK, so.

0:15:2.370 --> 0:15:18.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The last thing I want to make sure to cover is the rules of engagement that we all agreed to yesterday and they worked well for us. I think they're good rules of engagement, ground rules. If you if you wanna call them that, they seem to serve us well yesterday. And I just wanna review them and say that we're gonna.

0:15:18.780 --> 0:15:25.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'll put here to those today or at least make an attempt to here adhere to those today. They're behind Rick's head.

0:15:26.230 --> 0:15:28.540
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ohh well yeah they are.

0:15:29.180 --> 0:15:30.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And they're on the screen. You can come back.

0:15:33.420 --> 0:15:42.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. So the the intent here is to focus on the issue to not get personal, but to stick with focusing on the issue and certainly not.

0:15:43.960 --> 0:16:1.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Personal attacks are not appropriate here. We know that much of what we're talking about is a passion. That's why you're here. But we are wanting to make sure we don't talk over each other and one person at a time with the passion is fine as long as it's focused on the issue.

0:16:2.640 --> 0:16:3.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm.

0:16:5.310 --> 0:16:33.580
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The the raised hand function helps with that, I mean and we ask you to manage that yourself with your own mute and unmute button. When when you're ready to speak. I also didn't say, but we really appreciate your willingness to share your face as well as your voice. And so during the issues where you intend or most interested, please put your face up so that we can see who's who you are. Ohh the third rule of engagement.

0:16:34.640 --> 0:16:45.690
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Many of you came. Obviously you're here because you have something that you are perspective you wanna share or at at least is important to you. But we also ask that you come with a spirit of curiosity.

0:16:46.910 --> 0:17:4.520
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And are willing to be interested in what the others on the call are interested in and offering. It's not just about what you have to offer. And lastly and then this is something that Rick said that we wanna concentrate on the remedies and new dimensions of the objections that you offered.

0:17:5.600 --> 0:17:10.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So any questions about those I have, I see. Nicholas, your hand is up.

0:17:14.440 --> 0:17:16.340
Nicholas Holshouser
I was just getting in the queue, that's all.

0:17:17.410 --> 0:17:18.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For the first topic.

0:17:18.750 --> 0:17:18.950
Nicholas Holshouser
Yep.

0:17:19.710 --> 0:17:32.260
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, alright, you're way ahead. Good. Actually, I think we're about there. Does any back-to-back to James before we dive into the first topic? Yeah, thanks, Nancy. Just wanna mention a few things. So First off.

0:17:33.660 --> 0:17:41.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Many of you know haven't put Simmons. Kevin, if you could come on. He's online. Our deputy for supervisor.

0:17:43.70 --> 0:17:49.280
Fitzsimmons, Cavan -FS
Morning, everybody. Kavats even step before she buys her National Forest. North Carolina, thanks for joining us again. Looking forward to today.

0:17:51.210 --> 0:18:2.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
This cabin, and then the other thing I I'll, I'll mention is Nancy mentioned like using the hand feature. I know there's a few folks that are on the phone line and not on the teams, so.

0:18:4.750 --> 0:18:24.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Just as we go into those topics, you know you can just make sure that we know that you're on and and we're trying to capture. I think we know like for instance, I think David Whitmire's on the phone line, we know what your number is. So we'll we kind of recognize you in the in the in the list of participants. But if folks are on the phone.

0:18:26.290 --> 0:18:45.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You can text or call to Quincy at that 770 number so that we can kind of get a name with the number so we know who which topic you might be interested in joining on. So we'll make sure to capture that we actually only have one number, we don't know. OK, who's who's that 803-640-9125?

0:18:53.460 --> 0:18:53.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right.

0:18:55.300 --> 0:18:56.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We'll catch up with you, and if you can.

0:18:58.70 --> 0:19:0.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You can text to Quincy, that'd be great.

0:19:3.300 --> 0:19:4.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How's James?

0:19:4.830 --> 0:19:5.260
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm.

0:19:6.450 --> 0:19:37.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, I think just, just for everyone's benefit, of course, we're here having gone through a long process that that many of you have been through for, for for many years. We published the Fe IIS and revise plan in January and we had the objection filing period, which kind of brings us to where we are today. And so really at this point, as Rick said, you know our team and the forest level is kind of stepping back and we're getting that review by Rick and that team of specialists.

0:19:37.730 --> 0:19:54.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
From across the country and and Rick will be that reviewing officer and providing any instructions back to me in the forest for to address the issues that have been raised and the objections. So thanks for the time today.

0:19:55.910 --> 0:20:1.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right. Any questions for any any of the three of us before we begin, we good.

0:20:4.440 --> 0:20:21.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I'm going to turn direct to set the stage for the soils and water topic. Alright, great. Thanks Nancy. And for a first up, we're gonna talk about riparian management zones. I was gonna run through the suggested resolutions. So some of what we've got.

0:20:22.660 --> 0:20:24.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is supplement.

0:20:25.120 --> 0:20:31.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Analysis and adopt clearer protections for riparian management zones and ephemeral streams.

0:20:32.210 --> 0:20:39.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Develop enforceable standards and guidelines for riparian management zones that will be used during project planning.

0:20:41.250 --> 0:20:47.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Established buffers that are at least as protective as other national force in this in the region.

0:20:48.380 --> 0:20:52.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Prohibit logging within 100 feet of all waterways.

0:20:54.340 --> 0:21:4.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Use the most current and best available data set to map riparian management zones, then supplement the EIS and correct the analysis.

0:21:5.230 --> 0:21:14.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Recalculate sustained yield and probable sale quantity based on remapping of repairing management zones, which are not included as part of the suitable timber base.

0:21:16.520 --> 0:21:17.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Lastly.

0:21:17.880 --> 0:21:27.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
In contrast, the North Carolina Forestry Association suggests removing ephemeral stream channels from any desired conditions. Objective standards and guidelines, and removing.

0:21:28.590 --> 0:21:34.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
UTR, Dash, DC-06 from the final plan.

0:21:37.910 --> 0:21:40.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So maybe a question then kind of kick things off.

0:21:41.370 --> 0:21:46.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, so regarding our mapping and calculation of the suitable timber base.

0:21:47.410 --> 0:21:56.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And a Rd building associated with riparian management zones. I know you gave us in your objection and considerable amount of information related to modeling.

0:21:57.580 --> 0:22:3.680
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Like to dig into that issue a little deeper. So it helped me understand why.

0:22:4.910 --> 0:22:10.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Folks feel the modeling and the information we used as insufficient at the at this planning scale.

0:22:12.40 --> 0:22:18.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I don't know if that's Nick and Susanna. Your hands are raised, but are either are you prepared to answer that question?

0:22:21.470 --> 0:22:22.530
Nicholas Holshouser
Certainly, certainly.

0:22:22.220 --> 0:22:24.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right. OK, great. Perfect. Thank you.

0:22:25.60 --> 0:22:28.40
Nicholas Holshouser
At which we both responded. Which one would you like to go first?

0:22:29.10 --> 0:22:29.460
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Plus.

0:22:29.270 --> 0:22:30.160
Nicholas Holshouser
I'll, I'll take it.

0:22:32.520 --> 0:22:33.160
Nicholas Holshouser
Thanks very much.

0:22:32.620 --> 0:22:33.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And would you introduce yourself?

0:22:34.250 --> 0:22:49.80
Nicholas Holshouser
Yes, I'm Nicholas Holzhauser, a long time resident of Brevard and a lifetime recreational user of these forests, like so, my first memories are of the four way stop sign in physical forest.

0:22:50.170 --> 0:22:53.340
Nicholas Holshouser
But long before there was anything else there other than I believe, Baggies.

0:22:55.990 --> 0:23:19.400
Nicholas Holshouser
I appreciate the opportunity to address all of the assembled representatives of the Forest Service. You know my primary objection, as, as Mr stated, is errors and emissions and analysis and calculation of the riparian management zones impact a number of other factors. Timber harvests, Rd building, water quality related environmental consequences, which are addressed in the impact statement.

0:23:21.440 --> 0:23:37.270
Nicholas Holshouser
It was my assessment after looking at the data that the analysis was was incorrect to a significant degree which should trigger a a reanalysis, a redo of the riparian resources.

0:23:39.190 --> 0:23:42.60
Nicholas Holshouser
The four service made have been incredible claim.

0:23:43.200 --> 0:24:12.330
Nicholas Holshouser
That, and I just brief quote from the from the EIS the data set, it was created by overlaying several versions of USGS website NHD data to eliminate mapping inconsistencies and lack of reliability and flow stream origin fields. They further the forest further made the claim that it's the most current fine scale mapping of streams available today. As you mentioned the the my objection was was fairly lengthy documented in the back in the appendices appendices with various other data sets.

0:24:12.870 --> 0:24:26.190
Nicholas Holshouser
Which were available at the time of the analysis, showing significant dramatic differences in the of the the the mapped stream network, the flow network of the Nantahala and Pisgah forests.

0:24:27.630 --> 0:24:50.540
Nicholas Holshouser
As far as the data set used, the the USGS states on their own in in their own website in their own information that the data set represents the water drainage network. the United States features and represented is the most up to date and comprehensive hydrograph hydrography data set for the nation, and that up to date is actually important in in my objection.

0:24:51.680 --> 0:25:10.430
Nicholas Holshouser
My objection is not that that science used was incorrect, simply that the forest used at an out of date version and for what reasons? I cannot I cannot understand because there is in fact there are no mapping inconsistencies in the USGS data. There are the authoritative source for mapping in this country.

0:25:12.510 --> 0:25:23.90
Nicholas Holshouser
So I don't disagree with the science. I guess I say that's not the best available science because it was not up to date and there were more up-to-date information sources available. If you look through the appendices.

0:25:24.310 --> 0:25:29.680
Nicholas Holshouser
You can see a comparison of available data sets to give you an idea of the scope of the error.

0:25:31.130 --> 0:25:52.180
Nicholas Holshouser
Available USGS NHD datasets. Readily downloadable from their website and available to anyone since 2012 to the current date maps approximately 178% more stream miles than the data set. You know the the the results of the analysis of the Forest Service. That's roughly.

0:25:52.930 --> 0:25:58.650
Nicholas Holshouser
4700 miles to 2600 miles mapped are represented in the US Forest Service data set.

0:26:0.470 --> 0:26:17.680
Nicholas Holshouser
If the scope at the landscape level because you mentioned the landscape planning, the acreage that that takes out of the suitable timber base in the Forest Service showed that was a roughly 6.7% they reduced the suitable timber base by the repair and management zones.

0:26:18.880 --> 0:26:38.150
Nicholas Holshouser
At A at a landscape level, just using the higher number 4700 miles, more or less you could easily come to that, that error being close to double right or half they they represented roughly half the acreage. There are other data sets available.

0:26:39.340 --> 0:26:42.50
Nicholas Holshouser
Beyond that, which should have served as a.

0:26:42.750 --> 0:26:53.80
Nicholas Holshouser
The entity check up to to the to the team. One very important data set is produced by the North Carolina geologic.

0:26:54.420 --> 0:27:24.210
Nicholas Holshouser
Group uh. It's called inside one map, their data set, which is actually enhanced over NHD, although I I didn't expect the Forest Service to use it necessarily, it was available for inspection maps approximately 250% more miles than in the analysis that I would note that the NC One map team is a partner of the USGS and the only reason that that the North Carolina specific data is not included in the national data is simply because of quality control checks over attributes.

0:27:24.390 --> 0:27:24.960
Nicholas Holshouser
Not mapping.

0:27:27.150 --> 0:27:40.860
Nicholas Holshouser
And there's another interesting partner organization that the Forest Service has, the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission, which actually for many years I can't even figure out how early it was. But I know certainly before 2012.

0:27:41.590 --> 0:28:11.520
Nicholas Holshouser
Has a list of designated drought waters, and they're listed designated Trout waters is. It shows double the amount of maps stream miles that the Forest Service identified in their analysis. And I go by the assumption we could ask someone from the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission on the call that every mile of designated trout water should be considered a perennial stream for purposes of riparian management zones by the US Forest Service. Since the reason they they mapped those miles is because of the.

0:28:12.100 --> 0:28:15.270
Nicholas Holshouser
The populations of native trout in those in those waters.

0:28:18.460 --> 0:28:19.230
Nicholas Holshouser
Umm, certainly.

0:28:22.300 --> 0:28:22.650
Nicholas Holshouser
Yeah.

0:28:16.160 --> 0:28:23.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The neck. Can we ask you to take a breath for a minute here and and and give us a chance to just make sure.

0:28:23.990 --> 0:28:28.430
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We're with you? Yeah, and. And I guess, Nick, I.

0:28:30.450 --> 0:28:46.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It would be helpful to to to kind of, you know, understand some of those concerns of the data and things, you know, focusing on what, what, what would you recommend in terms of how to resolve some of the concerns that you have?

0:28:47.380 --> 0:29:0.430
Nicholas Holshouser
So through through, you know my experience working with the Forest Service on various projects in the forest, which is always good. I I I appreciate you know the the the collegial.

0:29:1.570 --> 0:29:16.260
Nicholas Holshouser
Working with the Forest Service, especially in the field I've I've been, you know, I've I've been really happy to go into the field with with your team and and and do work in various projects. One thing that I have seen consistently is that projects in the scoping.

0:29:17.360 --> 0:29:21.280
Nicholas Holshouser
Reflect this this lack of detail in the mapping.

0:29:22.710 --> 0:29:40.570
Nicholas Holshouser
And there's a, you know, the current project in limestone. I would use an example and in fact, you can actually look up in my appendices, I did a comparison of licks done with with the available mapping versus, you know, old mapping. And you can see at a detail level these, you know sometimes 200%.

0:29:41.390 --> 0:29:44.820
Nicholas Holshouser
Difference in in actual actual mappable.

0:29:46.500 --> 0:30:4.220
Nicholas Holshouser
Streams and what what this results in is that myself as a member of the public, can't can't accurately analyze projects at the scoping phase, because we can't, for instance, know how many streams are crossed by logging road or a, you know, or or in a stand.

0:30:5.890 --> 0:30:15.840
Nicholas Holshouser
In Lipstone I identified using in C1 map data that that the riparian management zones are are at least underestimated by 50%.

0:30:17.60 --> 0:30:18.510
Nicholas Holshouser
And what I would like to see.

0:30:19.510 --> 0:30:31.490
Nicholas Holshouser

And I understand that, you know Supplementally IS can be a still a formidable task. And I I don't want to derail this process because we're we are so close to to to a finish line and a general consensus.

0:30:32.780 --> 0:30:56.790
Nicholas Holshouser
What I would like to see is that the the Forest Service acknowledged the errors and undertake a rigorous examination of the right period resources and fundamentally that better. The best maps are used at the scoping phase of projects to give all parties, whether they're environmental organizations or members of the public and the Forest Service themselves, the people who who look at this.

0:30:57.540 --> 0:31:8.180
Nicholas Holshouser
You know, look at a project on a map. First, a real understanding of what the right period and resources are in any project would just plan, whether it's timber harvest or recreation or anything.

0:31:9.310 --> 0:31:12.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, I think I think you've made your point. It's really, really clear.

0:31:13.590 --> 0:31:25.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Let's give Rick a chance to. Yeah, thanks. Nick is in thinking about what we covered is talked about the the analysis incorrect and was this the case where?

0:31:25.890 --> 0:31:26.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
USGS.

0:31:27.590 --> 0:31:30.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Saying the name, the 2012 time frame.

0:31:31.690 --> 0:31:39.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That area covered for the the area the landscape covered by the plan and then during the life of the plan.

0:31:41.500 --> 0:31:49.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It's been been worked on. Different portions may have been updated, but the last the entire landscape was under one.

0:31:50.630 --> 0:31:51.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
1.

0:31:53.510 --> 0:31:54.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Common.

0:31:55.320 --> 0:31:58.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Set of information was, you know, earlier than.

0:31:59.610 --> 0:32:1.190
Nicholas Holshouser
It it yeah.

0:31:58.750 --> 0:32:1.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know what may have been updated and more pieces here and there.

0:32:1.940 --> 0:32:10.450
Nicholas Holshouser
So if I what I can done and again I will dive into detail of of my appendices cause that that detail is in there, but at A at a summary.

0:32:11.740 --> 0:32:15.330
Nicholas Holshouser
They're different versions of the data set, and fundamentally the the.

0:32:16.280 --> 0:32:46.430
Nicholas Holshouser
Again, the mapping has been accurate ever since the beginning, back when they flew planes over, you know, like plane planes, and didn't have lidar and didn't have technology. The mapping itself was was quite accurate. The the USGS recognizes that that improvements come from technology like LIDAR, etcetera. So the first data sets which were which were or the they're the data set which was available in 2012, which was when the analysis was done was the was basically the earliest data set.

0:32:46.510 --> 0:32:52.160
Nicholas Holshouser
That did not really even been updated significantly with light our data and that represented.

0:32:53.560 --> 0:32:57.310
Nicholas Holshouser
Approximately the same amount of miles is the Forest Service got.

0:32:58.260 --> 0:33:27.650
Nicholas Holshouser
However, in 2012 there were already publishing significantly updated and better maps reflecting better technology that showed in the range of what I said at 4700 miles or 178% more map miles. And that's just that is within the you know that's that's locking it into this to the to the forest boundaries and subsequent iterations of the NHD because of because of improvements brought about by state organizations like NC 1 map.

0:33:28.530 --> 0:33:44.790
Nicholas Holshouser
It it does a lot of the grunt work of actually the the engineering behind taking LIDAR and turning it into

flow networks is up in the 6000 mile of stream network and in the forest boundaries and and even in C1 map is not entirely completely updated inside the forest boundaries.

0:33:45.390 --> 0:33:47.730
Nicholas Holshouser
But that data was available to the Forest Service.

0:33:45.570 --> 0:33:52.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I've got another question. Hold on. Hold on. Yeah, but there is another question. Just go on, you know, just hearing is.

0:33:53.560 --> 0:33:54.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So the USGS.

0:33:55.470 --> 0:33:58.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So about 170% more streams.

0:33:59.680 --> 0:34:9.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And that was, you know, say, 6000 more miles stream. So maybe help help finish this thought is 170 percent 6000 more miles.

0:34:10.660 --> 0:34:13.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
PNC one maps 250% more streams.

0:34:14.650 --> 0:34:16.580
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The the.

0:34:17.510 --> 0:34:18.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
While my.

0:34:18.720 --> 0:34:21.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Commission two times the amount of streams.

0:34:22.90 --> 0:34:23.30
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Seems like it's.

0:34:25.690 --> 0:34:27.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
A lot of difference out there.

0:34:27.430 --> 0:34:35.720
Nicholas Holshouser
It it, it is frankly and that's that's I guess that's why I you know I raised it as a as an error in admissions objection rather than simply something.

0:34:36.950 --> 0:34:40.540
Nicholas Holshouser
That should be. You know, we just like take off line.

0:34:41.860 --> 0:34:42.480
Nicholas Holshouser
Because.

0:34:44.140 --> 0:34:44.320
Nicholas Holshouser
Yeah.

0:34:41.620 --> 0:34:46.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, alright. OK. Yeah, I think I think we're getting it so, so.

0:34:47.250 --> 0:34:48.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. So as far as the?

0:34:49.640 --> 0:34:56.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The what do you like to say? You said you didn't want to derail things now, but you'd like a rigorous examination of the streams. Does seem like it's.

0:35:9.760 --> 0:35:10.190
Nicholas Holshouser
So.

0:34:57.460 --> 0:35:12.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm is a little squishy. Is like, this one's 250%, this one 170%. This ones double this ones 6000 more miles like. Well, we're in the universe if we've noticed since there's been photos. Where do you land?

0:35:11.610 --> 0:35:41.740
Nicholas Holshouser
Yeah. And in these, these data sources aren't in disagreement. What you find is that, you know, you can lay them on top of each other and more miles doesn't mean streams in different places. It mostly means that those streams are are better understood up into the headwaters, which is again part of my thought that this is really a serious error because it's these headwaters which are the most concerning to us from a, you know, we're gonna get into deep soils. We're gonna get into water quality. We're gonna get into biological diversity. So.

0:35:42.320 --> 0:36:9.580
Nicholas Holshouser
The error is is is in reality in the most important, most critical places in the forest, and the and the. So just one thing to to make sure I answer Rick's question the the the data does it disagree with each other you know, so I you know I I try to use my hand right it's it's the same thing it's just it gets a little farther in the next one gets a little farther up the network and the next one gets a little farther up the network. Right.

0:36:10.330 --> 0:36:17.580
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Fashion. Yeah. OK. Thank you. Really appreciate it. And and we could spend more time on this, but I wanna make sure we hear from others. Thank you, nick.

0:36:17.410 --> 0:36:18.460
Nicholas Holshouser
Thank you very much. Thank you.

0:36:19.250 --> 0:36:22.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. Savannah or Susanna. Excuse me, Susanna.

0:36:24.680 --> 0:36:25.480
Susannah Knox
That's OK.

0:36:26.630 --> 0:36:43.440
Susannah Knox
So I just want to mention that it's, we can't really talk about soil and water without also talking about roads, because roads represent the biggest sedimentation risk on the forest. So I just want to mention at the outset that the remedies will be talking about later in roads are also extremely important to soil and water.

0:36:44.20 --> 0:36:49.880
Susannah Knox
Umm. And I think there's also a theme that ties together soil and water and roads, which is that.

0:36:50.530 --> 0:37:20.940
Susannah Knox
The plan does not account for the dramatically increased activity levels, including particularly the timber harvest goals. It assumes that Rd building will continue to occur at the same relatively modest pace and that impacts to soil and water will actually be improved under the plan even though activity levels are going to quintuple and the maintenance and mitigation requirements we see in the plan and the analysis of impacts that we see in the EIS really just aren't up to the task.

0:37:21.10 --> 0:37:46.480
Susannah Knox
When it comes to these increased activity levels, so this is an overarching problem with soil and water that I just wanted to bring up to sort of frame all the issues. I know you wanted to focus specifically here

on remedies and specifically on riparian zones. I wanna thank Nick for providing that great background on the modeling issues and how those can be improved.

0:37:47.330 --> 0:38:1.200
Susannah Knox
In terms of the plan components that we would like to see, Umm, we would really like to see similar to other nearby National Forest plans. The width of streamside zones increase as slopes in increase.

0:38:1.800 --> 0:38:11.870
Susannah Knox
Umm. And we would also like to see binding protections for ephemeral streams. Right now the language talks about minimizing ground disturbance.

0:38:12.830 --> 0:38:40.600
Susannah Knox
And avoiding vegetation removal. These aren't really these don't really provide enough guidance for people to understand what they're going to be required to do and not do at the project level. So for example, we suggested that ground disturbing equipment should be prohibited in a 25 within 25 feet of an ephemeral stream zone. But vegetation could still be removed consistent with the prescription for that area.

0:38:41.680 --> 0:38:43.180
Susannah Knox
We also would like it to be.

0:38:43.250 --> 0:39:1.950
Susannah Knox
Me. Uh. The the demarcation between intermittent and ephemeral stream zones, to be clear. So if any of the criteria the agency used to classify a stream bed as ephemeral or not met, then the intermittent stream zone should be should be applied.

0:39:3.850 --> 0:39:17.550
Susannah Knox
And I can go into other remedies there. I wanted to focus on the stream side zone since that's what your question was about, but I have more to say about soil and water in general and steep slopes. So do you have any questions about that?

0:39:18.540 --> 0:39:21.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. And Suzanne, I don't think you, you told us who you are representing.

0:39:22.170 --> 0:39:32.120
Susannah Knox
I'm so sorry. I'm from the Southern Environmental Law Center, so I'm I'm representing our organization and all of the groups that we represent in our comment letter.

0:39:32.910 --> 0:39:33.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

0:39:32.990 --> 0:39:34.320
Susannah Knox
Our objection letter rather.

0:39:35.670 --> 0:39:43.380
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But the just to go over, go about the the plan doesn't account for the timber sales and there's the.

0:39:44.240 --> 0:39:54.510
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You're at the current plan level, then there was an increase in that and and then part of that increase was if there was, if there was assistance from partners and that's where you talked about the quadrupling.

0:39:55.540 --> 0:39:57.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, and that the.

0:39:57.760 --> 0:40:15.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So playing you'd like to see the planning components, the width of the SMZ increase as a slope increases, and then a lot more for the project level on minimizing ground disturbance. And maybe there's an example as you'd like to see a 25 foot.

0:40:17.330 --> 0:40:35.30
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Zone or distance on ephemeral streams and then when there was a question, make sure I've got this right when there's a question between whether it was a femoral or intermittent. I may not be saying this right when it was a question of whether it was intermittent or ephemeral, you'd like to see us apply the protections for the intermittent.

0:40:35.620 --> 0:40:38.390
Susannah Knox
That's right. That's right. That's a good summer.

0:40:37.490 --> 0:40:38.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But miss anything?

0:40:39.300 --> 0:40:44.500
Susannah Knox
No, no, I I can also expand on our issue with the.

0:40:44.580 --> 0:40:55.180
Susannah Knox

Umm, activity levels increasing and and how those are not accounted for in the plan or in the analysis. If you'd like me to at this point.

0:40:55.860 --> 0:41:5.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Think maybe change your question. Yeah, I and maybe not just for use Susanna. But you know, one of the things that's always the challenge, especially with as as.

0:41:8.680 --> 0:41:36.870
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Biologically diverse, our our forests are is kind of a scale issue. Like what? What, what can we? What can we show at the plan scale and what what do we need to do to provide some framework for applying, you know, because there's always gonna be things that we can't possibly know about at the at the project level scale. So you talked a little bit about that in terms of putting some framework. So when we're applying a project level, but I guess.

0:41:37.350 --> 0:41:42.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Not just for you, but for others. Like, where's that balance of of, of the of the?

0:41:43.520 --> 0:41:58.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The the specificity or the OR the granularity of what we need at the plan scale versus project scale and and knowing that is great data that we have, it's never gonna be perfect of what's on the ground.

0:41:59.540 --> 0:42:2.100
Susannah Knox
Sure. So so there are some.

0:42:2.920 --> 0:42:29.490
Susannah Knox
I think there are a lot of things that can be done at the plan level that relate to the project level that can provide clear sideboards for any project that takes place in the future. The examples that we were talking about for stream side zones are just one of those examples that would affect project planning, but the project level planning but are also in the plan itself and so provide a blueprint for projects.

0:42:30.160 --> 0:42:59.650
Susannah Knox
Umm, I think one and and we'll we'll this will probably be more applicable to roads because I think we have a lot more kind of systemic things that have to happen at the plan level but another another thing that we've suggested when it comes to base cation depleted soils, we think that those should be removed from the suitable base and that has to happen at the plan level.

0:43:0.700 --> 0:43:31.370
Susannah Knox
You know, currently the only real standards referring to those vulnerable soils are related to monitoring the problem rather than doing anything about it. There is a gesture towards adding lime to soils at the project level, but even that is not binding. I think it's in the response to comments so adding lime to soils

is a good practice in some cases, but we don't believe that it's practical or financially realistic for dealing with the cumulative impacts of logging on vulnerable soils.

0:43:31.660 --> 0:44:5.610
Susannah Knox
Across large areas, so our suggestion is that the plan should simply remove those depleted soils from the suitable base. So that's one example of something that we think should definitely happen at the plan level. It could. There could be also a commitment to assess and avoid depleted soils at the project level in the plan, but we think it would be simpler to simply remove them from the suitable base so that that's another example of specific remedies.

0:44:6.70 --> 0:44:10.0
Susannah Knox
That we think need to happen at the plan level. Umm, similarly.

0:44:11.80 --> 0:44:11.450
Susannah Knox
Yeah.

0:44:19.100 --> 0:44:19.590
Susannah Knox
Sure.

0:44:9.390 --> 0:44:26.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So that they not can. Can I interrupt here and just so you said that I, I would like to keep us focused on riparian management zones. That first piece, could we ask you to hold now and and hear from a few more people?

0:44:27.350 --> 0:44:28.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And that would be.

0:44:30.610 --> 0:44:31.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good.

0:44:26.930 --> 0:44:48.400
Susannah Knox
Sure. Yeah. I was just trying to respond to James's question with some specific examples, but but yes, our our suggestions about riparian management zones, I think go to that same issue of their there should be binding standards in the plan that could be applied to future projects and and couldn't provide guidance that's more predictable in every project.

0:44:49.580 --> 0:45:0.270
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Helpful. OK, thanks. And others here may also wanna weigh in on on an answer to James question. So going further here. We've got Nick by Miller.

0:45:3.570 --> 0:45:4.360
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. Thank you.

0:45:5.880 --> 0:45:14.170
Nick Biemiller
So I want to, I guess first apologize in advance. I was on the call yesterday, but I didn't share my screen because I'm getting over COVID.

0:45:22.740 --> 0:45:23.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
While you're fine.

0:45:25.230 --> 0:45:27.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No apology needed. Glad you're on the mend.

0:45:15.100 --> 0:45:33.780
Nick Biemiller
Came down with it over the weekend and I'm still not feeling very well, so I apologize for my congestion and general kind of state of being. I'm probably at best at 70% functioning right now, so forgive me if my thoughts are a little slow or less clear than they could be normally.

0:45:35.620 --> 0:45:45.910
Nick Biemiller
So Nick the Miller, I am representing the rough grass society in American Woodcock society. My work is our Southern Appalachian Forest conservation director.

0:45:47.600 --> 0:46:5.870
Nick Biemiller
One of the issues that we objected to in our objection document is really just our concern about overprotection of ephemeral streams and the forest plan and the way that that will likely make timber harvesting and a lot of these harvest units really unnecessarily onerous.

0:46:6.970 --> 0:46:35.380
Nick Biemiller
I'm just a little context of something that we've been working on over the past two weeks in preparation for this meeting is we've been going through and being very solution kind of resolution oriented and looking through our objection document and looking at areas that we might not have provided enough specific resolutions and developing some more specific areas in terms of sections, language, paragraphs.

0:46:35.950 --> 0:46:41.250
Nick Biemiller
In the forest plan and FIS, that, if edited, could resolve our objections.

0:46:41.970 --> 0:46:57.940
Nick Biemiller
So after the call yesterday, you know it made me feel that maybe that level of detail might not be

appropriate during the meeting, but I'm happy to go there if that is appropriate or I'm happy to provide some more of that specific resolution information with the Forest Service after the call.

0:46:59.380 --> 0:47:27.340
Nick Biemiller
But specifically to the issue of a femoral streams, I think it's important to recognize that if there is one thing that we've gotten pretty right in forestry, it's forestry BMP's and their effectiveness that protecting water quality, it's worth kind of looking at the North Carolina Forest Services assessment of NC Forestry BMPS across the state where they found that essentially where BMPS are adopted.

0:47:28.270 --> 0:47:33.970
Nick Biemiller
Water quality is adequately protected and those BMP's do not apply a buffer.

0:47:35.80 --> 0:47:54.40
Nick Biemiller
Or very stringent restrictions on ephemeral streams. They mostly focus on perennial and intermittent streams, so I'm not sure that our resolution was fully captured in the document that was shared, but I'll share just some specific suggested resolutions that I have so.

0:47:55.320 --> 0:48:1.630
Nick Biemiller
Specifically, removing the paragraph on ephemeral streams from the forest Plan on page 49.

0:48:2.820 --> 0:48:32.980
Nick Biemiller
And also editing the standard SZS 01 to establish parameters that align more directly with the Forest Stewardship Council and their forest certification standard for streamside management zones for the Appalachian region. That standard does not protect ephemeral streams, but it does include added protection for perennial and intermittent streams so that can be found on page 102 of the FSC standard.

0:48:33.660 --> 0:48:49.170
Nick Biemiller
And specifically what that standard does I think is provided a pretty elegant solution where it doesn't provide additional protections to ephemerals, but it does include added protection to perennial and intermittent streams that vary in size depending on slope.

0:48:50.0 --> 0:49:2.10
Nick Biemiller
So there's both inner SMZ's and outer SMZ's that are applied to perennial streams, and they're also broken out between non high quality waters and high quality waters.

0:49:2.780 --> 0:49:37.110
Nick Biemiller
So I don't know if we wanna get into the details and depth. I mean it's all in that standard with FSC. But essentially within that inner SMZ for non high quality waters, it extends 25 feet from the high watermark and it allows for single tree and group selection treatments as long as the canopy is not reduced more

than 10% and then that that inner SMZ for high quality water extends 25 feet and doesn't allow for any timber harvesting and those high quality waters and then the outer SMZ is broader.

0:49:48.520 --> 0:49:49.180
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So nick.

0:49:37.450 --> 0:49:50.500
Nick Biemiller
Varies depending on slope from 55 feet to 140 feet and allows for single tree in Group selection. Treatments that don't exceed 50% of canopy cover. So and then basically intermittent streams. Yeah, I'm sorry.

0:49:51.660 --> 0:49:53.50
Nick Biemiller
Too much detail maybe?

0:49:56.370 --> 0:49:56.740
Nick Biemiller
Sure.

0:49:51.190 --> 0:49:57.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, I'm just. I'm just wanting to make sure I'm. Yeah, I'm just wondering. Wanna make sure this is useful, right? Yeah. Yeah, and.

0:49:59.570 --> 0:50:0.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And just to.

0:50:2.490 --> 0:50:3.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The question is, uh.

0:50:4.520 --> 0:50:6.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For wait for it, you're going over.

0:50:7.40 --> 0:50:7.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.

0:50:8.190 --> 0:50:9.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That that's been provided.

0:50:10.590 --> 0:50:11.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

0:50:10.590 --> 0:50:41.80
Nick Biemiller
So we get our objection document. We recommended that the to remove the added restrictions and language around ephemeral streams, but we didn't provide as much specific language around what's resolve in terms of the edits. So what I've done over the past two weeks to try and bring more specificity into the conversation with you all today is I actually went through and provided more detail so I can provide that information after the call today if it's less productive.

0:50:41.130 --> 0:50:44.150
Nick Biemiller
For me to go into that level of depth on the call.

0:50:45.390 --> 0:51:11.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is that appropriate in our process? I think it at this point. I appreciate you all you mentioning the the FCC guidelines is is is some of the the framework for that. I think at this point you know kind of in the process we're not really getting a lot of additional information to be fair to everyone. But I think what you provided and you just spoke to Nick is very helpful.

0:51:11.540 --> 0:51:19.90
Nick Biemiller
OK. Well in that case then I'll try and be as specific on the call as I can. If you're not gonna kind of process that information after the call.

0:51:21.10 --> 0:51:21.520
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

0:51:21.60 --> 0:51:31.30
Nick Biemiller
So I guess I would just point you towards page 102 of the FTSE standard, which is where that information is provided, and I think that would mostly resolve our our objection issue.

0:51:32.110 --> 0:51:34.180
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. Yeah, I think and just.

0:51:34.970 --> 0:51:39.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
To make, we're trying to make sure we wanna hear the the.

0:51:58.240 --> 0:51:59.30
Nick Biemiller
Gotcha. OK.

0:51:40.160 --> 0:51:59.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Here what you had to say, and then you say well, page 102 and then page 49 kissing on that. But I think I

think the concern is is US receiving, you know more documents at this point might be might be an issue. So yeah, so.

0:52:0.260 --> 0:52:3.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But you can't. Can I sit on the those?

0:52:6.600 --> 0:52:7.740
Nick Biemiller
OK, great.

0:52:3.170 --> 0:52:10.520
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Of those points, who is perfect and and then want one thing just to round out the thought.

0:52:11.600 --> 0:52:12.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.

0:52:12.830 --> 0:52:18.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But overprotection of intermittent is worrisome to you because.

0:52:19.60 --> 0:52:21.310
Nick Biemiller
I'm sorry overprotection of ephemeral streams.

0:52:22.230 --> 0:52:25.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Overprotection of femoral. He was a concern because.

0:52:25.950 --> 0:52:44.840
Nick Biemiller
Because I think it's it will overly limit the way in which timber harvesting and forest operations are conducted on the ground in a way that's likely unnecessary because the best available evidence shows that where BMP's are adopted, they effectively protect water quality.

0:52:45.440 --> 0:53:5.260
Nick Biemiller
Umm and BMP's do not require peripheral stream protection, so we're we're we're supportive of the concerns around water quality. We wanna make sure that water quality is protected with forest operations, but we feel like the best available science indicates that that can be done without increasing protections on ephemeral streams.

0:53:9.50 --> 0:53:9.650
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. You're welcome.

0:53:6.710 --> 0:53:9.900
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. Rounding that out, man. Appreciate it. Thank you, nick.

0:53:10.670 --> 0:53:23.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I can see that we're really bleeding across all three of these subtopics, so I'm not going to worry about it. OK, we figured we would. Yeah. Yeah. So they're all they're connected. They're all connected. So in the queue, I've got Josh and then Jason.

0:53:24.430 --> 0:53:25.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Josh, you first.

0:53:25.580 --> 0:53:47.990
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah. Good morning. Thanks. This is Josh Kelly representing mountain shrew. And I just wanted to chime in on the riparian area mapping and modeling issue and provide some historical context on that. Mountain Tree has been involved with forced planning on the Nantahala Physicus since the 1982 planning rule. Literally, we were founded in 1982. This is our 40th anniversary and.

0:53:48.790 --> 0:54:19.380
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
We LED an effort to remand the 1987 Forest Plan that was successful, the chief of the Forest Service agreed with 10s of thousands of members of the community in Western North Carolina and in 1992 remanded the 1987 Forest Plan and which resulted in the 1994 and then at 5 and the basis of that remanding of the plan was actually the fact that the allowable sales quantity from the 1987 plan was about twice as high as what was actually sustainable for the forest.

0:54:19.590 --> 0:54:30.970
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
You know, at that time there was about 5000 acres of year being clear cut and then handling Pisgah National Forest. And the reason the allowable sales quantity was set too high. And you can ask Larry Hayden, who has done some work on the planning team.

0:54:32.950 --> 0:55:1.300
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Was that riparian areas for perennial and intermittent streams were not properly mapped, and this is I just want to emphasize this is a critical issue for identifying operable lands, for timber harvest. And I do think that accurately mapping those is key for planning our restoration projects, planning our wildlife habitat management projects, planning the timber harvest projects that happen on the forest and.

0:55:1.840 --> 0:55:31.290
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
There is a really big issue in the EIS with identifying those lands and also probably the PTS Q and other numbers that are coming out of the EIS. And so I do think Mr Holzhauser has some good suggested remedies in potentially a supplemental EIS on the issue or potentially a commitment in the plan to deal

with this at the scoping phase of every project. I personally think the supplemental EIS would be the more efficient way to handle that.

0:55:31.450 --> 0:55:42.130
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Then to do this for every single project, but I I do think it's it's critical and I think history shows how critical it is. So that's just I wanted to provide that historical context.

0:55:43.580 --> 0:55:44.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Josh.

0:55:46.650 --> 0:55:47.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thanks.

0:55:48.910 --> 0:55:50.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, Jason katoi.

0:55:52.320 --> 0:56:1.320
Jason Totoiu
Good morning. I'm Jason. That's why I'm a senior attorney with the Center for Biological Diversity. Appreciate the opportunity to speak today.

0:56:2.520 --> 0:56:13.930
Jason Totoiu
I would just like to say that we we support the position of what of SLC and what Susanna discussed earlier with the 25 foot ephemeral buffers.

0:56:15.90 --> 0:56:21.320
Jason Totoiu
I think this, you know from our organizational perspective, this is particularly important because of.

0:56:22.560 --> 0:56:25.290
Jason Totoiu
The importance they have for salamander ecology.

0:56:27.270 --> 0:56:58.0
Jason Totoiu
We're we're we're looking at over two dozen species of salamanders, at least within the forest. A many of these travel upwards of 100 meters or more, and they're migration to breed in these ephemeral streams. Others that don't, that don't necessarily breed in these streams can still be found there. And so I think it's important that we, you know, take specific steps to protecting these salamanders through.

0:56:58.80 --> 0:57:14.310
Jason Totoiu
Like the standards and guidelines, I think what we have right now with the plan just is is simply

inadequate. The plan actually recognizes the importance of these ephemeral streams, but then there's a disconnect. It just it essentially ends in the discussion.

0:57:15.410 --> 0:57:24.820
Jason Totoiu
And it doesn't, you know, say, one way or another, why are we, why do we not have or an ES? Why do we not have these standard and guidelines in place?

0:57:25.900 --> 0:57:44.270
Jason Totoiu
You know, given their their importance, the 25 foot buffer standard is strongly supported in the science. We submitted multiple reports with from EPA from a UGA and and others. So this isn't just an arbitrary.

0:57:45.540 --> 0:57:49.980
Jason Totoiu
A measure that is, we've just, we've just thrown in there.

0:57:51.500 --> 0:58:8.780
Jason Totoiu
Frankly, I'm a little surprised, actually, that we don't have consensus on this across a broad array of stakeholders. I'm a sportsman and myself and it just it just kind of puzzles me as to why there was disagreement here. I think we can achieve.

0:58:12.290 --> 0:58:17.630
Jason Totoiu
Increased amounts of of of early successional habitat or young force without.

0:58:19.380 --> 0:58:29.860
Jason Totoiu
Compromising the integrity of an informal stream. I mean, we can we can reach our goals using a scalpel and not a hatchet. Let's be.

0:58:31.50 --> 0:58:49.760
Jason Totoiu
Just measured and reasonable in our approach, and I think that in doing so, we'll see all biodiversity protected and that's why we we really believe that standards and guidelines need to be in place to protect these resources. Thank you.

0:58:51.90 --> 0:58:52.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank thanks Jason and.

0:58:52.550 --> 0:58:57.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm, but one thing I was wondering was if if there was some.

0:58:59.0 --> 0:59:3.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Maybe. Uh. Differences in definition between some of the?

0:59:3.730 --> 0:59:12.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, stream designations of perennial and intermittent and I just want to make sure we're talking about the same thing.

0:59:13.900 --> 0:59:45.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And yeah, I think as I think that as I think some of the specialists were digging in on how things were defined in in certain of the, the you know, research papers that were cited, what was defined in the research paper as intermittent might be what we were thinking of as a femoral or vice versa. So that there might be a little bit of a mismatch with how things are defined and how we how we classify them in the in the plan that might be part of the issue here.

0:59:47.200 --> 1:0:19.490
Jason Totoiu
Yeah, I think a site specific. Yeah, I think going back to Suzanne's point about, you know, a site Sophistic analysis where we, you know, if if there is that I guess Gray area. But I mean I would just reference maybe the George Washington, the Cherokee, the Chattahoochee, those forests, they have provisions there where you can make those adjustments. There's some discretion based on the you know, site specific conditions and what the what the project level. So that's something that we would further support as well.

1:0:20.880 --> 1:0:22.30
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you, Jason.

1:0:23.540 --> 1:0:24.180
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ready to move?

1:0:25.120 --> 1:0:27.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Finish that note. Say it's specific.

1:0:28.260 --> 1:0:29.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Adjustments.

1:0:30.840 --> 1:0:34.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
At project level and you see mentioned that the.

1:0:36.0 --> 1:0:45.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The Chateau, the Cherokee and the JW jet have similar similar provisions to allow for the site specific adjustment at the project level.

1:0:47.270 --> 1:0:48.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Yeah, capture that.

1:0:50.960 --> 1:0:53.310
Jason Totoiu
Are you? Did I'm sorry. You did? Thank you.

1:0:49.920 --> 1:0:54.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Chasing. You're kind of freezing, but I think like, we're with you. Thank you, Jason.

1:0:55.460 --> 1:0:59.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So John Hatcher's on the phone. Can we hear from you, John?

1:1:11.90 --> 1:1:12.990
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Not he.

1:1:15.30 --> 1:1:16.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Unmute yourself.

1:1:18.510 --> 1:1:19.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Star 6.

1:1:20.200 --> 1:1:21.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, this is on you.

1:1:26.260 --> 1:1:29.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, we'll go into that. We'll go on and I'll call I'll.

1:1:31.170 --> 1:1:32.170
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Hello this is a.

1:1:30.390 --> 1:1:32.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Try again after the next boy.

1:1:34.950 --> 1:1:36.340
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Hello, can you hear me?

1:1:37.560 --> 1:1:39.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes, please introduce yourself.

1:1:41.50 --> 1:1:52.900
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Ohh yes it. And please please forgive me my name. I am not doctor John Hatcher, but I am Blair Bishop, Western vice president for the North Carolina Forestry Association.

1:1:53.760 --> 1:1:54.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

1:1:53.410 --> 1:2:24.490
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
A and and had the opportunity I just to be provided the link I of course I I sit on the executive committee. I I would I would love if Doctor Hatcher. I'm not sure if he is on the call or Rob Elliott at this time but but I can speak as an executive committee member to are just general position in regards to ephemeral streams and and just point specifically to that. If my comment if that is within line with.

1:2:24.590 --> 1:2:29.600
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
With this process, yeah, cause so that would be the first question because I certainly.

1:2:31.400 --> 1:2:33.420
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
I I was not the one registered to speak today.

1:2:40.380 --> 1:2:40.630
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
OK.

1:2:34.490 --> 1:2:41.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes, now you're. You're part of the the organization. So yeah, go go right ahead with the focus on the remedy or additional information.

1:2:42.890 --> 1:2:46.750
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Sure thing. Absolutely and absolutely, let me.

1:2:59.520 --> 1:3:0.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Here, take your time.

1:2:47.820 --> 1:3:1.230
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
But forgive me, I had just if you, if you don't mind just giving me one second. And I I I had it to open here and I. But as I as I pull that up and again I I do.

1:3:2.190 --> 1:3:2.950
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Thank you, ma'am.

1:3:5.40 --> 1:3:9.340
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
I I do, I do know our position. I'm just trying to pull our document up at this point.

1:3:9.730 --> 1:3:12.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Fine, that's fine. We kind of caught you off guard.

1:3:19.790 --> 1:3:22.420
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
I just want to get it right and stick to the script.

1:3:24.730 --> 1:3:25.970
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
And in a positive way.

1:3:39.840 --> 1:3:50.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And just a reminder, if you've spoken, if you've raised your hand and spoken and you're no longer in the queue or no longer want to be in the queue, you can lower your hand.

1:3:51.910 --> 1:3:55.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I know we're coming back to Susanna for sure. I marked you.

1:3:58.70 --> 1:3:59.670
Nick Biemiller
Yeah, I I saw my.

1:3:57.570 --> 1:4:1.100
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
OK. Yes, I I'm ready. Ohh, Stevie.

1:4:1.190 --> 1:4:1.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

1:4:0.880 --> 1:4:9.10
Nick Biemiller
I saw my hand up because I was hoping to respond to Jason's comment because it seemed a little bit just directed towards what I had to say, so I was hoping for a response.

1:4:11.220 --> 1:4:15.190
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm, so yeah, let's do that right now. Who's speaking?

1:4:16.250 --> 1:4:21.480
Nick Biemiller
Yeah, that's nick. Yeah. Nick. Nick, be Miller. Sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off, Blair.

1:4:29.880 --> 1:4:30.230
Nick Biemiller
OK.

1:4:33.450 --> 1:4:33.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

1:4:22.560 --> 1:4:34.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, wait a minute, Nick. I I I'm. This is my attempt to try to keep with threat threads of conversation. So if this is in response, I think it's appropriate now and then we'll go to Blair. OK, sounds good.

1:4:34.400 --> 1:4:41.970
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Yes. And I I'm excuse me, I am ready and I look forward to speaking after you all have that conversation.

1:4:42.620 --> 1:4:44.680
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you, nick.

1:4:44.450 --> 1:4:57.130
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. So it sounded like just Jason, based on your comments about being a sportsman and about being confused about there being issues here that your comments were directed towards what I had said. So I just wanted to be able to respond.

1:4:58.350 --> 1:5:19.770
Nick Biemiller
I think that part of our objection and concern here is grounded in like the real world application of forest operations and timber harvesting. And if you're not familiar with the way in which timber is actually a harvested through logging operations on the ground, I think it could be.

1:5:20.560 --> 1:5:23.80
Nick Biemiller
Difficult to understand how much.

1:5:22.590 --> 1:5:23.110
John Culclasure
Can you tell?

1:5:23.730 --> 1:5:38.820
Nick Biemiller
Restricting equipment from ephemeral drainages cause really inhibit the feasibility of a commercial

timber sale from occurring. So we're talking about a situation where we're mostly dealing with ground based logging systems.

1:5:39.420 --> 1:5:48.210
Nick Biemiller
Umm, that needs to operate under already very restrictive conditions on our National Forest lands. When it comes to access.

1:5:48.860 --> 1:5:58.530
Nick Biemiller
When it comes to hauling distances, when it comes to just the standard forestry BMP that are established in North Carolina and the existing regulations in the forest plan.

1:5:59.430 --> 1:6:27.120
Nick Biemiller
And we're also dealing with the logging workforce that is already operating at the margins with really tight financial constraints, limited market opportunities and very limited opportunities to make commercial timber sales on National Forest lands financially feasible for their small businesses. You start adding on top of that restrictions on equipment use within ephemeral drainages. You look at a given harvest unit.

1:6:27.830 --> 1:6:35.160
Nick Biemiller
So depending on how you classify and think about ephemerals within that harvest unit, that could be a huge proportion of that unit.

1:6:36.120 --> 1:7:2.690
Nick Biemiller
That can go ahead and make us to hell that otherwise with with good perennial and intermittent stream protection could be an operationally feasible, financially feasible sale for a logging contractor. You add huge buffers for equipment operation because of a female ranges that could turn that easily into a no bid sale, especially given the limiting the limited operators limited equipment.

1:7:3.470 --> 1:7:25.850
Nick Biemiller
And limited opportunities that we have on National Forest lands. So, you know, it might seem like ohh, why can't we just protect ephemeral drainages and and be able to achieve those early successional timber harvest objectives? I think once you start looking at that real world application on the ground, you start to see just how much that could make some of these harvests not feasible to implement.

1:7:26.520 --> 1:7:27.990
Nick Biemiller
And that's that's really our concern.

1:7:29.450 --> 1:7:31.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, nick. I appreciate that. Thank you.

1:7:33.660 --> 1:7:36.180
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, let's go back to Blair now.

1:7:37.850 --> 1:8:3.260
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Yes, just a brief introduction. My name? Blair Bishop. I own and operate Bishop, forestry and land. We work with primarily private land owners throughout Western North Carolina, but also have had the wonderful opportunity to partner with US Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as state Wildlife Resources Commission on all different projects.

1:8:3.370 --> 1:8:34.310
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Both on state game lands as well as are adjoining land owners that are that have above them. So it's a great opportunity. I appreciate the opportunity to speak today and during this period. So thank you and thank you for your time and you know I guess first it's just to back up Nick, you know we're we're in full support of the Rough grouse society. You know, I don't want to reiterate. I think Nick has made just several good points and so we're in, we're in full support of this is.

1:8:34.390 --> 1:9:3.760
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
But that position, and specifically he made reference to those pages in the document and and we we we just absolutely echo that. And then more specifically for us you know we we want to remove the ephemeral stream channels of course as any desired condition or objective from the standards or guidelines in the forest plan and that includes WTR Dash DC Dash 06 located at page 42 with the final plan.

1:9:4.390 --> 1:9:34.30
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
But you know, we have a clean Water Management Act, the 1972, that's a federal act we have in North Carolina on game lands in North Carolina, Forest Service is the one that inspects our our logging operations and they on, excuse them, get a little emotional here. And so I'll, I'll take it back a notch. But so it's very emotional because in fact, we have federal and state law. We have state authority through the NC Forest Service.

1:9:34.430 --> 1:9:57.730
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
That has a right to shut us down for compliance issues and just to echo Nick, we you know we're we've been working hard hard to improve our protection water quality. It's no joke for us. You know we take it seriously and so anyhow so so what's putting forth in the plan exceeds.

1:9:58.470 --> 1:10:8.240
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Federal and state law, I mean, it's kind of crazy to me that we would tie our hands that way. And So what it is is it's an attempt to have just restrict.

1:10:9.450 --> 1:10:19.860
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
At the forest in other ways and and well, I'm getting. And forgive me. I'm. I'm deviating a little bit, but. And specifically the soils we talked a lot about roads.

1:10:20.690 --> 1:10:51.500
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Uh, and sure, I wanna say the cats out of the bag or the soil's out of the bag. But we've lost a tremendous amount of soil. I think if you look at soil loss and yes, we have a lot of foul or roads, but the damage was done and looking ahead we have great forest technology. We know so much more about buffers and and mitigation and and and better. So you know we we need to be innovative and we need to be progressive in our thoughts and.

1:10:51.560 --> 1:10:56.830
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
And not just so close minded and scared about.

1:10:58.270 --> 1:11:5.100
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Improving our forests and providing maintenance and drainage, we got these roads are still running off. They got water running down.

1:11:5.540 --> 1:11:9.900
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Uh, all of those, and they're going right in the Creek. And those roads were made.

1:11:10.650 --> 1:11:30.70
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
80 years ago, OK. And there's still there's still contributing to sediment and nothing's going on. So anyhow, so that's specifically again just that WT RDCO 6 and that's located on page 42. And yes, we don't, we don't want any restriction around the femoral drainages. We have enough challenges.

1:11:31.540 --> 1:11:35.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, Claire, thank you very much. Thank you. Anything.

1:11:35.390 --> 1:11:36.0
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Thank you, ma'am.

1:11:36.890 --> 1:11:37.280
Elliot, James
Umm.

1:11:38.0 --> 1:11:38.620
Elliot, James
Excuse me.

1:11:38.70 --> 1:11:39.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hold on a second.

1:11:39.460 --> 1:11:40.50
Elliot, James
Uh, sorry.

1:11:39.690 --> 1:11:40.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Just one second.

1:11:43.530 --> 1:11:45.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Who's looking at my notes I took.

1:11:46.960 --> 1:11:50.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Blair and I think I've got it. I appreciate you sharing.

1:11:51.720 --> 1:11:52.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

1:11:53.870 --> 1:11:54.120
Elliot, James
If.

1:11:56.530 --> 1:11:56.740
Elliot, James
OK.

1:11:52.260 --> 1:11:57.260
390bff4f-bfd5-45e5-b447-19f5ff2afc54
Yes, Sir. Thank you. Thank you all very much. And and James as well. Thank you Sir.

1:11:57.890 --> 1:12:7.740
Elliot, James
Yeah. Excuse me. So again, James Elliott. I'm. I'm, I'm with the NFA as well. Just I wanted to just quickly add the resolution.

1:12:8.160 --> 1:12:18.780
Elliot, James
Umm that we provided in the objection was that we support legislatively defined forest practice guidelines and performance standards, so the FPGA's.

1:12:19.470 --> 1:12:23.400
Elliot, James
Or the state of North Carolina that were legislative defined provide.

1:12:24.550 --> 1:12:26.880
Elliot, James
They they actually do have some slight.

1:12:28.70 --> 1:12:32.180
Elliot, James
Protections for ephemeral streams in there where they.

1:12:32.630 --> 1:12:35.930
Elliot, James
The join to form an intermittent stream.

1:12:36.620 --> 1:12:42.360
Elliot, James
And so there are already to echo some of this, but it's in that that was our solution was to.

1:12:43.170 --> 1:12:55.480
Elliot, James
Umm, revert to the state legislative legislatively defined forest practice guidelines that already have clear guidance on how to protect.

1:12:56.890 --> 1:13:6.980
Elliot, James
Intermittent perennial antheral streams where they are necessary and they are slope corrected as well so.

1:13:8.950 --> 1:13:19.390
Elliot, James
These are already defined the logging community, the forest products industry has already familiar with them and it is a reliable standard to use. So that was our solution was to.

1:13:20.40 --> 1:13:20.580
Elliot, James
Umm.

1:13:21.430 --> 1:13:22.500
Elliot, James
Reference those.

1:13:24.130 --> 1:13:25.400
Elliot, James
FPGS thanks.

1:13:25.790 --> 1:13:29.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thanks for that addition, James, anything.

1:13:30.210 --> 1:13:32.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For James, no. Got it either.

1:13:34.480 --> 1:13:35.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Already existing.

1:13:36.530 --> 1:13:38.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Legislation on standards have.

1:13:39.310 --> 1:13:42.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That they're in place FPGA's.

1:13:43.210 --> 1:13:44.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And they have a.

1:13:45.160 --> 1:13:49.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Afford protection for a primary ones where they join the form intermittence.

1:13:52.510 --> 1:13:53.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Appreciate that.

1:13:54.80 --> 1:13:55.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you and.

1:13:56.350 --> 1:13:57.680
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Go by Rob Beverly.

1:13:58.510 --> 1:14:3.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, rob. No, that was James Elliott, right. He goes by Rob. You go by Rob.

1:14:3.650 --> 1:14:4.740
Elliot, James
Yeah, sorry.

1:14:5.910 --> 1:14:6.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm that way too.

1:14:8.620 --> 1:14:12.500
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
More than more than once. OK, let's move to David Whitmer.

1:14:14.350 --> 1:14:15.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
In the queue.

1:14:17.120 --> 1:14:20.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, no, not in the queue on the phone. Sorry. You're on the phone, David.

1:14:20.960 --> 1:14:22.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
In the Cuban on phone.

1:14:30.220 --> 1:14:31.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Are you there, David?

1:14:34.800 --> 1:14:43.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm gonna. I'm gonna keep you in the queue and I'll move along and then we'll try you again. So now I'll talk. Andrea Leslie.

1:14:51.280 --> 1:14:52.710
Leslie, Andrea J
Hi, there. Thank. Thank you.

1:14:54.490 --> 1:15:9.160
Leslie, Andrea J
So I work with the Wildlife Resources Commission and I wanted to speak on a couple of points that we've been discussing over the past 45 minutes. The first is on ephemeral streams and.

1:15:10.20 --> 1:15:41.110
Leslie, Andrea J
As we read the plan, uh, both the desired condition that mentions ephemeral streams and the general management approach for ephemeral streams in a paragraph in the plan only allow they. They basically allow general guidance to protect a femoral streams and in terms of bed and banks and and we believe that the language right now allows flexibility for management within that area.

1:15:41.340 --> 1:15:43.570
Leslie, Andrea J
It's not really restrictive, but.

1:15:45.30 --> 1:15:50.620
Leslie, Andrea J
Ephemeral streams do provide important functions to overall stream.

1:15:52.140 --> 1:15:53.140
Leslie, Andrea J
Quality and.

1:15:54.360 --> 1:15:55.830
Leslie, Andrea J
Water quality and.

1:15:56.310 --> 1:16:2.200
Leslie, Andrea J
And dynamics. So we're supportive of the language that's in the plan at this point.

1:16:4.820 --> 1:16:7.850
Leslie, Andrea J
Any questions on that? Because I'll move on to another point.

1:16:9.310 --> 1:16:11.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I don't have any questions. Thank you, Andrew.

1:16:11.520 --> 1:16:14.570
Leslie, Andrea J
OK. Yeah I on mapping.

1:16:15.30 --> 1:16:37.440
Leslie, Andrea J
Umm, I think most folks on this call understand that all stream mapping is an estimate. None of that stuff is based on on the ground determinations. And so oftentimes there are vast underestimates of stream mileage in a hydrography data set that's determined via.

1:16:37.570 --> 1:16:39.950
Leslie, Andrea J
And the.

1:16:41.110 --> 1:17:9.580
Leslie, Andrea J
Topographic analysis or LIDAR analysis. So in the end the Forest Service is gonna be responsible for on the ground determination on a project level, right? And that goes all in the same thing goes with determining a perennial versus an intermittent versus an ephemeral stream. And North Carolina has methods that's been developed by an interdisciplinary group involving.

1:17:10.40 --> 1:17:26.490
Leslie, Andrea J
State and federal agencies to determine the difference between ephemeral, intermittent and perennial streams, and we recommend that the Forest Service take a look at that those methods, because in the end you're going to have to determine that on the ground.

1:17:31.630 --> 1:17:33.30
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Andrea and.

1:17:34.440 --> 1:17:42.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, that's one thing. You know, kind of as we work through this on my mind is how far can the plan take us?

1:17:43.650 --> 1:17:50.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
On, you know at that at that plan level, the broad level and then how much how much.

1:17:51.320 --> 1:17:58.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And it's not that not to kick a can in any way, but how much, just because of the scale of the plan has to be.

1:17:59.90 --> 1:17:59.540
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.

1:18:0.370 --> 1:18:5.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Done from that project level with all the other components that are in place.

1:18:6.120 --> 1:18:15.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That they got in the background while while I'm hearing everything because we've got more ephemerals, less ephemerals, more analysis at the plan level.

1:18:16.730 --> 1:18:26.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Or and or more at the project level. So I thank you for. Thank you for putting that thought in the room because that helped bring bring some of the what's swirling in my head.

1:18:27.780 --> 1:18:28.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.

1:18:28.860 --> 1:18:30.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Little bit more forward. Thank you.

1:18:31.400 --> 1:18:31.830
Leslie, Andrea J
Sure.

1:18:33.30 --> 1:18:33.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

1:18:34.260 --> 1:18:36.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So let me just check with David Whitmer.

1:18:37.850 --> 1:18:38.460
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ready.

1:18:39.860 --> 1:18:40.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
To be called on.

1:18:44.150 --> 1:18:49.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right, so let's go back to Susanna. So I know you had more points from the SLC.

1:18:50.940 --> 1:18:52.460
Susannah Knox
Yes, thank you so much.

1:18:51.270 --> 1:18:53.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And after he after Susanna, we'll take a break.

1:18:55.180 --> 1:19:3.150
Susannah Knox
Thank you so much. I just wanted to, I wanna thank Andrea for confirming the importance of ephemeral streams.

1:19:3.230 --> 1:19:32.740
Susannah Knox
Umm, we do think that the lack of restriction in the current language is a significant problem. I think history shows that without binding language in the plan, protections won't really take place at the project level and so that's why we've suggested something that's more clear guidance for for projects to follow. And I think related to that that issue and the the reason why protections like.

1:19:33.230 --> 1:19:43.320
Susannah Knox
General Stream protections are so important is that I know that you know this from our written objection. But going back to Nick's point about BMPS.

1:19:44.590 --> 1:19:58.930
Susannah Knox
Respectfully, we just could not disagree more that there was sufficient to protect water resources and

soil on the forest. And I just want to if I could share my screen for a second. I have a few visual demonstrations here.

1:19:59.900 --> 1:20:3.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Are we able to allow her to share her screen? Yes. OK.

1:20:2.600 --> 1:20:6.660
Susannah Knox
I think Dequincy gave me the ability, so let's see if I can.

1:20:6.420 --> 1:20:6.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

1:20:7.590 --> 1:20:8.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
2nd.

1:20:7.600 --> 1:20:8.150
Susannah Knox
Oops.

1:20:9.630 --> 1:20:14.340
Susannah Knox
Can you see? I can't. No, I can't see. Can you see that picture?

1:20:15.420 --> 1:20:15.800
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
It's.

1:20:14.860 --> 1:20:18.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes, we can talking you not figure 6.

1:20:16.20 --> 1:20:23.720
Susannah Knox
OK, so this is, yeah. So this is from the Panther branch sale and that this is a relatively recent example where.

1:20:24.800 --> 1:20:27.190
Susannah Knox
Steep logging and steep slopes.

1:20:29.460 --> 1:20:36.660
Susannah Knox
With higher rainfall events resulted in a lot of sediment entering the water here.

1:20:37.800 --> 1:20:55.690
Susannah Knox

Umm, so these are just a few visuals and then I want to go back to show how we believe the BMP effectiveness have been really dramatically inflated by the plan and the analysis and the EIS.

1:20:56.350 --> 1:21:28.240
Susannah Knox
So this is a temporary Rd stream crossing in the Thunderstruck timber sail and this was only rated a minor temporary impact and this is despite the fact that ground based logging methods were used on steep slopes in this rule in this sale and that was admitted by Forest Service staff. This is up here you can see an A monitoring note admitting that this was the wrong method to use on such steep slopes.

1:21:28.340 --> 1:21:52.230
Susannah Knox
And here's another picture showing some impacts from that sale, and so that I think illustrates our issues with BMPS and the fact that they are really dramatically overrated as ways to protect soil and water resources on these forests were steep slopes and high rainfall events, for example, are not uncommon.

1:21:52.870 --> 1:21:55.20
Susannah Knox
Umm. And also.

1:21:56.80 --> 1:21:57.100
Susannah Knox
I think this.

1:21:59.230 --> 1:22:1.430
Susannah Knox
This in particular.

1:22:2.340 --> 1:22:25.260
Susannah Knox
Illustrates the fact that we need a plan standards that are enforceable, such as going back to the rule that preserves the presumption in favor of cable logging on steep slopes, and even making that rule stronger. This shows that effects can be really devastating and should not these kinds of things should not be totally punted to the project level, which the new plan does.

1:22:26.840 --> 1:22:28.260
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right, just take a pause.

1:22:29.40 --> 1:22:29.550
Susannah Knox
Sure.

1:22:31.850 --> 1:22:33.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Anything from you too.

1:22:38.260 --> 1:22:39.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Appreciate that. So.

1:22:40.800 --> 1:22:43.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Like the plan still lacks protection.

1:22:43.950 --> 1:22:45.500
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh for ephemerals?

1:22:46.240 --> 1:22:49.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You disagree with the take on BMP that was stated earlier.

1:22:50.670 --> 1:22:51.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, and then?

1:22:52.500 --> 1:23:2.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Really recognizing that steep slopes and high rainfall events are not uncommon and that, uh, what a how did you characterize it with cable logging a?

1:23:3.830 --> 1:23:7.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There needs to be more attention to that for cable logging.

1:23:6.350 --> 1:23:11.390
Susannah Knox
Sure. So here, let me go back to, I need to exit sharing my screen.

1:23:12.50 --> 1:23:12.580
Susannah Knox
Umm.

1:23:13.990 --> 1:23:45.440
Susannah Knox
So we the this rule in the in the new plan is a a backslide from the the old plan where there was a strong presumption in favor of cable logging and slopes over 40%. And this the new plan leaves it entirely to project level discretion. And we think that and and and and even under that old plan sometimes, you know we have other examples too of timber sales that took place with ground based logging methods.

1:23:45.530 --> 1:24:7.500
Susannah Knox
On steep slopes and so if anything, the old rule needs to be made stronger and it needs to be clear that ground based logging methods cannot be used on slopes over 40% unless there is. There is some finding

made at the project level that that methods can be used which are at least as protective as cable logging.

1:24:9.360 --> 1:24:12.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
An old rule being a a standard in the the current.

1:24:14.10 --> 1:24:14.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, not.

1:24:13.710 --> 1:24:19.300
Susannah Knox
Sorry. Yeah, I'm I'm referring to the current the currently active plan. Yes, when I say old rule.

1:24:20.70 --> 1:24:22.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That's I figured, just wanted to clarify. Thank you, Susanna.

1:24:22.80 --> 1:24:23.370
Susannah Knox
Yeah, sure, sure.

1:24:24.820 --> 1:24:25.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So so.

1:24:25.140 --> 1:24:26.160
Susannah Knox
And and I just.

1:24:27.530 --> 1:24:28.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
This is just to process check.

1:24:28.630 --> 1:24:58.760
Susannah Knox
Yeah, sure. If if I could just wrap up my comments on BMP's, you know the I think the our comments and our which we went to and into in much more detail in our written comments about why the performance, the implementation and the efficacy of BMPS and how they've been completely overinflated in the EIS. That highlights the need for for very specific plan components that protect.

1:24:59.140 --> 1:25:11.670
Susannah Knox
Soil and water resources. These are not they're not optional. Protecting and restoring ecological integrity and aquatic resources are not optional plan components, they're.

1:25:11.800 --> 1:25:42.530
Susannah Knox

Their required by the the planning role and I would also point out that other forests managed to harvest timber while having stronger protections for ephemeral streams and logging on steep slopes than we have here. So this shouldn't. We don't expect this to preclude timber sales. We just want common sense protections in the plan that will actually protect water resources in a way that ordinary BMP's we have shown.

1:25:42.790 --> 1:25:44.890
Susannah Knox
Are just are simply not up to the task.

1:25:47.10 --> 1:25:50.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you so much, Susanna. Anything from you guys? We're good. Thank you.

1:25:51.800 --> 1:26:3.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So so David Whitmer, we we would like to take a break now, can you hold your comments? I hear that your I'm trying to get in on the phone again, can you hold until we come back at quarter after?

1:26:4.980 --> 1:26:6.120
1ad9f816-054e-43b4-ab8b-980d85d49bf8
You can you hear me?

1:26:6.750 --> 1:26:7.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

1:26:8.250 --> 1:26:9.10
1ad9f816-054e-43b4-ab8b-980d85d49bf8
OK, good.

1:26:11.110 --> 1:26:11.400
1ad9f816-054e-43b4-ab8b-980d85d49bf8
Just.

1:26:10.360 --> 1:26:15.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, alright. So we'll come back to you and and start with you. After a 15 minute break.

1:26:16.720 --> 1:26:18.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
At night at 10:15.

1:26:19.570 --> 1:26:20.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

1:26:20.840 --> 1:26:21.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks everyone.

1:39:17.690 --> 1:39:17.900
659c68c8-b03c-4eb8-87b4-9e750927d835
Good.

1:39:26.290 --> 1:39:28.540
659c68c8-b03c-4eb8-87b4-9e750927d835
Good morning. John Hatcher, can you hear me now?

1:39:29.810 --> 1:39:31.50
659c68c8-b03c-4eb8-87b4-9e750927d835
I know we're on bright steel.

1:39:31.670 --> 1:39:32.490
Nick Biemiller
Yeah, we got you, John.

1:39:33.650 --> 1:39:34.280
659c68c8-b03c-4eb8-87b4-9e750927d835
Thank you.

1:41:40.950 --> 1:41:43.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK my live.

1:41:46.750 --> 1:41:49.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Can y'all hear me? Somebody give me a thumbs up.

1:41:50.630 --> 1:41:52.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Can hear you. OK. Thank you.

1:41:58.230 --> 1:41:59.720
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Welcome back.

1:42:10.240 --> 1:42:13.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
This owl I know makes the quality.

1:42:14.550 --> 1:42:18.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Speaking and middle Video calling so much better than just their.

1:42:19.70 --> 1:42:19.460
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Little.

1:42:22.350 --> 1:42:22.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Players.

1:42:24.440 --> 1:42:27.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you Shirley for making this work for us.

1:42:28.580 --> 1:42:33.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, so we got 45 minutes left to cover other.

1:42:34.760 --> 1:42:39.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Other entries here in the category of soil and water.

1:42:40.140 --> 1:42:44.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And before we start on roads, even though I understand there's quite a bit of overlap.

1:42:45.230 --> 1:42:59.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We promised David Whitmire. We'd hear from him first on the phone, and then I have Nick Miller, Nick Holzhauer and Sarah sit. I keep calling you the wrong name. Susannah in the queue. Still with your hands up.

1:43:2.190 --> 1:43:8.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Already ready to go, you guys? Yep. OK, so David, it's Europe.

1:43:10.280 --> 1:43:24.610
36ddd6c8-062b-4253-8fe8-ed8fa5fd3904
Thanks, Mary Kay. I appreciate the opportunity to David Whitmire with a fishing while our Conservation Council apologize for not knowing what my phone was not meeting, it might have been on it so long it it's stuck. But anyway, appreciate the opportunity.

1:43:25.230 --> 1:43:33.560
36ddd6c8-062b-4253-8fe8-ed8fa5fd3904
Uh, this was our only objection that we had that we had listed. So we we do take this one pretty serious and I think that has.

1:43:34.400 --> 1:43:45.640
36ddd6c8-062b-4253-8fe8-ed8fa5fd3904
Why you not only to speaking to how we think this could affect habitat work? We need to do, but also I think it should have value and our support of the collaborative plan.

1:43:46.350 --> 1:43:58.60
36ddd6c8-062b-4253-8fe8-ed8fa5fd3904
That that was put forth by the fire service and we appreciate the the last 10 years of working with you guys. I'm bringing that out now just goes this is our only objection and and probably my last time I'll be speaking.

1:43:58.570 --> 1:44:2.550
36ddd6c8-062b-4253-8fe8-ed8fa5fd3904
Uh, after incur with the Rough Grass society, our.

1:44:3.440 --> 1:44:27.570
36ddd6c8-062b-4253-8fe8-ed8fa5fd3904
Our objection was based on the not limiting the work totally within the ephemeral area. We felt that the conjunction with the other riparian areas was at the critical point, and it sounds to me like Nick's solution there covers our our issues. So we concur with that and also it's not a lot of the North Carolina Fire services. Well, the Forestry Association, so.

1:44:29.170 --> 1:44:31.790
36ddd6c8-062b-4253-8fe8-ed8fa5fd3904
Appreciate that opportunity and again.

1:44:35.270 --> 1:44:39.900
36ddd6c8-062b-4253-8fe8-ed8fa5fd3904
Even with the what we've even heard today, where the mapping might not be totally.

1:44:40.720 --> 1:45:2.190
36ddd6c8-062b-4253-8fe8-ed8fa5fd3904
It's totally perfect on a lot of riparian areas. That is so much more critical to not narrow down our our matrix areas in where we can actually do work. And I just want to stress that that we we need to not lose that footprint. It was a collaborative process. You guys did great work. I know everybody don't agree. We could have easily.

1:45:2.940 --> 1:45:20.670
36ddd6c8-062b-4253-8fe8-ed8fa5fd3904
Other objected to a lot of things that we didn't necessarily like, but we saw other peoples values and and felt like we could move forward without having to eject and I would. I would hope others will do the same. And again thanks for the opportunity to speak to regional on our on our objection.

1:45:22.640 --> 1:45:23.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, David.

1:45:24.990 --> 1:45:27.500
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thank you, David. Don't have any questions.

1:45:28.100 --> 1:45:29.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, alright.

1:45:30.330 --> 1:45:33.380
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I'd like to go back to Nick Holzhauer.

1:45:36.340 --> 1:45:49.450
Nicholas Holshouser
Yeah. Thanks. It just about some of the various comments. I thought there was a, it would be beneficial just to, I don't know, clarify a few things and perhaps add a little bit of context that maybe didn't come out and your questions to me.

1:45:51.70 --> 1:46:1.610
Nicholas Holshouser
There has. There's some some reference. I think Andrea, you know, made a reference as to the the, the, the not the benefit of the mapping but the quality of the mapping.

1:46:1.970 --> 1:46:5.400
Nicholas Holshouser
I give Whitmire just, you know, made a reference to.

1:46:6.740 --> 1:46:12.170
Nicholas Holshouser
Whether or not mapping is needed as specific level of detail, and I think even you.

1:46:13.250 --> 1:46:18.230
Nicholas Holshouser
Just went, had a question around you know plan and project level detail.

1:46:19.180 --> 1:46:26.240
Nicholas Holshouser
I think my point with the mapping is that the reason the resource itself is critical, I think everybody agrees on the importance of water.

1:46:27.730 --> 1:46:38.330
Nicholas Holshouser
Informing at the plan level, informing the public, informing subsequently the Forest Service representative different people who were involved in planning projects.

1:46:39.810 --> 1:46:46.260
Nicholas Holshouser
Is much better if that flows down from a core set of data which is available the the.

1:46:46.940 --> 1:47:18.340
Nicholas Holshouser
The analysis of the the stream network is not an onerous task. It doesn't it. It won't take years and years. It won't take thousands of men hours and that's why I think it's appropriate at the plan level to get it as

right as we can using using current modern data, because that then you know rolls downhill right from the from the top of the watershed. So such that every person, every entity can understand impacts and analysis.

1:47:18.660 --> 1:47:30.850
Nicholas Holshouser
There have been a couple of I I don't. I don't have a stake in the ground on the ephemeral issue or others there. Other commenters who you know who, who do, have pros and cons there. I will say that.

1:47:32.110 --> 1:47:42.880
Nicholas Holshouser
Typically the mapping is not gonna change that equation much because what you find is where where the real differences of opinion are in those classifications tend to be in places where.

1:47:44.50 --> 1:47:56.480
Nicholas Holshouser
You know, in many cases, you're not gonna actually have significant temporaries that there. There's some of the deepest, deepest places in the forest. I personally think having looked at the at the mapping in in significant detail.

1:47:59.30 --> 1:48:4.120
Nicholas Holshouser
Don't don't know. You know, I I'd be happy leaving a lot of that to the project level.

1:48:5.620 --> 1:48:10.520
Nicholas Holshouser
But I think the key here is that at the project level, you're gonna have to do this analysis anyway.

1:48:12.20 --> 1:48:21.330
Nicholas Holshouser
But that doesn't mean it's best to only do it at the project level, because you're asking every single project to undertake a significant effort.

1:48:22.990 --> 1:48:30.990
Nicholas Holshouser
In the field where a lot of information could have been made available beforehand via technology and.

1:48:32.100 --> 1:48:36.60
Nicholas Holshouser
You know, finally to comment on the the mapping itself Andrea mentioned.

1:48:37.370 --> 1:48:50.200
Nicholas Holshouser
You know the the state of North Carolina had actually, you know, taken the significant effort to understand classification of streams. The mapping that's out there is incredibly accurate. Today, the North Carolina.

1:48:51.770 --> 1:49:21.670
Nicholas Holshouser

When that project was part of the North Carolina geologic survey effort, it was a state-run effort that began in 2000 and and and four, I believe, via legislation and ran into the 2000 tens of the we're fortunate enough that the 19 Western counties in North Carolina were one of the target areas. So we actually have the most complete map system in the state, which is undergone rigorous analysis by scientists and NC State at the USGS etcetera. And there's actually a history.

1:49:21.830 --> 1:49:51.560
Nicholas Holshouser
I just put this out there going forward as part of the resolution is actually history of the Forest Service working with the USGS to improve their mapping, improve it over time because it benefits every single stage of project and play it. It benefits all the stakeholders, it benefits the public, it benefits the Forest Service for everybody to be on the same page. It adds consistency to to the project planning. And so it as recently as the is 2020, the US Forest Service in the Southwest District worked with the USGS.

1:49:51.750 --> 1:50:1.350
Nicholas Holshouser
On a on a project to actually update USGS data with on the field mapping they went through. You know, they're basically improving the data every time they do a project.

1:50:2.810 --> 1:50:7.940
Nicholas Holshouser
So you know that that's where I would, I would close my my side at this topic is that.

1:50:9.130 --> 1:50:21.700
Nicholas Holshouser
But the the mapping is is incredibly reliable. Now the technology is extremely advanced, the science is decades old and there's just I don't see any reason that it should not be the basis for informed decision.

1:50:22.970 --> 1:50:23.400
Nicholas Holshouser
Thanks.

1:50:23.190 --> 1:50:31.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you. Yeah, thank you. I think I maybe have a a general question just to throw out there is.

1:50:31.990 --> 1:50:43.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
When we're discussing the protection areas and SMZ's and in a lot of discussion on the females, there's you heard that there's.

1:50:44.50 --> 1:50:44.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.

1:50:45.630 --> 1:50:50.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Too much protection, not enough protection. I heard that. You know the idea that.

1:50:50.100 --> 1:50:58.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, so far as what you covered the mapping effort. So one question that comes to mind is when we're talking about that whole subject.

1:51:0.170 --> 1:51:7.580
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, that include existing roads, existing trails, user created trails.

1:51:8.290 --> 1:51:29.980
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But all all the things that are on the landscape that are in these and crossing these drainages that they're they're and as mentioned about the 80 year old. So the universe of what we're discussing, it's impacted by these trails. It seems like they there's a focus on timber sales, but I was interested to hear, are we talking about?

1:51:31.470 --> 1:51:47.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Your entire Rd system, all our trails and all the user created trails are out there as well. I just wanted to get a handle on the the the full impact of what we're discussing here and we're not necessarily asking Nick, but just in general, if somebody wanna weigh in on that.

1:51:50.410 --> 1:51:51.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Nick, do you?

1:51:53.400 --> 1:51:54.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You're muted, you're muted.

1:51:55.530 --> 1:51:56.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Can't hear you.

1:51:56.810 --> 1:51:59.780
Nicholas Holshouser
Sorry, sorry, I think this was this was.

1:51:59.860 --> 1:52:16.590
Nicholas Holshouser
Stud. Fundamentally, one of the reasons why I you know, after I looked at the at the analysis that I, I sort of dug into it is is because it's not about, it's about protecting a resource water, but it's also about understanding the impact of of not just the US Forest Service.

1:52:16.930 --> 1:52:32.80
Nicholas Holshouser
And created, you know projects, whatever. But General General impacts in the forest and so certainly

these old roads that the US foresters didn't create, you know they were created before the before the Forest Service existed.

1:52:33.360 --> 1:52:38.650
Nicholas Holshouser
When you look at a project and I give this example, the lick stand project, there's a there's a unit lick stone.

1:52:40.200 --> 1:53:4.270
Nicholas Holshouser
That that has a road through it and without a good map, you look at the you look at the proposal and you see four or five stream crossings. If you look at a better map, you see anywhere from 9 to 13 stream crossings. You can also look at existing corridor in the forest, these old roads and without a good map you can't tell how many times it crosses the stream, and you don't even know that it crossed the stream. So I think this benefits.

1:53:5.520 --> 1:53:19.840
Nicholas Holshouser
Really preparing resource, really understanding how how water impacts the landscape and and you know for the ephemeral part. Unfortunately ephemeral also includes really ephemeral meaning like runoff from roads.

1:53:21.10 --> 1:53:22.790
Nicholas Holshouser
And we know that this causes problems.

1:53:23.710 --> 1:53:40.680
Nicholas Holshouser
It in projects and and and it's not. It's not as sure the Forest Service fault right that that North Carolina highway dumps a bunch of water onto a logging Rd. But the fact is it causes damage and and so you know that that's where these different zones.

1:53:42.70 --> 1:53:55.350
Nicholas Holshouser
There's lots of places where a better understanding of what's on the ground. I'm starting with with people's inherent knowledge of of the landscape through mapping is important. It can benefit all of us.

1:53:56.700 --> 1:53:58.190
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you, nick.

1:53:59.340 --> 1:54:14.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So. So we've got Susanna and Nick. Be Miller in in the queue. But before we go there, I just wanna invite anybody who has not yet spoken on this topic and might want to, whether you're on the phone or on teams.

1:54:15.820 --> 1:54:18.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is there anybody else out there who has not voiced yet?

1:54:25.370 --> 1:54:29.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, thanks. So Nick, be Meyer and then Susanna.

1:54:31.570 --> 1:54:32.460
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. Thanks, Nancy.

1:54:34.80 --> 1:54:44.730
Nick Biemiller
So I think when we think about ephemeral streams, it's important to be evidence based, and I hope we would all strive to utilize the best available science.

1:54:46.180 --> 1:54:49.290
Nick Biemiller
And let me share my screen quickly if I can.

1:54:50.90 --> 1:54:59.320
Nick Biemiller
Umm, I'd like to pull up the North Carolina Forest Services BMP assessment report that they developed back in 2016. Can everybody see my screen?

1:55:0.520 --> 1:55:0.910
Nick Biemiller
And.

1:55:0.250 --> 1:55:2.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We can, but it's so small we can't read anything.

1:55:3.620 --> 1:55:4.230
Nick Biemiller
How's that?

1:55:5.450 --> 1:55:6.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Better getting better.

1:55:8.470 --> 1:55:9.460
Nick Biemiller
OK, how about that?

1:55:9.310 --> 1:55:11.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You're gonna probably have to read it to us anyway.

1:55:11.640 --> 1:55:27.870
Nick Biemiller
That's fine. OK. I just wanted to highlight that you know, providing a few anecdotal examples of situations where things were observed is not necessarily scientifically vigorous evidence that shows statistical significance.

1:55:28.970 --> 1:55:58.780
Nick Biemiller
And lucky for us, we actually do have some of that data to help inform the way that we think about ephemeral streams and SMZ protections in general, both here in North Carolina through North Carolina Forest Services, BMP assessment, but more more regionally for the Appalachian region from in Cassie and from FSC and their national risk assessment. So this report over 4 year period assessed 9671.

1:55:58.870 --> 1:55:59.710
Nick Biemiller
Uh, BMP.

1:55:59.790 --> 1:56:23.620
Nick Biemiller
The BMP units across the mountains, specifically in North Carolina, and found that we're BMP's were properly implemented. There was virtually no risk to water quality in every case, so I just wanted to highlight this because I think that this evidence speaks for itself on the effectiveness of BMP's. I'm protecting what are quality and I think we should all strive to be evidence based.

1:56:26.160 --> 1:56:27.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. Thank you.

1:56:28.860 --> 1:56:30.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Now to Susanna.

1:56:30.730 --> 1:56:31.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That PLC.

1:56:31.150 --> 1:56:34.770
Susannah Knox
Sure. Well, if I could go back to.

1:56:36.950 --> 1:56:39.770
Susannah Knox
The BMP issue real briefly.

1:56:41.10 --> 1:56:47.40
Susannah Knox
I showed some some images before. I'm gonna share my screen again to show one more.

1:56:48.210 --> 1:56:48.770
Susannah Knox
Umm.

1:56:51.950 --> 1:56:57.520
Susannah Knox
So this is something that was rated as this is a photo.

1:56:58.940 --> 1:56:59.540
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There we go.

1:56:58.180 --> 1:57:3.110
Susannah Knox
Of something that was rated and and major long term impact. Can you see that photo there?

1:57:3.690 --> 1:57:4.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes.

1:57:5.130 --> 1:57:20.190
Susannah Knox
And that's a fish passage obstruction. And this is a legacy fish passage problem that was not remedied by the project. And I wanna highlight that because the EIS one of the elements that the EIS relies on.

1:57:21.390 --> 1:57:51.680
Susannah Knox
To to downplay the impacts on on streams is the idea that projects will result in improvements to legacy, legacy Rd issues and this indicates that this legacy Rd problem was not remediated with this project and in fact the only recommendation just said that replacement should occur when funds become available. And this was a part. This is just one example of an impact that was found.

1:57:52.180 --> 1:58:18.90
Susannah Knox
And was incorporated into a BMP monitoring report that found an overall implementation rate of 96.7% and an effectiveness rate of 97.1%, and this included not just this impact, but a bunch of other impacts that I alluded to before that were rated as minor temporary impacts. And I think the photos really believe that. So I just want to.

1:58:18.970 --> 1:58:19.500
Susannah Knox
Uh.

1:58:20.120 --> 1:58:55.10
Susannah Knox
Kind of highlight that as another another example of how BMPS are not always perfectly implemented and not always up to the task. And I also noticed that in even in the document that Nick was just showing there were thousands of BMPS that were not properly implemented and that represents

thousands of of potentially critical impacts to streams that took place. So you know, implementation is not always perfect. I think that's something that the plan and the analysis of the plan and the IRS have to.

1:58:55.80 --> 1:59:20.560
Susannah Knox
Recognize and even when perfectly implemented things don't always go according to plan, and that's something that has to be recognized. And again, that's not just an analytical problem that we think requires a supplement to the EIS. That's also a reason why having really clear, enforceable standards like the protections to have emerals like the rules about logging on steep slopes like.

1:59:20.670 --> 1:59:41.240
Susannah Knox
A enforceable clear protections for base cation depleted soils that we mentioned earlier all need to be part of the plan. One thing that we didn't cover that I wanted to mention before our time on soils is up is the 8515 soil impairment standard and that is we.

1:59:42.210 --> 2:0:14.0
Susannah Knox
You know, I think extensively wrote about that in our objection, which I will try not to rehash, but that is not best available science. We believe it must be replaced by something more scientific and something that really meets the standard laid out in the planning role. The planning role requires soils and soil productivity to be maintained and restored. So on its face, something that allows substantial soil impairment up to 15% in a project arguably doesn't even meet the rule.

2:0:14.670 --> 2:0:46.820
Susannah Knox
That rule has been that standard. The 8515 standard has been rescinded from region 8 guidance as no longer best available science. We believe that the universal soil loss equation is a mathematical formula. It's evidence based. It's developed by the USDA based on decades of data. That's just one suggestion for how to begin to meet planning role requirements to restore soils and productivity and soil productivity. So I just wanted to mention that because it was a remedy that we didn't get too earlier.

2:0:47.110 --> 2:1:19.780
Susannah Knox
And also just make clear that we need supplements to the EIS to realistically assess BMP's and the inadequate monitoring that has taken place of BMPS in the past, and we also need a supplement to the EIS that would evaluate the cumulative impacts of various activities on base cation depletion, particularly if timber harvest and vulnerable soils continues to be part of the plan.

2:1:19.860 --> 2:1:28.410
Susannah Knox
Which again, we think that that should be addressed at the plan level, but if it's not cumulative impacts really need to be addressed in the EIS and currently they're not.

2:1:29.10 --> 2:1:29.400
Susannah Knox
Umm.

2:1:30.630 --> 2:1:43.750
Susannah Knox
And and finally monitoring, I mentioned that monitoring of BMP'S in the past needs to be accurately accurately assessed for purposes of evaluating this plan, and the effectiveness of BMP.

2:1:43.830 --> 2:2:18.220
Susannah Knox
Is, but we've also made some suggestions in our written objection for how to improve monitoring going forward. What needs to be sooner after projects are closed to accurately assess short term impacts and then it also needs to be done more than once so that long term impacts can be assessed. So we appreciate that the agency is sending its monitoring program to the research team for reevaluation, but improvements we believe need to be made part of the plan as well. So those are just a few things that we didn't get to cover in our earlier discussion. I'd be happy to answer any questions about that.

2:2:19.450 --> 2:2:20.980
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Great. Thank you, Susanna.

2:2:22.160 --> 2:2:24.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But give Rick a minute to absorb.

2:2:28.60 --> 2:2:38.260
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
They want to make sure I captured, we talked about a supplement to the IRS to address the BMP's and insufficient implementation and monitoring a supplement to the EIS.

2:2:39.780 --> 2:2:48.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh for base cat ion depletion and then then was it? There's additional suggestions in your response, or did I miss something?

2:2:52.470 --> 2:2:54.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You're muted, Susanna.

2:2:54.860 --> 2:2:57.650
Susannah Knox
Sorry about that. Umm, I think that's everything we just covered.

2:2:58.780 --> 2:3:0.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Excellent. Thank you, Suzanne.

2:3:1.700 --> 2:3:2.270
Susannah Knox
Thank you.

2:3:4.20 --> 2:3:9.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So now I'm just focusing on this whole big section. We said we wanted to cover before 11.

2:3:10.220 --> 2:3:20.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Under soil and water, all three subtopics and I just want to make sure that all of the objectors and interested persons have that wanna weigh in there, have weighed in before we.

2:3:21.960 --> 2:3:23.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Figure out where to go next.

2:3:25.470 --> 2:3:55.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Because they kind of overlapped and yeah, we didn't mix that all up. Do you have any other questions that you wanna ask? Well, I do think Rick had kind of asked that general question about and maybe that gets into some of the roads pieces, but some of the other uses that I'll also can have impacts to water quality, whether that's roads or or trail impacts, user created trails, those sorts of things. Yeah. For example, when we're talking about the ephemerals for example.

2:3:55.950 --> 2:4:1.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Or you can be anything within the the stream system, but I think maybe Ephemerals might.

2:4:2.360 --> 2:4:27.380
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Pronounce it more is just to get an idea of, you know, a handle on that or cause the focus seemed to be bringing up timber sales, but also would that include existing trails that we've got such as mountain bike trails that cross ephemerals hiking trails, other trail horse trails, equestrian use, also our our entire Rd system.

2:4:28.160 --> 2:4:30.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I was trying to get trying to get a feel for.

2:4:31.730 --> 2:4:35.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know when when we talk about the ephemerals are out there.

2:4:36.80 --> 2:4:37.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Cut your.

2:4:38.470 --> 2:4:48.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Where to take that is it? Is it just a concern for timber sales or is it a concern for everything that touches say?

2:4:49.300 --> 2:4:50.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Their emeralds.

2:4:51.30 --> 2:4:52.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Rob Elliot.

2:4:53.870 --> 2:4:57.730
Elliot, James
Yeah. Thank you again. Ohh representing the NFA on this.

2:4:59.640 --> 2:5:5.870
Elliot, James
The interesting part there is that the North Carolina B BMP manual and 4th practice guidelines.

2:5:6.700 --> 2:5:13.960
Elliot, James
Actually speak to this topic that it's not specific only to say temper sales. I'm sharing my screen now.

2:5:14.300 --> 2:5:14.970
Elliot, James
Umm.

2:5:16.300 --> 2:5:36.770
Elliot, James
This is the actual document itself from the BMP guidelines and it talks about that minimizing disturbance to the soil. This is specific to ephemeral streams, right? So BMP's for ephemeral streams. This is in the document that is part of our resolution to these issues that it does not just include.

2:5:37.480 --> 2:5:56.260
Elliot, James
Say driving a piece of equipment, a logging piece of equipment through an e-mail stream or whatever it it it applies to, it says this includes Rd skids, trails, log decks, portable mills and fire lines. In my opinion. Right? And this this could be extrapolated into any.

2:5:57.70 --> 2:6:14.380
Elliot, James
Land use could be a a user created trail anything you just mentioned there and that list of things it you know protection, you know, protection of water bodies is critical. We certainly acknowledge the importance of ephemeral streams and their.

2:6:15.780 --> 2:6:43.250
Elliot, James

Impacts on the landscape and indeed you know in this manual, sorry I jumped around there, but it talks about very specifically. You know we talked about before this issue of you know how we treat ephemerals in the BMP manual and FPGA's and it shows really clear picture here of how that happens where these braided channels come into form and intermittent stream. But in general, yes, I I I agree with you that.

2:6:44.380 --> 2:7:5.90
Elliot, James
This discussion needs to extend to other applications, so I'll stop sharing the screen there. I was trying to show a picture. They show a really good picture in that section of the impact of a an ephemeral buffer that was created upon analysis in the field.

2:7:5.690 --> 2:7:36.180
Elliot, James
Umm, that was necessary to prevent the movement of soil into the water. And when we talk about soil and water quality protection in that sense, that's what we're focused on and that does not preempt, you know, we've heard things about salamanders and other critical species and certainly an advocate for using the natural heritage database to find this populations on the landscape and plan logging activities around them. But you know, water quality and BMPS, FPGA's, this discussion is about limiting.

2:7:36.600 --> 2:7:42.910
Elliot, James
The movement of soil into water as a non point source of pollution source.

2:7:43.570 --> 2:8:9.930
Elliot, James
Umm. And so they're not mutually exclusive in my opinion. If there was a critical of, you know, a species that was listed and an ephemeral stream, obviously that would their trigger, right? Another response to buffer that and and handle that ephemeral drainage because there's a sensitive species there. So. But when we're talking strictly about this water quality issue and ephemerals in my opinion we're.

2:8:10.600 --> 2:8:34.410
Elliot, James
We're trying to parse the issue a bit here and and focus on the movement of soil into the water channel. And so you know again FPGA's and BMPS as part of our resolution. They do speak very clearly to how to handle that even in the case of ephemeral. So just wanted to clarify that one more time that it does apply to all the other land uses you mentioned.

2:8:36.260 --> 2:8:37.870
Elliot, James
And you know we do.

2:8:39.110 --> 2:8:43.280
Elliot, James
Certainly acknowledge the importance of of ephemeral streams on landscape. So.

2:8:43.760 --> 2:8:44.410
Elliot, James
Thank you.

2:8:45.180 --> 2:8:45.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hey, rob.

2:8:47.10 --> 2:8:49.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
More of just.

2:8:50.590 --> 2:8:57.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Giving Rick a minute. But I'm gonna see if Nick or Suzanne I wanna address Rick's.

2:8:57.890 --> 2:9:1.510
Nicholas Holshouser
Question I can't understand whichever of us.

2:9:2.520 --> 2:9:3.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Just a second.

2:9:2.570 --> 2:9:9.160
Susannah Knox
Uh, yeah. My, my my hand is raised to address the same question I I have no preference who goes first, so I'm not sure who.

2:9:16.890 --> 2:9:17.180
Nicholas Holshouser
8.

2:9:8.790 --> 2:9:17.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. And I and I'm just trying to take the queue from Rick to make sure he's ready before we go. I'm catching up good. Yeah. OK. OK. So, nick.

2:9:18.790 --> 2:9:24.280
Nicholas Holshouser
Yeah, I guess again to go back to, you know, as I dug into the issue, I I actually.

2:9:24.950 --> 2:9:57.90
Nicholas Holshouser
Down the mapping to be that that information where where do all these perennial intermittent and the femoral channels exist on the landscape to be incredibly useful information of myself, just as an amateur naturalist, use you use information to understand the forest, to know you know where where debris might come from that you know this in a culvert where potential impacts are to look at the at the resource impact of of other recreation uses whether it be social trails.

2:9:57.320 --> 2:10:17.130
Nicholas Holshouser
Mountain biking, questran dispersed camping, particularly unauthorized uses. You know, often it's it's not apparent where, where it impact is coming from, but if you know where the water comes from, you know it's it's pretty easy to trace. So I I think there's wide applicability of.

2:10:18.40 --> 2:10:24.310
Nicholas Holshouser
Of a really robust knowledge and you know necessarily talking about remedies, but.

2:10:25.840 --> 2:10:28.930
Nicholas Holshouser
You know, I would, I would. I would much rather.

2:10:30.90 --> 2:10:52.320
Nicholas Holshouser
You know, participate in in improving our knowledge about about the the stream network of these forests, help the Forest Service, you know, on a on a real committed project to fully understand this because I the the the benefits I think are immense and in all of our aspects and.

2:10:54.220 --> 2:11:1.530
Nicholas Holshouser
Although you know to give a couple of, I don't wanna say Miss counterexamples because you know their cases where ephemeral BMP's are followed.

2:11:2.640 --> 2:11:22.410
Nicholas Holshouser
We we get so much significant rainfall that beginning 50 year events these days in the forest, that without an accurate understanding of of how the water flows, whether it flows out of the ground or whether it flows off a road or whether it flows because it's at the bottom of three steep draws.

2:11:23.800 --> 2:11:31.130
Nicholas Holshouser
If you don't, if you just don't have a base understanding of that, I I personally don't know. You know, I I would. I would feel uncomfortable.

2:11:32.680 --> 2:11:41.210
Nicholas Holshouser
Drawing bit large conclusions about you know what, any what any activity has has an impact on it forced.

2:11:42.240 --> 2:11:42.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

2:11:43.510 --> 2:11:44.100
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

2:11:45.570 --> 2:11:47.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, move to Susanna.

2:11:49.10 --> 2:12:0.650
Susannah Knox
Thank you. I just wanna say, you know, we certainly agree it's not just timber harvest that that represents impacts to to soil and water resources on the forest.

2:12:1.830 --> 2:12:31.460
Susannah Knox
We haven't talked too much about the impacts of the current Rd system, which you mentioned and the maintenance backlog because there's another section where we expect to be able to address that in more detail. But we definitely agree that the existing Rd system represents a huge impact on resources. We've just focused more in this section on on activity levels increasing and and timber harvest.

2:12:31.550 --> 2:13:2.580
Susannah Knox
Because that is the activity that stands to see a huge increase under the new plan and and also it affects the road system as well and would require expansion of the road system and itself, which is something that will address also when we talk more directly about roads. But you know I have this little chart up here that just explains why the activity levels are such a concern for soil and water resources so.

2:13:2.700 --> 2:13:33.250
Susannah Knox
On the left you can see that under the current plan, with 650 acres of regeneration harvest per year, there was one critical sediment impact to streams per year, and that's that's average. And that only represents one of the types of impacts to water resources here. The proposed plan would quintuple that level of regeneration harvest per year, but the EIS only accounts for.

2:13:33.360 --> 2:14:4.640
Susannah Knox
And the plant mitigation members and measures in the plan only expect the same amount of the same single number of critical impacts to streams. Despite that activity level increase and all the on the right side, you can see what we would expect the impacts to increase proportionally to the activity levels increasing. So that's why we focused on timber projects and the increase in in timber harvest that's expected under the plan.

2:14:4.900 --> 2:14:28.270
Susannah Knox
Here, it's not that we think that that's the only impact to soil and water resources, but it's something that you can't ignore because of the activity levels that will be increased under the plan. And again we'll, we will we certainly believe that roads, the existing Rd system isn't represents an enormous impact and we expect to address that in more detail later.

2:14:29.670 --> 2:14:31.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, that. Thanks for that. Thanks for that.

2:14:33.250 --> 2:14:36.460
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, so we've got a few minutes left here. Josh, you wanna go next?

2:14:37.200 --> 2:14:42.490
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah, yeah, I do. In addition to the points that other speakers have made, I just want to.

2:14:43.200 --> 2:15:12.910
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
In regard to to Rick, your question about maybe the differences in planned content with timber harvest versus roads and trails, I think it's important to realize that timber harvest have some pretty big loopholes that do not apply to roads and trails. Most roads and trails are system roads and trails and have standards and guidelines for their construction and maintenance, whereas timber harvest there are a lot of structures and disturbances involved with timber harvest particularly what are known as skid trails or skid roads.

2:15:13.570 --> 2:15:46.870
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
That are more or less unregulated and and have no or very little planned content to to manage them, and that's why it's really important to have planned content to protect riparian areas from those largely unregulated activities that occur in timber harvest. So I do think there's a distinction there in the way that forest surface treats timber harvest as opposed to official road and trail construction. And I do think user created trails. That's not an action that the Forest Service takes. That's an action that other people take. So it's not really in the same category.

2:15:47.80 --> 2:15:50.70
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
As as as timber harvest and system routes and trains.

2:15:51.160 --> 2:15:52.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Point, but thank you, Josh.

2:15:53.550 --> 2:16:6.980
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Anybody online? You're another handling? Yes, there is. There's still another hand up. I just want to check anybody online or on. I don't mean online. I mean on the phone then may wanna voice here.

2:16:11.450 --> 2:16:13.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, alright. So.

2:16:14.200 --> 2:16:20.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Rob, your hand is still up. Do you? Did you not put it down or do you have something more? Sorry, I need to put that down.

2:16:22.700 --> 2:16:24.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thanks for that. Just trying to get a feel for.

2:16:25.770 --> 2:16:28.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
What? All what? All we're talking is trying to picture.

2:16:29.80 --> 2:16:43.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Picture between the mapping and the the the discussion about the intermittence perennials and ephemerals and then the activities of trying to get a feel for, you know, a picture in my mind of what all they talk about. So that was very helpful in it. It helped also kind of hear more.

2:16:44.370 --> 2:16:50.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We bring some clarity in my mind as you explain that about more about what were the concerns were. So thank you for.

2:16:51.420 --> 2:16:55.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Entertaining that question and and providing that response. Appreciate that.

2:16:56.720 --> 2:17:9.500
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So my question is, do we have pretty much the same crowd for the roads discussion that is starting in 10 minutes? Do we anticipate about the same people or do we need to take a break and wait till the top of the hour?

2:17:11.40 --> 2:17:19.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So we haven't addressed the drinking water. They're several injectors per person drinking water, objections, any drinking water objections in.

2:17:20.520 --> 2:17:21.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The room.

2:17:22.850 --> 2:17:24.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That hasn't have not been spoken to.

2:17:25.820 --> 2:17:27.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Under this category drop.

2:17:31.320 --> 2:17:35.670
Elliot, James
Ohh no, I'm sorry, I'm still trying to put my hand down, can't figure it out.

2:17:37.90 --> 2:17:37.630
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

2:17:38.670 --> 2:17:41.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No drinking water. Objections in the room.

2:17:43.370 --> 2:17:44.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

2:17:45.550 --> 2:17:58.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Any other ideas? Or do you want to go to robes? Yeah, I guess just to, you know, and I think those kind of subtopics were around steep slopes and soil protection. I think Susanna, you hit on some of that and then.

2:17:59.210 --> 2:18:7.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Any other things around segmentation, water quality and impacts to drinking water? So I guess just a a chance to, you know, hit anything on on those?

2:18:8.120 --> 2:18:19.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Soil and water issues before we focus in on the roads piece. Yeah, we figured there'd be overlap, but we don't wanna move on and and and leave anything of those.

2:18:21.420 --> 2:18:22.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, nick.

2:18:24.620 --> 2:18:29.700
Nick Biemiller
Yeah, just a very quick comment kind of in response to John to Josh's comment, sorry.

2:18:30.420 --> 2:18:48.550
Nick Biemiller
Is that the way that timber harvest are conducted in terms of their impacts to water quality and soil, including things like skid trails, is very clearly included in the states for best practices guidelines as well as the state forestry BMP's. So it's not just.

2:18:49.810 --> 2:19:2.230
Nick Biemiller
SMZ's that are covered within that law and within the BMP manual, it also includes things like skid trails and the way that harvests and operations are conducted to protect what are quality. So just wanted to be clear on that.

2:19:4.480 --> 2:19:17.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thanks, nick. So let's I understand that road. We've talked to some about roads, but let's make this shift now to to the section that we had 1/2 an hour for and we're we're close now.

2:19:18.930 --> 2:19:24.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So for those of the you objectors and interested persons that would like to.

2:19:25.210 --> 2:19:25.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No.

2:19:26.780 --> 2:19:28.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Offer something there. Do you wanna set the context fix?

2:19:30.170 --> 2:19:33.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sure thing. Thanks, Nancy. Yes, so for roads.

2:19:34.430 --> 2:19:35.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'll go through the.

2:19:35.980 --> 2:19:42.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
List of some of the suggested resolutions we have just to kind of, you know get get the get the information into our our room here.

2:19:43.680 --> 2:19:46.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
To suggested resolutions on roads and some of those are.

2:19:47.730 --> 2:19:52.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Determine whether the provision of roads and the plant components achieve species persistence.

2:19:53.630 --> 2:19:59.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Select an alternative that calls for less regeneration, harvest and reduced Rd building.

2:20:0.730 --> 2:20:7.100
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Established standards that require maintenance of permanent roads and decommissioning of temporary roads when they are no longer needed.

2:20:8.80 --> 2:20:15.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Require the four service to reduce the maintenance backlog for the road system before new roads are constructed.

2:20:16.260 --> 2:20:29.190
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Discuss how the addition of up to 10 miles of Rd per year would impact the ecological integrity and diversity of the forests. If the road maintenance backlog is not reduced.

2:20:30.530 --> 2:20:39.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Discuss specific decommission activities that will occur on the forest and how those activities will mitigate impacts that are occurring throughout the forest.

2:20:41.580 --> 2:20:49.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then lastly, reanalyze the road system as part of the plan and complete travel management sub parts A&B.

2:20:52.890 --> 2:20:53.720
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

2:20:56.740 --> 2:21:1.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, the only hand I see up here is Susanna. I'm gonna call on you. That's the. I'll see.

2:21:4.490 --> 2:21:19.600
Susannah Knox
Thank you. So as as I mentioned in soil and water, the road system is the biggest impact to these resources. And so everything we say here is related to soil and water and the remedies we talked about here are very important to soil and water.

2:21:20.330 --> 2:21:32.410
Susannah Knox
And the big picture issue here is that there's just no way the activity levels can increase the way the plan describes without expanding the road system more than.

2:21:32.510 --> 2:21:42.180
Susannah Knox
Uh, far more than what is set forth in the EIS and thus increasing the already dire maintenance backlog.

2:21:42.840 --> 2:21:53.340
Susannah Knox
Umm, I'm gonna share my screen to show a map we have here that illustrates this problem, so I'll zoom in a little bit here so you can see.

2:21:54.180 --> 2:22:28.890
Susannah Knox
The orange is the currently inaccessible lands, and it's actually kind of hard to see, but because they take up so much of the the matrix and interface overlay there. But the point is that almost all of the currently inaccessible lands, or in fact all are entirely within the matrix and interface management areas, and that's important because matrix and interface are the two least restricted management areas and in fact.

2:22:29.540 --> 2:22:43.740
Susannah Knox
They are the management areas where access is prioritized as desired as a desired condition and where the plan actually has a standard demanding known net increase or decrease rather in roads.

2:22:45.300 --> 2:23:14.660
Susannah Knox
And there's simply no way that all of this inaccessible land can be included in the in the suitable base for timber harvest, and that timber harvest goals in the plan could be reached without a lot more Rd building than the plan anticipates. The EIS, by contrast, asserts that Rd building will occur at roughly the same levels as current Rd building.

2:23:14.790 --> 2:23:42.320
Susannah Knox
And the numbers just don't add up here. So our objection in terms of remedies, our objections suggested that the forest used the management area allocations from the partnership recommendations. I don't presume to speak for the partnership here, but but we believe that that would be a simple way for the plan to take account of this, this.

2:23:43.560 --> 2:24:14.710
Susannah Knox
Ex. Potential expansion into unrelated areas and obviate the need to dramatically expand the road system. And second, also a partnership recommendation. We believe the forest should commit to reducing the maintenance backlog before expanding the road system. This is also extremely important in light of ongoing Clean Water Act violations represented by the existing Rd system. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act requires road construction.

2:24:14.800 --> 2:24:39.770
Susannah Knox
And maintenance to comply with BMP's geared towards reducing water quality impacts and ensuring a product Organism passage and contemplating the kind of increase in the road in the road network that is contemplated by this plan without committing to reducing that maintenance backlog first is is a real problem and we also want to highlight that.

2:24:40.950 --> 2:25:9.620
Susannah Knox
Plans have to be fiscally realistic under the planning rule, relying on the same maintenance levels that have gotten us to this point with a bad maintenance backlog issue, which is what the plan does. 280 miles of maintenance Rd maintenance per year is not gonna work, and it's certainly not going to keep up with the expansion of the road system that the plan and the activity levels and the plan.

2:25:9.880 --> 2:25:20.150
Susannah Knox
Would require, I'll say another way to handle it in the plan would be to make a binding the EIS's assertion that the road system will not expand.

2:25:21.350 --> 2:25:50.820
Susannah Knox
The same as the EIS as I mentioned, assumes that it'll only minimally expand consistent with current rates of Rd building. You know you could put that in the plan as a requirement and that would that would allow the EIS to realistically rely on that. That still wouldn't address the maintenance backlog and we we strongly endorse the partnerships recommendation that they're being a trigger where maintenance backlog.

2:25:50.920 --> 2:25:53.900
Susannah Knox
Have to be reduced before the road system could be expanded.

2:25:55.20 --> 2:25:57.10
Susannah Knox
We also made some suggest.

2:25:56.130 --> 2:25:58.510
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hello 1 second one, one second just.

2:25:57.790 --> 2:25:59.800
Susannah Knox
Yeah, sure that the bus.

2:26:2.800 --> 2:26:3.260
Susannah Knox
Yeah.

2:26:0.740 --> 2:26:9.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But we can catch up a little bit. Ohh, I'm catching up. But I did wanna go back and just cover when you talk about inaccessible.

2:26:10.340 --> 2:26:10.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
What?

2:26:11.460 --> 2:26:13.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Could you could explain that just a little bit more of what?

2:26:14.650 --> 2:26:17.200
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
What you're defining as inaccessible.

2:26:18.740 --> 2:26:50.410
Susannah Knox
I would have to go back to see if the plan defines that it specifically. I mean these are not these are terms that the Forest Service itself uses. So I'm not, I'm not, you know, I'm using that map that I showed before was was used using the the Forest Services own data on inaccessible acreage. There's a table in the EIS that also shows accessible versus inaccessible acreage, but that that is my understanding is that it could not be reached.

2:26:50.830 --> 2:26:52.400
Susannah Knox
By the current Rd system.

2:26:54.390 --> 2:26:55.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good. Thank you.

2:26:54.870 --> 2:27:23.840
Nicholas Holshouser
It I I could just jump in and cause I can answer the question specifically, even though I didn't do the analysis just in my period analysis, the the inaccessible accessible is was a spatial exercise and anywhere from the Forest Service can correct me. But I know if there's anybody here who could jump in on that side, it was based on proximity to roads, steepness of slope, the other other factors and that's how they basically did the suitable versus unsuitable or accessible versus inaccessible. OK, just to just so you have that clarification.

2:27:25.620 --> 2:27:28.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So make sure you we were tracking. Thank you. Thank you, nick.

2:27:28.290 --> 2:27:35.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So can I just do a a process check with you Susanna home? Do you have a lot more? A little more on roads?

2:27:34.960 --> 2:27:57.400
Susannah Knox
That that is really the the the this mismatch between the activity levels and what the plan contemplates and what the IRS contemplates is the biggest point here. I had some more discussion of temporary roads that I'd like to get to at some point, but if we want to put that on hold for other people to participate or any questions you might have, that would be fine.

2:27:58.410 --> 2:28:3.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That's OK with you. I'll keep you in the queue, but I'll ask them another couple voices first.

2:28:3.340 --> 2:28:4.550
Susannah Knox
No problem. Thank you.

2:28:6.420 --> 2:28:9.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thanks. So then Jason, tui.

2:28:11.640 --> 2:28:37.70
Jason Totoiu
Hi Jason Totoy Center for biological diversity. We fully concur with SLC's remarks and particularly on the point of address need the need to address the maintenance backlog before new roads are constructed. There's one additional item though I like to to just put out there because I think there's ambiguity in the plan and uncertainty going forward, but.

2:28:38.220 --> 2:28:39.410
Jason Totoiu
That that's the.

2:28:40.280 --> 2:28:51.90
Jason Totoiu
We we really think the Forest Service needs to consider the impacts of climate change and when these new roads are constructed and maintained so that they are.

2:28:52.320 --> 2:28:56.60
Jason Totoiu
So we can respond to more intense storms and rainfall events.

2:28:58.150 --> 2:29:12.320
Jason Totoiu
That four service only states in the EIS and plan that'll be constructed. They'll be constructed based on a current standards. I think that's a little bit ambiguous. Is that current as of the plan that is?

2:29:13.260 --> 2:29:23.320
Jason Totoiu
Once it's finalized or is that an evolving process whereas you know new new technologies are developed and designs are?

2:29:24.540 --> 2:29:42.130
Jason Totoiu
Are are implemented that it will be keeping pace with the the with those new approaches. I think it's really significant because the EIS really clearly recognizes that quote. In recent years, large storm events have further impacted road conditions and road maintenance needs.

2:29:43.250 --> 2:29:45.960
Jason Totoiu
So I think we we all can generally agree that.

2:29:47.320 --> 2:30:15.70
Jason Totoiu
You know, at times we're getting a a tremendous lot more tremendous amount, more of of of rainfall and storms and that other types of natural disturbances. And then when these new roads are gonna be constructed, they need to be based on the the, the most current technology. So that to us was just something that we wanted to flag because we were concerned that this is the the language kind of reflects just a static.

2:30:16.40 --> 2:30:19.560
Jason Totoiu
Period or or or or or or approach. Thank you.

2:30:20.410 --> 2:30:43.870
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, Jason, so thank you. So maybe some clarity on that. Yeah. Yeah. And and Jason I and somewhat related to the plan, but it just just in general, we know we definitely hear you. We we saw the impacts of Tropical Storm Fred last year on and and actually we're embarking on work with a lot of partners that are on this call and others around how do we.

2:30:44.570 --> 2:31:9.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How do we have our roads and trails and other infrastructure more resilient to to climate change and the more intense and frequent storms that we know will see and we have some great examples where we've done that work with replacing old culverts with AOP and that sort of thing that was able to withstand that and provide that habitat and everything else. So anyway, just just to say that that's definitely high on our radar.

2:31:10.940 --> 2:31:13.900
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
To to to do that type of work going forward.

2:31:16.520 --> 2:31:19.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Jason. Megan sucked. Sutton. Welcome.

2:31:21.160 --> 2:31:29.530
Megan N. Sutton
Good morning. I'm Megan Sutton representing the Nantahala Episcope forest partnership. And you know, I really.

2:31:30.350 --> 2:31:35.230
Megan N. Sutton
Respect the great amount of care that is taken not only in.

2:31:36.500 --> 2:31:44.670
Megan N. Sutton
Putting forth, you know, creating a plan and then creating these, this series of three days of meetings about really broad ranging topics and so.

2:31:45.380 --> 2:31:53.50
Megan N. Sutton
My comments I feel like continually come back to the fact of the partnership is a such a broad and diverse.

2:31:53.910 --> 2:32:5.780
Megan N. Sutton
Group of organizations that in order for us to reach agreement on anything we we really had to weave together everything. And so roads are no different.

2:32:7.300 --> 2:32:8.350
Megan N. Sutton
I think that.

2:32:9.330 --> 2:32:11.550
Megan N. Sutton
In particular, the.

2:32:12.640 --> 2:32:25.180
Megan N. Sutton
The things that we're going to talk about this afternoon related to, you know, active management and what we have social license and collaborative support for how much active management and how much old growth protection.

2:32:25.660 --> 2:32:46.930
Megan N. Sutton
Umm this this piece about roads is really critical to those agreements and in particular when the, you know, tiered objectives, the idea of doing 2 tiers, you know what's fiscally capable and what's more capable with a lot of partner support. When this idea came forward.

2:32:48.70 --> 2:33:1.440
Megan N. Sutton
We created something that I think as a as a unique moniker within the partnership would, which is we called it a trigger. And you've you've heard someone say it today already and that was the the notion that in order to go from.

2:33:2.590 --> 2:33:33.120
Megan N. Sutton
Fiscally responsible, this tier one to, you know, a much more advanced program of work with partner resources. There needed to be some, some things that would make sure that we weren't kind of outpacing our capabilities. And I think that this piece around roads and in particular non-native invasive species which we haven't spoken about yet are the two that the partnership are really bringing forward in our objection.

2:33:33.950 --> 2:33:52.840
Megan N. Sutton
And in order to have collaborative support for all this active management that that we do have the support for on having taking a much closer look at roads and the maintenance level backlog, the back, I know that you'll have the budget to.

2:33:53.530 --> 2:34:4.110
Megan N. Sutton
To maintain 13% of your roads. And so I know this is no, this is not a news flash for any of the Forest Service on the call. You know, it's it's really it's a tough situation.

2:34:5.600 --> 2:34:18.760
Megan N. Sutton
But I think it's one that we really need to figure out how to address the fact that there is such a backlog and with increased activity as has been already mentioned.

2:34:19.430 --> 2:34:51.600
Megan N. Sutton
There will likely be more, you know, a greater Rd network expansion. And so for us to really have the collaborative support to be able to, you know kind of expand into these Tier 2 objectives, the road maintenance levels and dealing with this backlog not increasing and providing really explicit direction on how to deal with that is critical. So I just wanna go come forward and name that on behalf of the partnership and all the organizations that I'm here today representing.

2:34:53.880 --> 2:34:59.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You're the explicit direction would be on how to handle the maintenance backlog.

2:35:0.380 --> 2:35:29.460
Megan N. Sutton
Yeah. So in our 2020 comments, we go through a lot of the things that we've already talked about this morning. You know, we talked about aquatic Organism passage, steep slopes, vulnerable soils, temporary roads, highly erodible soils. We talked about all these things. But the thing that is kind of really top of mind for the Members and the partnership collectively is that the backlog of Rd maintenance not increase.

2:35:30.390 --> 2:35:53.410
Megan N. Sutton
Umm. And so we need to whether it that comes in the form of an objective saying that you know the road maintenance backlog could be reduced by a certain incremental amounts and so or an objective or you know there's there could be other ways to do that. You know our way is not necessarily the only way but I think that the thing that's really important to.

2:35:54.170 --> 2:35:59.580
Megan N. Sutton
To tell you, as you know, we've offered different ideas on objective or having like a road bank.

2:36:0.10 --> 2:36:6.280
Megan N. Sutton
Umm, like a you know where you could create a Bank of when certain.

2:36:7.280 --> 2:36:15.480
Megan N. Sutton
Roads are maintained or decommissioned. Then you could add new ones. You know there's there's different ideas and you have really creative people, so I'm sure that.

2:36:16.590 --> 2:36:26.960
Megan N. Sutton
You can figure out the best way to manage that, but I we're just not seeing that reflected in the plan at this point in time on how to to adequately deal with that.

2:36:29.620 --> 2:36:32.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you. Thank you. So Rd bank ideas.

2:36:33.570 --> 2:36:33.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.

2:36:34.770 --> 2:36:35.870
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
More.

2:36:37.330 --> 2:36:38.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
More solid take on.

2:36:41.430 --> 2:36:41.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

2:36:42.790 --> 2:36:46.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Either maintain it or decommission it.

2:36:46.680 --> 2:36:47.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Before.

2:36:48.650 --> 2:36:50.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Before you know adding anything.

2:36:52.80 --> 2:37:10.740
Megan N. Sutton
Yeah. And and like I said, so our our comments in 2020 did go into a number of like options on how how

you know, we see that you could do this, whether it's, you know, by finding more money, you know that would be more money for Rd maintenance, more infrastructure or other things.

2:37:11.920 --> 2:37:21.750
Megan N. Sutton
Figuring out how to decommission, to download, downgrade, relocate roads and proving you know all kinds of information that you could do within the travel.

2:37:23.240 --> 2:37:30.890
Megan N. Sutton
Within the tap. That's kind of, you know, slated to be done in the future there. So there's lots of different ways that it could be done, but I think it's just.

2:37:31.970 --> 2:37:32.320
Megan N. Sutton
But.

2:37:33.90 --> 2:37:43.840
Megan N. Sutton
The critical piece that I wanna make sure that it's noted is that it needs to be addressed more thoroughly than what's in the plan in order to have support to do a bigger program of work.

2:37:46.400 --> 2:37:47.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you.

2:37:48.370 --> 2:37:54.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So let me just call out anybody in the interested person category.

2:37:55.190 --> 2:37:58.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Wait, that would like to have a voice on roads?

2:38:5.920 --> 2:38:8.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then and then anybody on the phone?

2:38:9.850 --> 2:38:11.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, here's John, OK.

2:38:12.810 --> 2:38:13.160
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
OK.

2:38:12.880 --> 2:38:14.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
John polisher.

2:38:13.920 --> 2:38:16.130
John Culclasure
Yeah, I just wanna chime in and just just kind of.

2:38:16.220 --> 2:38:46.760
John Culclasure
Uh, double down on the importance of roads for access for sportsmen and women and all recreational users, and just a nobody had found a balance between sedimentation and and decommission roads, but I would encourage you all to not take roads off to system and need those for management capabilities and access. I think there's a real opportunity to work together with a lot of these interest groups that the Great American Outdoors Act and that we could submit some joint projects together to address the remedy these roads issues and trails issues that are causing sedimentation.

2:38:47.460 --> 2:39:17.350
John Culclasure
You know, once you pull road off the system, it's never gonna be added back and never gonna get back in there. So. And the other thing I'll just add is keep hearing a lot of comments about increased management capabilities. But yesterday I heard yesterday that we were cutting 650 acres and that's not gonna increase. So I don't really see a significant increase in harvest levels. And I think we could find find some ways to come together with some creative projects and stewardship contract and to address these Rd needs without taking them off the system and reducing access for force users.

2:39:22.530 --> 2:39:23.260
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Jenna.

2:39:24.640 --> 2:39:26.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And Nick, be Miller.

2:39:28.280 --> 2:39:43.610
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. Well, thank you. I really appreciate John's comment there and I feel like I just wanna use this opportunity to offer my support for kind of the Tier 2 objective levels that the Forest Service has established in the plan and I think.

2:39:44.850 --> 2:40:14.420
Nick Biemiller
To John's point, there are things that we can do creatively as partners with the Forest Service to hopefully help resolve this issue that a lot of folks are highlighting. You know, I think stewardship agreements are a great example of how we can actually take on a project as a partner to help achieve more young and open forest creation and then use the forest product revenue from that sale to pay for Rd maintenance, maybe help with that backlog. So I think I would just highlight kind of creative solutions.

2:40:14.620 --> 2:40:23.910
Nick Biemiller

And working with partners and specifically thinking about some of these tools like stewardship as maybe a pathway forward as win, win solutions to this issue.

2:40:28.700 --> 2:40:29.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, nick.

2:40:30.160 --> 2:40:33.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. And I say will harlins got his hand up. Welcome back will.

2:40:34.840 --> 2:40:59.50
Will Harlan
OK, thank you. Uh, another win, win solution that you've already have sitting in your laps and that incorporates, I think this whole discussion as a great case example is the craggy national scenic area, which has steep slopes, ephemeral streams and drinking water for the town of Weaverville and a road system that has been closed for almost a year now due to climate change.

2:41:0.370 --> 2:41:30.220
Will Harlan
Related storms but we have a solution already on the table that is widely supported by the city, the county and all of the stakeholders and widely supported by the public, and that is to create the craggy national scenic area which could bring additional funding to protect, to maintain and restore those roads, and already has that public buy in and support. So that is another alternative in contrast to what was just proposed, here is a workable solution that you already have on the ground.

2:41:30.300 --> 2:41:32.60
Will Harlan
That could address all of these issues.

2:41:33.370 --> 2:41:36.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks, Walter. I'm curious because it was brought up yesterday and you brought it up now.

2:41:37.920 --> 2:41:41.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is there a particular additional funding that you're knowledgeable of?

2:41:44.310 --> 2:41:44.810
Will Harlan
The.

2:41:45.470 --> 2:42:12.60
Will Harlan
Designation of a national scenic area in all of the other in many of the other cases across the country has brought with it additional funding and support. So I think with the Forest Services recommendation of the National Scenic Area, I think you would have bipartisan support in North Carolina and across the

country for creating this this 10th National Scenic area and you would get federal funding that would come along with it.

2:42:13.610 --> 2:42:16.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Yeah. Thank. Thank you for clarifying that. Appreciate that.

2:42:17.450 --> 2:42:21.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So one last call for people on the phone.

2:42:22.820 --> 2:42:24.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Then I wanna speak to Rhodes.

2:42:26.580 --> 2:42:27.450
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
Can someone hear me?

2:42:28.280 --> 2:42:28.990
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes.

2:42:33.690 --> 2:42:34.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sarah Brady.

2:42:29.820 --> 2:42:34.760
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
Ohh hi there. This is shared Brady. I finally got through. Listen, I just need to get.

2:42:35.620 --> 2:42:36.930
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
Shared Brady.

2:42:39.140 --> 2:42:39.480
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
Comma.

2:42:38.250 --> 2:42:39.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And who are you representing?

2:42:41.40 --> 2:42:43.810
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
Well, I'm one of the injectors for iheart Piska.

2:42:44.620 --> 2:42:45.720
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Great. OK. Thank you.

2:42:46.720 --> 2:42:55.710
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
OK, I just need to know and it's a definitive answer on when Stoney Fork Rd #63 and Big Abbey Rd #74 is gonna be open.

2:42:58.210 --> 2:42:58.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So.

2:42:57.970 --> 2:42:58.960
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
Does anyone know?

2:43:6.40 --> 2:43:6.460
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
Umm.

2:43:0.670 --> 2:43:10.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That's a good question. That kind of will talk about the the impacts of those roads in particular up there. We had impacts on other parts of the forest as well.

2:43:24.290 --> 2:43:24.770
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
Umm.

2:43:11.500 --> 2:43:32.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I I I can't give you a definitive answer and so this is this. This gives you a I think a sense of of some of the the challenges that we face is of how important that access is. I think John spoke to that in terms of not just for our management activities, but more importantly for for all the different users that you've used the for us so long way of saying.

2:43:41.0 --> 2:43:41.290
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
OK.

2:43:33.850 --> 2:43:50.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I think that the the Stony Fork Rd in particular has some pretty major damage in landslides. That's gonna take a a large amount of time to to figure out engineer what that solution would would be. I can't give you a definitive date on that. I think the the the other Rd.

2:43:50.480 --> 2:43:56.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The IT has some more minor damage, but I I can't give you definitive things, but.

2:43:58.30 --> 2:44:4.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

You know that that's the the the kind of the daily thing that that we deal with on the forest is when we do close the road.

2:44:5.320 --> 2:44:17.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, we we start getting calls very quickly after that. And so it's always a balancing act on that maintenance and and and the thing. So anyway we'll we'll follow up with you and I'll have my district Ranger.

2:44:24.580 --> 2:44:24.990
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
OK.

2:44:19.160 --> 2:44:28.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Reach back out to, to to to look at that. But I'll just say we are bringing on a a recovery team.

2:44:38.240 --> 2:44:38.470
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
OK.

2:44:30.150 --> 2:44:40.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
To to help with the with the impacts from and the recovery from from Tropical Storm Fred. And we wanna make sure as we do that.

2:44:41.810 --> 2:44:52.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I know we're a little off topic, but as we do that to, I think John's point, we're not just replacing in kind stuff that blew out last year, but we're we're working with partners to improve.

2:44:53.560 --> 2:45:0.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That, that, that, that infrastructure, roads and trails so that the next time we get the storm, it's gonna be more resilient.

2:45:1.950 --> 2:45:3.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, sure.

2:45:1.380 --> 2:45:8.250
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
OK. And then also are we, are we allowed to even walk up there or is it just closed to pedestrian?

2:45:9.10 --> 2:45:9.770
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
Traffic too.

2:45:20.550 --> 2:45:21.720
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
Yeah, that's Walker 3.

2:45:10.830 --> 2:45:21.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm, I think uh will might be able to speak to this more. I think at least the road as I understand there's trails that, that, that cross definitely the one that goes up to the Douglas falls. So that should be open to pedestrian.

2:45:23.70 --> 2:45:23.590
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
OK.

2:45:30.180 --> 2:45:30.740
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
OK.

2:45:21.920 --> 2:45:31.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ohh Stony Fork, I wouldn't really recommend people getting too far up there because it is a it is a messed up there with with LAN landslides.

2:45:33.330 --> 2:45:33.570
91a26cb9-7335-4e57-820e-3469e3a892f7
OK.

2:45:32.530 --> 2:45:34.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Well, do you wanna address that a little bit further?

2:45:35.620 --> 2:45:48.940
Will Harlan
Yeah, that's absolutely right, James. Thank you. And just to bring this back to to the topic that we're discussing, this is a clear example of why JSON's recommendation, recommendations and susannah's are so important here.

2:45:49.900 --> 2:46:19.170
Will Harlan
We can't expand the road system without addressing this maintenance backlog 1st, and to do so is is, is reckless and and not supported. So we strongly endorse what SELC and the center have put forth about addressing the maintenance backlog 1st and getting those roads up to standard before it expanding the road system by up to 203 hundred miles over the life of the plan.

2:46:22.320 --> 2:46:31.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right, I'd like to go back to Susanna. You, we deferred some of what you had to say and we're what do we have about 10 minutes left now till lunch.

2:46:32.150 --> 2:46:45.450
Susannah Knox
Not that you need to take all 10 minutes. I just wanted to make sure you have enough time. Thank you. I don't think I will take all 10 minutes just to quickly address some points that were raised in the in the the last conversation.

2:46:46.670 --> 2:47:16.580
Susannah Knox
I think to the extent that the plan relies on money from partners and funding from partners using stewardship, stewardship agreements and future timber projects to address the maintenance backlog that needs to be an enforceable part of the plan. So we we certainly support, we understand the severe fiscal restraints that have led to the current maintenance backlog.

2:47:16.700 --> 2:47:47.600
Susannah Knox
And we support the the use of partner resources to address that. But the EIS even refers to the fact that timber projects will will come with improvements to roads, to Rd maintenance and improvements that will help water and soil resources. But there is nothing in the plan that actually is enforceable and will ensure that that will happen. So again we have this issue where the EIS.

2:47:47.940 --> 2:48:17.750
Susannah Knox
Is relying on something that's not actually in the plan, so to the extent that the forest wants to use partnership resources and stewardship projects and timber projects to to address that maintenance backlog that needs to happen, that needs to be in the plan. And I would just recall that one of the photos I showed earlier was to a legacy Rd issue that was creating an aquatic Organism passage blockage.

2:48:18.0 --> 2:48:51.330
Susannah Knox
And it was actually a a photo from monitoring of a stewardship project. It was the Mulberry Globe Stewardship project and that legacy Rd issue that fish passage blockage was not remedied with that project and that will continue to happen unless there are enforceable plan standards that require new projects to go back and help out with that maintenance backlog. I also just wanted to mention quickly that the planning rule requires plan components that will establish a sustainable Rd system.

2:48:51.530 --> 2:49:21.690
Susannah Knox
So it doesn't matter that every existing Rd has a use or a constituency. If you expand the area where roads are needed, that's just not a way to move to a sustainable system and that's why we need all these components that we've already suggested in the plan itself that would move towards a more sustainable system. So that that's just a response to the conversation that just took place with some, you know, bigger picture issues that I didn't bring up before, but.

2:49:22.760 --> 2:49:32.190
Susannah Knox

As far as temporary roads, we do want to see enforceable plans standards, ensuring that temporary Rd impacts.

2:49:32.270 --> 2:49:35.420
Susannah Knox
Umm are are ameliorated?

2:49:35.840 --> 2:50:7.190
Susannah Knox
Umm, we don't many temporary roads as it as it stands now are used for repeated entries and they're not truly temporary, and this is particularly a problem because when they're built and when they're maintained, their not subjected to the same engineering standards as permanent system roads. So what temporary roads need to be truly temporary and that needs to be part of a standard in the plan, they can't be subject to repeated entries. They also the decommissioning of temporary roads.

2:50:7.270 --> 2:50:16.750
Susannah Knox
And we appreciate that the plan does have some language committing to decommissioning temporary roads, but that language, we believe needs to be more specific.

2:50:18.30 --> 2:50:36.330
Susannah Knox
And they have the temporary Rd decommissioning has to incorporate the national core BMP's and explain that return to resource production for purposes of this plan means that soils are stabilized, aquatic Organism passage issues are addressed.

2:50:37.450 --> 2:50:57.290
Susannah Knox
And non-native invasive species are are absent, and while characteristic species are able to be reestablished and I have a couple I will just share really quickly, some visuals of a recent project where that was not the case. This is upper santella.

2:50:57.920 --> 2:51:4.940
Susannah Knox
A temporary Rd cuts so you can see here that this is after the project is closed.

2:51:6.20 --> 2:51:35.160
Susannah Knox
And there's essentially a big Cliff of dirt over here that is not stabilized. This is an example of a temporary or permanent impact from a temporary Rd that was not resolved when the project was closed. And this is from the same project. This is erosion from a temporary Rd cut. So we need to see impacts like this ameliorated for temporary roads. And we need to see a plan, standards that would.

2:51:35.770 --> 2:51:36.550
Susannah Knox
Address that.

2:51:38.520 --> 2:51:39.430
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hold on one SEC.

2:51:40.730 --> 2:51:41.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Just take a pause.

2:51:48.140 --> 2:51:49.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks for giving me mouse.

2:51:50.230 --> 2:51:56.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Making a note on what you just said, Susanna said. I got it. OK, appreciate that. Continue, please.

2:51:58.20 --> 2:52:4.250
Susannah Knox
That is actually all I had. Unless you have any questions for me about the temporary Rd issue or anything else.

2:52:7.390 --> 2:52:11.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, I think you laid it out very clearly. I didn't have any questions to clarify on that. Thank you.

2:52:12.930 --> 2:52:13.480
Susannah Knox
Thank you.

2:52:13.470 --> 2:52:15.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, thanks. Thanks Susanna.

2:52:15.950 --> 2:52:19.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Nick Hotel, how's your has your has his hand up?

2:52:25.430 --> 2:52:26.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, yeah.

2:52:20.520 --> 2:52:30.50
Nicholas Holshouser
I just. I raised my hand and I've requested input from interested parties a few times. I I have some interested party on this, not not a primary objector.

2:52:31.590 --> 2:52:41.440
Nicholas Holshouser

I I did wanna perhaps just give some first some some personal experience on the ground experience related to a specific project which is in scoping right now.

2:52:42.540 --> 2:52:48.570
Nicholas Holshouser
The looks and project it's been expressed. You know about decommissioning of roads and losing Rd access etcetera.

2:52:49.750 --> 2:52:54.180
Nicholas Holshouser
To to to, to characterize what the Forest Service is proposed there.

2:52:55.850 --> 2:53:15.170
Nicholas Holshouser
I'm I'm a user of a lot of the roads in the forest myself for for birding, for naturalist activities. In that case, the proposed decommissionings are not any kind of Rd that anybody's gonna access. Anyway. I I don't want there to be a mischaracterization that that the Forest Service is proposing to decommission.

2:53:16.30 --> 2:53:47.160
Nicholas Holshouser
You know, roads are significantly. I haven't seen any evidence of that, that, that there's there decommissioning roads which are significantly used by users, whether it's bikers or equestrians or anything, is that if that project is an example, the roads which are decommissioned are are, are actually just old woods roads that exist on maps and that they're they're rightfully decommissioning because no person is is really gonna use that road. So I thought I didn't. There was some discussion around, you know, limiting access through decommissioning, in my experience.

2:53:47.640 --> 2:53:53.100
Nicholas Holshouser
In projects, but current and past is that they're they're not decommissioning roads, which are.

2:53:53.900 --> 2:53:56.380
Nicholas Holshouser
Significantly used by any user base.

2:53:58.940 --> 2:53:59.310
Nicholas Holshouser
Thanks.

2:53:59.120 --> 2:54:1.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks for adding that, Nick. Thanks for clarification.

2:54:2.950 --> 2:54:8.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, so anything else on anything we covered this morning before we go out to lunch?

2:54:11.180 --> 2:54:14.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right. So I'm sorry, miss it, Nick.

2:54:16.600 --> 2:54:35.380
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. Thanks. I just wanted to kind of respond to the comment about temporary roads and kind of drive home. My previous point about the efficacy of the States forest practices guidelines and BMP's on protecting water quality. And so the BMP.

2:54:35.460 --> 2:54:35.990
Nick Biemiller
The.

2:54:37.580 --> 2:54:52.810
Nick Biemiller
Manual does have clear direction on how to handle skid trails and temporary roads in it, and again, the results from the North Carolina Forest Services analysis clearly shows that when those practices are adopted, water quality is protected. So.

2:54:53.970 --> 2:55:10.110
Nick Biemiller
It would be hard for me to support something that goes above and beyond what is highlighted in that manual as a standard or guideline in the forest plan, given that the evidence shows that those practices in the BMP manual are effective.

2:55:12.810 --> 2:55:14.100
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, nick. Thank you.

2:55:14.860 --> 2:55:20.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, so let's close out the morning. The two of you, anything that's leftover?

2:55:21.270 --> 2:55:21.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Beyond.

2:55:27.30 --> 2:55:27.350
Susannah Knox
Hey.

2:55:24.960 --> 2:55:52.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And he closeout comments. Yeah. Thanks for the conversation today. I think, you know, it was good to hear multiple points of view and. And, you know, I know we all know this. But, you know, the one of the founding reasons that we have a National Forest is is to ensure cleaning abundant water. So I know how important this is, and especially in the light of climate change, I think several folks mentioned that.

2:55:53.760 --> 2:55:56.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So, Susanna, did you have a last comment before we break?

2:55:58.320 --> 2:56:16.660
Susannah Knox
I'm so sorry. I won't keep us too long. I know everybody's probably hungry at this point, but I I did want to mention that the plan differs a lot of the this analysis of the road system to the travel analysis plan and you know.

2:56:17.470 --> 2:56:23.700
Susannah Knox
Obviously, we look forward to engaging in that process, but the planning rule requires that plan components.

2:56:25.310 --> 2:56:54.300
Susannah Knox
Move towards a sustainable Rd system now and that it's important for all of this planning to happen at once as part of the Forest Plan because one of the planning rules other requirements is to have a plan that's integrated and fiscally realistic and having activity levels increasing to the extent we've talked about in one part of the plan and not addressing the road impacts and travel planning.

2:56:54.600 --> 2:57:9.890
Susannah Knox
Uh, that would come with those activity levels. It is just it, it doesn't match up and you can't defer that analysis. It has to all be part of the same planning process. So that was just another thing that again we mentioned in our written objection, but I wanted to.

2:57:11.910 --> 2:57:13.20
Susannah Knox
Touch on that here.

2:57:15.380 --> 2:57:16.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Very good. Thank you, Susanna.

2:57:18.150 --> 2:57:22.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right. Are we ready to break? Yeah. I just wanted to say thanks for the.

2:57:23.420 --> 2:57:25.270
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The the the dialogue.

2:57:25.870 --> 2:57:34.100
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That this morning, and I'm really it's really helpful. I really feel like it's good. I picture that there's a a well.

2:57:34.790 --> 2:57:58.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That we're putting our thoughts into and I really appreciate people taking the time when I have questions to clarify and and if I've I've missed something, you're being very, very kind to to fill in the gap without saying where are you paying attention. So thank you. Thank you for being gracious as you work through questions I have that might seem odd or out of place at times, but it's it's helping me.

2:57:59.220 --> 2:58:5.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
In to hear more, so I appreciate that and I really appreciate the the the, the.

2:58:5.830 --> 2:58:8.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Does the wealth of information and I I can't help but thinking going to lunches.

2:58:10.700 --> 2:58:28.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The the enormity of what we do and what's before us, and we pick any one topic and we can dig into that and and how much there is to do and how much time there is to do it. So and the road discussions definitely bring that out but each of the discussions bringing that out so.

2:58:29.420 --> 2:58:38.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, welcome, welcome and thank you for being part of our world there and help us pack with these issues and figure them out. Thank you.

2:58:39.660 --> 2:58:55.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And so if if you are here this morning and you're not coming back this afternoon, thank you very much. Really, really appreciate you being here. We may have a a different cast of characters for this afternoon where we're gonna focus on forest management and ecological integrity.

2:58:55.990 --> 2:58:59.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And we will resume at 12:30.

2:58:59.900 --> 2:59:0.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks.

2:59:1.770 --> 2:59:2.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you very much.

3:11:10.0 --> 3:11:11.190
Maggie Carton (Guest)
Holy cow.

3:11:15.220 --> 3:11:15.780
Maggie Carton (Guest)
Yeah.

3:11:18.410 --> 3:11:20.250
Maggie Carton (Guest)
OK. Yeah.

3:11:30.470 --> 3:11:36.130
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Just a heads up that someone not muted. I'm not sure if you want your activities to be heard by other folks.

3:56:0.500 --> 3:56:1.900
Sam Evans
Nick, you don't look that bad to me.

3:56:4.10 --> 3:56:7.720
Nick Biemiller
I was just going to say, man, you like you got the blazer on and everything. Look at you. You're looking sharp.

3:56:9.110 --> 3:56:11.950
Sam Evans
I just hope if I get COVID I bounce back as fast as you.

3:56:14.270 --> 3:56:16.870
Nick Biemiller
I don't know, man. It had me under her for the past couple days and.

3:56:17.690 --> 3:56:19.670
Nick Biemiller
Finally, feel like I have my head out of the water.

3:56:20.790 --> 3:56:21.50
64d1acc9-b9a9-43e0-913a-eddaeb8cb18b
Yeah.

3:56:22.190 --> 3:56:26.300
Nick Biemiller
But that's only because I just took some word dayquil and I would prevent too, so.

3:56:27.590 --> 3:56:27.970
Sam Evans
Nice.

3:56:30.80 --> 3:56:30.900
Nick Biemiller
But I appreciate it.

3:57:23.970 --> 3:57:24.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

3:57:26.280 --> 3:57:29.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right. I think we're going back here.

3:57:40.900 --> 3:57:42.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We do have your head right on.

3:57:43.770 --> 3:57:44.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know.

3:57:45.950 --> 3:57:46.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Or.

3:57:55.530 --> 3:57:55.800
64d1acc9-b9a9-43e0-913a-eddaeb8cb18b
OK.

3:58:9.160 --> 3:58:9.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Get them all.

3:58:19.20 --> 3:58:19.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We are.

3:58:20.760 --> 3:58:21.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
They got it.

3:58:23.210 --> 3:58:24.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Afternoon ahead.

3:58:27.40 --> 3:58:30.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I think, Nancy, we just have some nice sliced like topics for this afternoon.

3:58:32.480 --> 3:58:38.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, big a big complicated topic, I think is what it is. 1 Just one, one topic, complicated topic.

3:58:38.970 --> 3:58:46.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ohh anybody knew online this afternoon that has not been with us before.

3:58:46.760 --> 3:58:49.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Raise your hand if that's true.

3:58:52.840 --> 3:58:54.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Done. OK.

3:58:58.660 --> 3:59:0.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And Sean, were you with us yesterday?

3:59:2.70 --> 3:59:4.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No. So entirely new, OK.

3:59:3.300 --> 3:59:8.970
Brogan, Sean
I know we're we're just joining us for this session this afternoon.

3:59:10.30 --> 3:59:17.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, great. So we're gonna just run through some of the opening comments to make sure you have the benefit of hearing those that we covered this morning.

3:59:18.940 --> 3:59:19.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Not start with Rick.

3:59:20.900 --> 3:59:37.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Again thanks everybody for being here. Thanks for taking the time and those of you who have been with us in the morning and and yesterday thank you for your continued involvement. For those joining us. So I'll cover a couple things that we talked about in the morning, not in his great detail, but try to hit some of the high points.

3:59:38.680 --> 3:59:47.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Again, thank you for bringing your objections forward. This helps us in our plan development and.

3:59:50.50 --> 3:59:52.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Some of the things I wanted to mention were there be.

3:59:54.120 --> 3:59:55.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
What we're doing is.

3:59:58.0 --> 4:0:3.200
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
This cut this concentrated time together is to for to help me go ahead.

4:0:0.770 --> 4:0:3.970
Megan N. Sutton
Hey, Rick, we can't hear you if you're talking to us, you're muted.

4:0:5.200 --> 4:0:6.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Oh oh.

4:0:7.470 --> 4:0:8.940
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I can hear Rick just fine.

4:0:8.790 --> 4:0:9.210
Nick Biemiller
Yeah.

4:0:8.810 --> 4:0:9.320
Ben Prater
I can hear.

4:0:8.800 --> 4:0:9.470
Sam Evans
Back in here.

4:0:12.150 --> 4:0:14.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So how was that Megan who said she couldn't hear?

4:0:16.710 --> 4:0:17.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You hear us now?

4:0:19.910 --> 4:0:22.680
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes, OK. OK, good. Well.

4:0:23.900 --> 4:0:25.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Didn't really miss much, Megan.

4:0:25.610 --> 4:0:36.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Alright, but I get into the more of the meat of things is purpose of this meeting is to help me fully understand some more more of a complex issues raised.

4:0:37.420 --> 4:0:43.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And especially hearing your potential remedies and and ideas on resolutions.

4:0:46.30 --> 4:0:54.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We're not. We're not going through every objection in this meeting. I've I've selected a broad array of issues covering multiple topics.

4:0:55.120 --> 4:0:56.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Over the next couple days.

4:0:57.340 --> 4:1:28.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And again, really wanna focus on as much as we can on those proposed remedies. I understand if some context is necessary, but with the time we have the rich rich dialogue opportunity we have is that that leaning forward and focusing on potential resolutions and again it helps helps me understand things I yesterday mentioned today is I can read but it really helps me to listen to here and and understand and and appreciate people as as I've asked questions and.

4:1:28.350 --> 4:1:30.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Your thoughtful responses on those.

4:1:31.200 --> 4:1:33.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And again, just to.

4:1:33.520 --> 4:1:41.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
A couple things I wanted to mention. I've already decided to exercise my discretion to extend the 90 day review period.

4:1:41.890 --> 4:1:48.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Also after this meeting this week, I'll I'll be preparing my final written response to the objectors.

4:1:49.660 --> 4:1:52.630
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That response or reflect my review of the objections.

4:1:53.760 --> 4:2:3.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I it'll have. It may include instructions to James to address changes I find necessary to address your objection issues.

4:2:4.790 --> 4:2:11.540
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
While at the same time improving the final plan decision, the plan and supporting documentation.

4:2:13.270 --> 4:2:14.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then.

4:2:14.780 --> 4:2:36.540
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
My final written response will address all of the issues raised as permitted by our regulations. I wish you one response to all objectors and interested parties, combining combining like issues under general topic areas and my response will be the final decision of the US Department of Agriculture regarding your objections.

4:2:37.760 --> 4:2:43.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you again and thanks for the the discussion and dialogue we've had so far.

4:2:44.380 --> 4:2:47.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And things to do have anything you wanted to add?

4:2:48.640 --> 4:2:59.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, I I thought the dialogue this morning was good, so looking forward to to some good conversations today. Yeah, and just a reminder that this we we're trying to use a conversational.

4:3:0.810 --> 4:3:22.870
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Mode throughout this so following threads common threads rather than jumping from one topic to another, the best that we can. It's a little bit hard for me to know that when we've got hands that are raised way in advance. I don't know if it's it's a hand that's following the thread or an original hand, but I can ask questions to make sure that we're keeping some continuity. The best we can.

4:3:23.610 --> 4:3:25.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then this afternoon.

4:3:26.920 --> 4:3:47.430
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Forest management and ecological integrity is the is the big theme and for those of you that have agendas, nothing different here except that early serial habitat. We sort of think will be covered under natural range of variability that in that first first chunk of subtopics what we want to get to oldbrook.

4:3:48.150 --> 4:3:54.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Fire and fuels and timber suitability and timber harvest. Can we move that down just a tad so that this line?

4:3:55.530 --> 4:3:57.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That comes in here just a tad.

4:4:0.470 --> 4:4:4.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It's down as far as it happens. All right. There you go. That's good.

4:4:5.460 --> 4:4:8.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Never should have come harvest so.

4:4:9.360 --> 4:4:21.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I think in this case it just like this morning. There's so much overlap, it may be hard to be linear in or thinking about how we're going through this, but we'll just try to.

4:4:22.990 --> 4:4:32.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Do the best I can to keep things moving and making sure we're gonna cover it all and then half day that we have any any questions or comments on how this has been working or?

4:4:33.30 --> 4:4:34.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Could be working better.

4:4:36.530 --> 4:4:37.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Process wise.

4:4:40.670 --> 4:4:42.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, great.

4:4:43.120 --> 4:4:43.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sam.

4:4:45.100 --> 4:4:55.230
Sam Evans
I just wanted to flag, you know, and I think in in my mind, there's sort of a couple like there, maybe the old growth issue kind of stands apart a little bit, it's, you know, and I think just to flag for y'all.

4:4:54.730 --> 4:4:55.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes.

4:4:56.930 --> 4:5:4.20
Sam Evans
I plan to cover the other topics on this list and a colleague is gonna step in when we get to the ultra section.

4:5:5.210 --> 4:5:6.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, that's great to know. Appreciate that.

4:5:8.200 --> 4:5:17.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right. And we do have lead objectors, we know that are representing lots of people and so we it might be good to start out with that.

4:5:18.500 --> 4:5:20.510
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
At the top of the hour here so.

4:5:21.250 --> 4:5:21.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It should.

4:5:23.140 --> 4:5:25.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
SLC Sam, would you like to leave?

4:5:27.20 --> 4:5:36.900
Sam Evans
Yeah, I'd. I'd love to cause I've done a lot of thinking between yesterday and today about how we can be efficient and and how we in SLC at least can be responsive to the.

4:5:37.680 --> 4:6:5.450
Sam Evans
Request to focus as much as possible on solutions you know we have a lot of technical ground to cover here. It's really important for us to dig into these topics in some detail. You know, I do think there is sort of a simple core problem. The planning rule requires the plan to include components that will move us toward ecological integrity, and it doesn't. But I think the solutions are also pretty simple. Just as simple as the problem is. And that's adopting planning components that are gonna do that.

4:6:6.330 --> 4:6:18.10
Sam Evans
And you know, this is a technical issue. It's also a really charged one because there are a lot of different perspectives on the value of using an RV, you know versus managing for single species recruits.

4:6:18.660 --> 4:6:42.520
Sam Evans
They're different perspectives on species composition and whether that's something we really need to worry about, different perspectives on ideal levels of wildlife populations and habitat. Those

perspectives, I'm sure, are going to clash in this session, and I think I just want to flag at the top that it may seem at times during this, this this session that we we have a gap that will never close, that we're very far apart.

4:6:44.120 --> 4:6:48.320
Sam Evans
I do think that the plan can accommodate all the perspectives in this room.

4:6:50.530 --> 4:7:5.370
Sam Evans
So you know, for example, I think some of the discussion is likely to revolve around our timber harvest levels too high, you know, but I think it's important to note that many conservation groups have supported high levels of part of this. If they're harnessed to meet ecological restoration goals.

4:7:6.270 --> 4:7:16.100
Sam Evans
And so that's, you know, that's for me, that's a note of optimism. I hope it lands that way. Yes, these are gonna be really important questions. And for many of us, the reasons.

4:7:16.760 --> 4:7:19.480
Sam Evans
Are just as important as the plane components themselves.

4:7:20.420 --> 4:7:25.990
Sam Evans
So, you know, I think there's no substitute for kind of getting into those reasons a little bit as we go.

4:7:27.490 --> 4:7:33.890
Sam Evans
To make progress, I do think that we kind of have to have first a common understanding of what the plan does and doesn't do.

4:7:34.930 --> 4:7:39.800
Sam Evans
So you know, like I said, I've been thinking a lot about, like, how to how to, how do we get there today.

4:7:40.940 --> 4:7:43.810
Sam Evans
And I I wanted to maybe start by.

4:7:44.600 --> 4:7:51.940
Sam Evans
Just giving a few background facts about the plan, what the plan does and doesn't do and and and what the models are.

4:7:53.530 --> 4:8:22.80
Sam Evans
You know, hopefully we'll all be in agreement generally about what these facts are so we can move forward with the discussion more quickly if we're not, you know, I'm happy to answer questions and I

think we could, you know, spend as much time as needed kind of getting into the details. But I guess what I would say is I think if it's OK with you, I'd like to just sort of do that first and see see where we're at at that don't mean this to be argumentative at all. I really I can say that right, I have lots of arguments, but I can save them if that is a.

4:8:23.230 --> 4:8:26.740
Sam Evans
Maybe if if others think that is an efficient way to get get going.

4:8:29.490 --> 4:8:33.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, it's, it's it's, it's jump in. OK, great. Well, I'll start.

4:8:33.90 --> 4:8:43.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And say and then in the same way, say I'm in the same way we did it this morning. If it feels like there's a lot of airspace being taken up by 1 voice, we might ask you to take a pause and come back.

4:8:44.520 --> 4:8:45.470
Sam Evans
Yeah, that's great.

4:8:44.470 --> 4:8:45.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Not knowing how much you got off.

4:8:46.560 --> 4:8:48.220
Sam Evans
Yeah, and and if I'm not seeing the thing.

4:8:46.630 --> 4:8:48.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And you can also periodically I may wanna.

4:8:50.370 --> 4:8:55.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Periodically, I may I may need to pause just to make sure I'm I'm staying with you too.

4:8:56.550 --> 4:8:57.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright.

4:8:57.850 --> 4:8:58.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The thank you.

4:8:56.860 --> 4:9:26.750
Sam Evans
Thanks. Very. Yeah. And so yeah, I'll just dive in then and I'll stop me when whenever the the, the first

thing I'd like to point out is that the old plan was under the old planning rule which was developed around ideas of economic efficiency and then the new planning rule shifted that paradigm to one of ecological integrity. So ecological integrity, defined as the condition of being within the NRV for the dimensions of composition, structure, process and connectivity.

4:9:28.180 --> 4:9:57.950
Sam Evans
You know, it's important to note that every other responsibility from timber to recreation kind of takes a second chair to that first one in the planning room. That's also, I think, since we're talking a lot about wildlife in this session, important to know that that's also how the planning rule addresses wildlife diversity for storing ecological integrity is the primary course filter. So when you have ecological integrity, you have large patches for the young forest associates. You have small gaps for the small gap associates all go through the old growth associates.

4:9:58.70 --> 4:10:2.400
Sam Evans
But late closed forest for the Interior Forest associates so.

4:10:3.30 --> 4:10:32.930
Sam Evans
And you know and and we know I think maybe getting into the real meat of the plan, we know what ecological integrity means for our forests, the, the this guy did an excellent job of defining ecological integrity at the echoes on scale. And literally no one has objected to that. You know, it's been on the table for years now. And and. And it has, it has not drawn any criticism because it's based on the best available science. And it was done in a way that.

4:10:33.10 --> 4:10:35.860
Sam Evans
I think everybody recognizes the the validity of it.

4:10:36.950 --> 4:10:38.530
Sam Evans
But the the.

4:10:39.710 --> 4:10:57.400
Sam Evans
Based on the estimates of probability of disturbance in each goes on the force have done the separate thing which is to model what the disturbance, what serial stages disturbance would produce in each of those ecozones. So for example code forest or model is having 4 to 5% young forests.

4:10:58.20 --> 4:11:2.230
Sam Evans
Whereas some of the drier forest types have much more young forests.

4:11:2.980 --> 4:11:9.10
Sam Evans
And then the forest ran a departure analysis to determine which ecozones needed the most young forest creation.

4:11:11.0 --> 4:11:28.580
Sam Evans
The percentages of young forests modeled for all of the ecozones were aggregated to create sort of a landscape scale gauge for how much young forest we ought to have under NRV. And that came out as a range from 60,000 to 90,000 acres on the landscape.

4:11:31.300 --> 4:11:47.390
Sam Evans
So here this is where we might, I think have a few more questions. So the the plan as it stands, the final plan doesn't have components and at least in the suitable management areas to move toward to use the timber harvest program to move towards reference conditions at the ecozone scale.

4:11:48.150 --> 4:12:6.940
Sam Evans
The plan aims instead to balance the age classes at the landscape scale, so creating a lot of large patches of young forests in the Covic ecosystem under the final plan would count as progress toward meeting that 60 to 90,000 acre landscape goal, even if it moved ecozones away from there.

4:12:7.760 --> 4:12:27.180
Sam Evans
Ecological reference conditions. So like, did that mean maybe put the same point a little differently in the old plan the forests had the discretion on suitable lands to do everything up to and including timber production. You know, things to focus on priorities like economics and volume and balancing age classes or to address restoration needs through an ecosystem lens.

4:12:28.10 --> 4:12:29.810
Sam Evans
In the new plan has that same.

4:12:30.710 --> 4:12:36.950
Sam Evans
Full spectrum of flexibility built into it into the, you know, into the timber program for the suitable base.

4:12:39.520 --> 4:12:45.380
Sam Evans
Maybe I'll just take a breath there because I think that's a lot to start with and make sure that we're kind of all tracking so far.

4:12:46.870 --> 4:12:53.630
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Wanted to check when you said the final plan doesn't have planning components. What was the next couple things you said there?

4:12:54.350 --> 4:13:22.270
Sam Evans
Yeah, for in the suitable management areas. So the the 58% of the Forest Citizen matrix and interface, there are no components to use the timber program to move towards ecozone scale reference conditions. So instead the you know the the goal there is to move toward that landscape scale measure

of young forest habitat. So it is, it doesn't matter where you put according to the plan, it doesn't matter where you put.

4:13:24.560 --> 4:13:29.210
Sam Evans
Young forest habitat, whether it's in Cove or dry forests it.

4:13:29.940 --> 4:13:34.610
Sam Evans
It is still contributing to the to that overall landscape level measure.

4:13:37.650 --> 4:13:39.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, thank you. Sure.

4:13:41.490 --> 4:13:41.840
Sam Evans
That.

4:13:41.170 --> 4:13:43.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ready to move on with Sam's comments?

4:13:43.350 --> 4:14:10.590
Sam Evans
Sure. Yeah. The the plan, I think does it does another thing. It explains why that's the case. The forests explained in the record of decision that the the reason for focusing on that sort of purely kind of structural lens for locating harvest and not worrying as much about ecozone scale reference conditions was because that was necessary to have a viable timber sale program and nominally.

4:14:11.230 --> 4:14:11.720
Sam Evans
That's.

4:14:12.720 --> 4:14:17.580
Sam Evans
That's I think that's that page 56 of the record of decision if you're, if you're looking for it.

4:14:18.530 --> 4:14:23.430
Sam Evans
There I here's another point that's pretty important to me there, the.

4:14:24.330 --> 4:14:41.690
Sam Evans
We looked through the plan and we cannot find any limits on the overall or cumulative use of harvests that would that would cause departure from an Oregon scale. So let's say you did 100% of your harvest in the code ecozones. There's nothing in the plan that says there's anything wrong with that.

4:14:42.430 --> 4:15:9.120
Sam Evans
And you know, I think as again speaking for SLC and our objectors, you know, who are also members of the partnership, we had a lot of conversation about this in the partnership and everyone recognized that the Forest Service needed flexibility. We also worried that that doing the same things over and over again and the same ecozones could be damaging cumulatively to our ability to make progress towards ecological integrity.

4:15:12.380 --> 4:15:16.910
Sam Evans
And we and we don't see any anything in the plan to sort of to balance those needs.

4:15:18.610 --> 4:15:38.470
Sam Evans
The here's another one project level analysis under the plant are not going to consider whether harvest is contributing to NYRB. So we've talked some about can we just figure this out at the project level, but in the response to comments the the the forest were really clear the and this is a direct quote that in ARB should not be evaluated at the project level.

4:15:42.390 --> 4:15:42.890
Sam Evans
That's that's.

4:15:43.790 --> 4:15:44.390
Sam Evans
Yes.

4:15:42.100 --> 4:15:44.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So can I just just do a process?

4:15:45.430 --> 4:15:54.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Got Josh, do you wanna come in on one of Sam's points or is this something new? I do want to come in on one of the Sam's points, but I'm not quite prepared to do so yet.

4:15:55.320 --> 4:15:56.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, alright.

4:15:58.60 --> 4:15:58.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Go ahead, Sam.

4:15:59.380 --> 4:16:29.170
Sam Evans
OK, I'll keep tracking and I'm I'm almost there. And and then I'll be with you know, glad to take cues from y'all where to go next the it's so the I wanted to give a little bit context for what the model issues

are that we're gonna talk about later. The forest used I mentioned the NRV model earlier and that was sort of a way to develop a serial condition reference conditions by ecozone which were aggregated into that 60 to 90,000 acre reference condition for landscape.

4:16:29.250 --> 4:16:44.900
Sam Evans
They'll young forest. A separate model was used to estimate the effects of implementing the plan in the future. So the spectrum model is is that we'll talk about a lot is the foundation for the analysis of effects in the future of the plans, veg management components.

4:16:47.150 --> 4:16:47.820
Sam Evans
And then.

4:16:49.470 --> 4:17:0.280
Sam Evans
Really close to finishing up here that I I think I I wanna share a visual for this one case. I think it's important. You know, I've I've been a little surprised by the number of people I've heard say that.

4:17:1.870 --> 4:17:11.260
Sam Evans
And the the this plan isn't gonna create enough disturbance on the landscape. And I just want to point out that the levels of disturbance sort of anticipated.

4:17:12.130 --> 4:17:22.660
Sam Evans
By the by the planner or pretty unprecedented. So here's a graph from the EIS kind of showing the volume overtime. If you look at the bottom right hand corner.

4:17:21.810 --> 4:17:23.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Can you make it a little bit bigger?

4:17:24.250 --> 4:17:25.360
Sam Evans
Sure, I'll give.

4:17:26.700 --> 4:17:28.120
Sam Evans
So I'll zoom into the bottom.

4:17:27.210 --> 4:17:28.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That's helpful. Thank you.

4:17:28.860 --> 4:17:33.110
Sam Evans
1st and this is sort of the current plan, this is where we've been.

4:17:34.100 --> 4:17:50.950
Sam Evans
And up here in the top left, you'll see the the you know the the the peak of the late 80s peak of of of timber, timber production on our forest. And you can see the number that corresponds to that there about 120,000 CCF.

4:17:52.530 --> 4:18:13.100
Sam Evans
If you look at it, the objectives and the projections in the EIS for for those objectives, for the, for the plan that was adopted, we we're looking at a much higher figure than as ever that has ever been achieved on the nihilistic. And that's in addition to all of the other events management practices like.

4:18:14.620 --> 4:18:17.800
Sam Evans
Well, like prescribe fire, which you know we're at, I think 40.

4:18:18.590 --> 4:18:39.170
Sam Evans
5000 acres a year. The top end of that one. So I just wanted to kind of give that for context. And you know, I know that Members, representatives from WRC in Grant County and others like that can speak to themselves. But I think it is important to note that when we hit that peak in the past, everybody just about everybody in this room was telling the poor service to slow down.

4:18:40.450 --> 4:18:55.0
Sam Evans
Including including those organizations so and one one more piece the the footprint of timber production we talked about earlier in the day is a pretty significant expansion from the current plan, including into inaccessible areas.

4:18:55.760 --> 4:19:1.300
Sam Evans
I think you know that's really all of the background that I think we need to dive in.

4:19:3.230 --> 4:19:10.530
Sam Evans
Into, you know, in in release what I I think of is the problems and of course you know if others think there are other background facts, I'm sure they'll feel free to share them too.

4:19:13.330 --> 4:19:14.110
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I am.

4:19:13.410 --> 4:19:43.890
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
OK, thanks. Thank you. I'm now prepared to to add something to what Sam was saying, Sam. Sam spoke about the concern that some ecozones might be harvested beyond what was beneficial for their the egos in ecological integrity. And this isn't just a hypothetical. We are seeing this right now in projects

and inhaling physical. I'm gonna attempt to share my screen. And so here is a GIS analysis I did of four projects on the Nantahala.

4:19:43.970 --> 4:19:50.580
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
That's good. That will be implemented under the New Forest Plan and of those four projects, 82%.

4:19:51.730 --> 4:19:52.10
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Of.

4:19:51.300 --> 4:19:52.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Make it bigger, make it bigger.

4:19:54.800 --> 4:19:55.160
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah.

4:19:54.400 --> 4:19:56.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Can you make it any bigger? Weekend? See anything here?

4:19:56.590 --> 4:19:59.370
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
OK, let me see if I can zoom in a little bit a little bit more.

4:20:0.790 --> 4:20:1.500
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Here.

4:20:2.820 --> 4:20:9.200
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Then maybe you might as well not have it up there if we if if it were the slider bar at the bottom.

4:20:9.950 --> 4:20:11.480
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Slider bar at the bottom.

4:20:11.880 --> 4:20:12.450
Sam Evans
Bottom right.

4:20:18.260 --> 4:20:18.640
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Perfect.

4:20:12.30 --> 4:20:20.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Bottom right of your of your of your of your Excel table, there's a slider bar that goes to 100%. You can just slide that in and make it bigger.

4:20:21.210 --> 4:20:21.940
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
OK.

4:20:21.630 --> 4:20:22.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Debbie.

4:20:23.510 --> 4:20:24.100
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Thanks Debbie.

4:20:25.0 --> 4:20:25.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Welcome.

4:20:25.660 --> 4:20:54.360
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
So are these, you know, these four projects are 12 mile Buck crossover, Nantahala Mountains project of those projects. Again a total of over 80% of the harvest is being targeted in just three ecozones Northern Hardwoods Cove and music Coke. And we know from the departure analysis that these are three of the lesser to part of the ecozones on the forest, three of the ecozones that need the less the young forest habitat than others. And the reason they are being targeted more is because of their.

4:20:54.810 --> 4:21:24.860
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Fiscal capability to support harvest and and this is going to be a tension throughout the planning process and I think this is a place where the plan has really fallen short as to not have ecozone specific goals for timber harvest and restoration. And I think it's very likely to lead to situations where the actual timber harvest projects are decreasing the ecological integrity of the forest. And so this is just an example that what is already being planned and will be implemented under the new plan.

4:21:25.60 --> 4:21:27.640
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Is already headed in this direction. This is not a hypothetical.

4:21:30.130 --> 4:21:33.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks, Josh. Anything to? No, no thank you.

4:21:34.890 --> 4:21:36.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, how about Nick?

4:21:37.390 --> 4:21:40.100
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You want excuse me? Similar.

4:21:39.980 --> 4:21:41.990
Nick Biemiller
Yeah, thanks. Thanks, Daisy.

4:21:43.90 --> 4:21:51.160
Nick Biemiller
Well, this is such a large subject area and it's hard for me to think about where to really begin as it relates to our objections.

4:21:52.460 --> 4:21:57.590
Nick Biemiller
Sam, I do appreciate the way that you kind of laid that all out. I agree with a lot of what you said.

4:21:59.50 --> 4:22:18.700
Nick Biemiller
I do wanna point out that we did have an objection based on some assumptions that it appears were included in the NRV model and I wanna make sure that we share that with the Forest Service on the call today. But before I dive into that, you know, I thought it might be useful.

4:22:19.410 --> 4:22:32.850
Nick Biemiller
For me to provide both a little context regarding rough grass societies objections and then the intent of our objections today, given that the vast majority of our objections are within this section.

4:22:35.10 --> 4:22:35.660
Nick Biemiller
So.

4:22:36.360 --> 4:22:56.550
Nick Biemiller
I think framing it up the way that Sam did in from the perspective of a wildlife habitat, we know based on the forests analysis that young forests conditions, open forest conditions and those late successional old growth forest conditions are what is underrepresented, right?

4:22:57.420 --> 4:23:13.970
Nick Biemiller
When we look at the age class distribution of our forests, where we see is the vast majority of our forests are in that 80 to 140 year age class that there's a lack of more open forest structural conditions on the landscape. And so it's no surprise that.

4:23:14.590 --> 4:23:27.820
Nick Biemiller
The vast majority of forest wildlife species that have been declining here in Western North Carolina on

Mandalen Pisgah rely on the biologically significant levels of all of those underrepresented forest conditions.

4:23:28.640 --> 4:23:43.480
Nick Biemiller
And that total habitat diversity in terms of more young forests, more open forest, more old growth, is what's gonna be kind of that win, win, win solution to benefit rough graphs, but also to benefit suites of at risk wildlife species that have been declining in the region.

4:23:44.200 --> 4:24:14.270
Nick Biemiller
Umm, but let's not forget that that young forest component, as part of that overall mosaic of habitat diversity, is an incredibly important to support the total biological diversity that our for us to have the capacity to provide old growth forests, take time to develop. The young forests need to be created through active forest management, at least if the goal is to maintain wildlife diversity and abundance in a human time frame, which I would argue part of the intent of.

4:24:14.360 --> 4:24:15.650
Nick Biemiller
Our National Forest is.

4:24:16.610 --> 4:24:45.680
Nick Biemiller
Umm, so I think the good news is that we can have it all. We can create biologically significant levels of young forest while also doing things like protecting and restoring old growth and creating and maintaining more open forest conditions. But at its core, I think the intent of our objections is to ensure that young forests are prioritized as much as the other underrepresented habitat conditions on the forest, including open forest conditions.

4:24:45.760 --> 4:25:16.710
Nick Biemiller
And late successional for his conditions. And we're really concerned that unless those Tier 2 levels of young forest creation are insured at the forest Plan level and then implemented in a time efficient manner that we're going to lose that component of the forest overall habitat diversity and the biological diversity that those young forest conditions support, including species like rough graphs. So broadly, before diving into the details, there's a lot in the forest plan that we support from the Rough Cross societies.

4:25:16.820 --> 4:25:33.510
Nick Biemiller
And we like the flexibility that the plan offers and we do think the plan, you know manages for a lot of diverse interests. But there are some things that we feel like we're require clarification we're missed or could be improved, especially when it relates to the FEIS models.

4:25:41.800 --> 4:25:42.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Nick.

4:25:34.180 --> 4:25:43.490
Nick Biemiller
And especially as it relates to you, some of the forest plan components that those models help inform. And so our concern there, yeah, sorry about that.

4:25:43.150 --> 4:25:46.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Nick, where those concerns in your written objections?

4:25:47.280 --> 4:25:47.750
Nick Biemiller
Yes.

4:25:47.710 --> 4:25:49.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So that's what you're written objectives contain.

4:25:50.270 --> 4:25:50.680
Nick Biemiller
Yes.

4:25:51.370 --> 4:25:53.100
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, alright. So just just.

4:25:57.320 --> 4:25:57.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But.

4:25:54.940 --> 4:26:5.510
Nick Biemiller
Just clarifying things. Yeah. And again, I'm just saying this because the intent was to provide the context and the intent behind our objections before getting into any details about resolutions.

4:26:8.690 --> 4:26:14.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So do you wanna take a pause there with that context and have us move around a little or do you wanna?

4:26:17.570 --> 4:26:18.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Testing.

4:26:15.250 --> 4:26:23.990
Nick Biemiller
So more into, yeah, I mean, unless we want to start going into the meat of some detailed objections that we filed in some suggested resolutions we have.

4:26:25.500 --> 4:26:27.410
Nick Biemiller
Which I'm I'm happy to do.

4:26:38.660 --> 4:26:39.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright.

4:26:25.630 --> 4:26:39.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You wanna get? You wanna get other contact? I think. I think this is feeling pretty good about getting some context all around different perspectives. So. So let's move on knowing Nick that we can come back. OK. Thank you.

4:26:39.890 --> 4:26:44.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. So you're welcome, Jason tutoring center of biological diversity.

4:26:47.300 --> 4:26:58.100
Jason Totoiu
Hi, good afternoon everyone. Just I just wanted to add one additional consideration in the to this conversation that we're having as a relates to.

4:26:59.560 --> 4:27:4.490
Jason Totoiu
The creation of early successional habitat, young for us etcetera within the forest.

4:27:4.570 --> 4:27:25.660
Jason Totoiu
Umm, you know, I think as it's been identified before, we've had a significant amount of disturbance that's projected within the forest. But I think one additional consideration here that needs to be made that which was not taken in the EIS and in the forest plan was.

4:27:26.470 --> 4:27:55.900
Jason Totoiu
How does this? How does this compare to what is going on within the broader landscape? So this this theme, this, this idea of an all lands approach? I think what the 2012 Planning Regulation did is it really signaled kind of a departure from the old way of doing things where now the regulations in a require and I'll just say I'll just state and part.

4:27:56.400 --> 4:28:24.340
Jason Totoiu
Quote in part here it the plan has to reflect the units expective distinctive roles and contributions to the local area, region and nation, and the roles for which the plan area is best suited. Considering the agencies mission, the unit's unique capabilities and the resources and management of other lands in the vicinity. So in the preamble to the rule, it it it calls upon the four service to look across boundaries.

4:28:25.60 --> 4:28:51.10
Jason Totoiu
And and in doing so, we have to look at the across this 18 county region and you know there's components have it's it, it kind of works a couple different ways. The components have to take into account contributions of the plan area to conditions within the broader landscape as well as the conditions in the broader landscape and how that may influence the sustainability of the resources within the planning area so.

4:28:51.860 --> 4:29:18.720
Jason Totoiu
We can get into this a little bit later, but I I just want to to to to identify and flag this issue because from our perspective this is a a critically important piece of the analysis which is which is missing because when you look across the 18 county region and you look at the amount of private ownership, the amount of of timberlands within the 10 to 20 year age classes.

4:29:19.840 --> 4:29:21.110
Jason Totoiu
And you look to.

4:29:21.880 --> 4:29:34.740
Jason Totoiu
I'm trends into the next several decades how that ownership is continuing to in transition and what those forests are gonna look like. I think it really begs the question at the end of the day.

4:29:36.280 --> 4:30:1.950
Jason Totoiu
Are are we doing too much here or is this too intensive of a of an approach from a disturbance standpoint within the force? Because the forest in many ways is gonna have to act as refugia for many species that otherwise don't have that habitat available elsewhere, and so happy to let go into that more. But I just felt like that wasn't something to important to under score here as part of our conversation. Thank you.

4:30:4.690 --> 4:30:5.720
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good. Thank you, Jason.

4:30:7.130 --> 4:30:8.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. And another new voice, Corinne?

4:30:13.380 --> 4:30:20.520
Karin (Guest)
OK, hopefully it's my sounds working today. Thanks. It is too too quick points with olive been talking about with early successional.

4:30:21.700 --> 4:30:23.20
Karin (Guest)
And one would be.

4:30:24.200 --> 4:30:35.750
Karin (Guest)
If we're addressing, you know, when you open up areas, you will get invasive species coming in and if it's being addressed, you know what, what's gonna happen. You know, as far as that parameter, there were not.

4:30:52.720 --> 4:30:53.20
630cad5b-115b-4526-bbd1-7daedc4be0a9
Phone.

4:30:36.730 --> 4:31:1.440
Karin (Guest)
Harming the forest, you're creating a lot more habitat for the invasive species, and the second point was that when we're talking about forest ages before human alteration, I mean force don't have ages per say, like a crop of corn or whatever. They would be a a whole system that's a continuum. So I mean, there are gaps, you know, from fire, ice or whatnot, but.

4:31:2.640 --> 4:31:11.950
Karin (Guest)
I can understand you opening up for hunting, but not opening up uh, you know, ecologically that we need large areas of early succession and that's it. Thanks.

4:31:14.130 --> 4:31:17.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Chris. Anything there? Thank you.

4:31:25.890 --> 4:31:26.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Will Harlan?

4:31:30.420 --> 4:31:47.570
Will Harlan
Hey, thanks for the opportunity to speak. Be speaking on behalf of iheart, Pisgah and the 750 consolidated objections under the iheart Piska coalition. We simply want to state the obvious that quintupling timber harvests.

4:31:48.190 --> 4:31:50.450
Will Harlan
Higher than its peak in the 1980s.

4:31:51.100 --> 4:31:56.540
Will Harlan
Building 200 to 300 miles of additional logging roads over the life of this plan.

4:31:57.420 --> 4:32:4.50
Will Harlan
And claiming that that will have no impact on water or spin seeds.

4:32:4.790 --> 4:32:6.740
Will Harlan
That doesn't fly. That doesn't add up.

4:32:8.480 --> 4:32:15.970
Will Harlan
We're going to see more disturbance with climate change that is not accounted for in the natural range of variation. And as Jason just mentioned.

4:32:16.790 --> 4:32:21.30
Will Harlan
If we look across the whole landscape of the 18 county footprints.

4:32:21.880 --> 4:32:47.750
Will Harlan
72% of the land of the forest land is in private ownership, 28 percent is in public lands, and that's where we're going to find the old growth. Those are going to be the reservoirs for their species. That's where the drinking water headwaters are found. And that's what you all are managing for the public good. So we encourage you to take on all lands approach as.

4:32:48.770 --> 4:33:5.810
Will Harlan
As the 2012 planning rule lays out in the humans preamble and we encourage you to quantify impacts that 200 to 300 miles of additional logging roads and quintupling timber, timber heart this will have on water and their species. Thanks.

4:33:7.440 --> 4:33:7.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks.

4:33:9.600 --> 4:33:16.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And other context or swing around the resolution. Well, let's hear from John Fulcher.

4:33:19.820 --> 4:33:20.410
John Culclasure
Yeah.

4:33:16.840 --> 4:33:22.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then I was gonna go back to Sam home. But I see Ben on the way in here too.

4:33:22.880 --> 4:33:38.360
John Culclasure
Yeah. Thank you. Yeah, I just wanna provide a counterpoint to that. All lands approached in the assumptions that the rest of the counties are gonna be under aggressive forest management. That's really not the case. As you all know, WC have rapidly developing part of the country and.

4:33:39.430 --> 4:34:8.690
John Culclasure
Uh, I think Asheville. Most a lot of y'all live are aware of the increase in house prices there and the pressure on development and farmland and that sort of stuff. And well, there is a a very robust Land Trust community that does a lot of work, conserving lands. A lot of those lands aren't even managed. And there's a big chunk of land in western North Carolina that is non touched and provides a large chunk of passive management. Whether that's the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the Blue Ridge Parkway, all the watersheds, Asheville watersheds, silverware.

4:34:8.780 --> 4:34:39.510
John Culclasure
That Murphy watershed town of Waynesville watershed and most of these land owners are non industrial, private forest land owners who don't really actively manage their land and don't have to, don't live up to their forest management plan. So I think and the quality of habitat on private lands is pretty poor anyway for early successional dependent species, it's golf courses and suburban areas and neighborhoods and that sort of stuff. So to say that the private lands is gonna serve as that refuge for a whole host of species and to push them aside and.

4:34:39.650 --> 4:35:4.410
John Culclasure
And and not give them that. They're due credit and incorporate everything and on private lands that's really overlooking the big picture. You know, it's so it's a big connection of federal lands, Forest Service, National Park Service and state Forest and WRC managed areas. And I do not think that pushing aside the early successional habitat and we learned that on private lands is is a is a good, good way to to manage wildlife.

4:35:7.450 --> 4:35:8.270
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks John.

4:35:9.860 --> 4:35:13.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So we're setting the stage still a little bit of context, then Prater.

4:35:15.380 --> 4:35:44.330
Ben Prater
Sure. Thank you, folks. I just wanted to respond quickly when we're talking about the proportion of species that are dependent on young farce conditions. And I'll point you to the exhaustive and I think well done analysis for our species of conservation concern. Now, to be fair, these speech contraction concern do not include demand, species or species that are managed for sustainable harvest for themselves.

4:35:45.290 --> 4:36:15.340
Ben Prater
However, I think it's important to point out when we're talking about levels of magnitude and impact of proposed disturbance in the forest that the vast majority of our species of conservation concern are not obligated to young forest conditions, in fact, only around 20 species of the more than 300 species

identified to the species of conservation concern analysis are determined to be young for our associates. So just wanna make that point clear so that we don't get lost in the sauce when we start picking and choosing.

4:36:15.460 --> 4:36:17.10
Ben Prater
Winners and losers on the species front.

4:36:18.780 --> 4:36:19.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Ben.

4:36:20.560 --> 4:36:33.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Think we've heard from everybody once? No. So we can. Yeah. Yeah. So circle back on resolutions that. Yeah, let them know what you're doing. Yeah. Yeah. So thanks. Thanks for send another. Yeah.

4:36:33.890 --> 4:36:41.680
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And the better. But she can. She can go after after. Yeah. Wanted. Wanted to move to now is unless there's anything.

4:36:42.570 --> 4:36:46.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
New that hasn't been mentioned to as far as setting the context.

4:36:47.510 --> 4:36:57.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Because this is such a big topic when we're spending the afternoon on it, so just wanted to take that time now to do that. So if there's anything new when I hit that as far as setting the context.

4:36:58.40 --> 4:37:0.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, and then one of.

4:37:1.80 --> 4:37:5.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Start moving through and going through folks with remedies and resolutions.

4:37:7.30 --> 4:37:11.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So, Rebecca, it's your hand raised to offer some context.

4:37:12.940 --> 4:37:13.230
Rebecca King (Guest)
Umm.

4:37:12.970 --> 4:37:14.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Or go to a resolution.

4:37:15.100 --> 4:37:33.250
Rebecca King (Guest)
Hi mine was just a response to one of John's uh comments about the lands at all. The other total of lands and I wanted to add that we do have a lot of game lands in this area and a lot of those game lands do have the younger forest.

4:37:33.810 --> 4:37:37.220
Rebecca King (Guest)
Umm, type of ecosystem? Thanks.

4:37:38.650 --> 4:37:40.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. OK, thank you.

4:37:42.860 --> 4:37:46.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right. So can we go back to Sam?

4:37:47.580 --> 4:37:52.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
With focus specifically on on some of the the remedies you've offered.

4:37:53.730 --> 4:38:23.950
Sam Evans
Yeah. So I I think there may be like one step in between here and and remedies which is to kind of dive into some of the specific issues that we've raised. I think I I heard that, I heard Nick say that he kind of had a a desire to do the same thing. I think the remedies are gonna make a lot more sense. You know, after we aired the issues a little bit since we've got the time, I think that might be helpful. Before I start, I wanna clarify one thing that I got a message from a colleague from the partnership that.

4:38:33.940 --> 4:38:34.300
630cad5b-115b-4526-bbd1-7daedc4be0a9
Actually.

4:38:24.70 --> 4:38:48.50
Sam Evans
Maybe I wasn't clear who I was speaking on behalf of. I wanna be really clear that I am speaking on behalf of SLC and the objectives on our on our joint injection and anything that said about the partnership is really just for context for how we've tried to engage on this issue and and you know and find common ground. But Megan can speak for the partnership and I don't mean to to to intrude on that.

4:38:49.610 --> 4:39:16.430
Sam Evans

I can give a little bit of help I think on the all lands question since that's come up in, in, in several people's comments, the four service has a data set that we provide in and draft comments that sort of answers the question about trends and early successional habitat creation on all lands in the 18 county region. That is the Hanson data set and it was analyzed to separate out.

4:39:17.800 --> 4:39:46.310
Sam Evans
Young forest creation from forest loss so that issue that John talks about is a real losing for us to development is a real issue that doesn't count as there like succession habitat creation of course, but if you separate those out and you just look at young forest creation, the rates of young forest creation over the last 18 years and on federal lands is about 1/4 of what it is on private lands and about 1/2 of what it is on state lands those numbers.

4:39:46.950 --> 4:39:51.340
Sam Evans
And you are pretty consistent over that time period. So hopefully that's helpful.

4:39:53.20 --> 4:40:6.280
Sam Evans
Those numbers spike on all lands when we have a severe wildfire season, but even if, especially during the sort of the intervening years where there's not a severe wildfire season, you see those trends.

4:40:7.140 --> 4:40:11.50
Sam Evans
So hopefully that's helpful and kind of making sense of the all hands question.

4:40:11.890 --> 4:40:12.370
Sam Evans
Umm.

4:40:13.710 --> 4:40:26.240
Sam Evans
You know I when I I feel bash a bashed that I did not mention current conditions. Nick thank you for filling that gap. I agree with Nick that our current conditions are.

4:40:26.890 --> 4:40:57.630
Sam Evans
It's a forest landscape that is primarily mid and late aged and that we were lacking in both young and old forests, you know, and we know because of that definition of ecological integrity, about how much young and old forest we are lacking by ecozone, I think you know the questions and the issues that I wanna get at in the session today are when we try to fix that problem. Are we doing it in the right places? And if we did what we're talking about in this plan in the long term, would we be overcorrecting?

4:40:58.610 --> 4:41:5.420
Sam Evans
So I guess I kinda wanna talk about each of those real quickly and then maybe hand it out, hand it over back to somebody else.

4:41:6.160 --> 4:41:6.600
Sam Evans
And.

4:41:7.450 --> 4:41:10.280
Sam Evans
So the I'll share an image here.

4:41:11.920 --> 4:41:33.50
Sam Evans
So this is this is an image from directly from the spec from model outputs for the Cove hardwood ecosystem. And you know, this assumes that we this afternoon I wanna talk more about the models and the problems that we think are in the models and how we think they undercount disturbance.

4:41:33.730 --> 4:42:5.870
Sam Evans
But, but even if you assume that the spectral model is inclusive of all disturbance that needs to be accounted for, it shows that the Cove hardwood force is gonna be out of whack. We're gonna create too much and this I will say, is with a 30% limitation attached. So the spectrum model was limited at, but it wasn't allowed to go over 30% of all harvested in the code system. And the reason that limitation was added is because otherwise the model was showing much more harvest in young forest.

4:42:6.60 --> 4:42:12.790
Sam Evans
It is an operative limitation in the model and there may be or service staff on the on the call we can explain that better.

4:42:14.220 --> 4:42:25.150
Sam Evans
At the same time, late closed and and well went and laid open, which is a much smaller component of Co forest trend almost to zero in the long term.

4:42:25.780 --> 4:42:35.260
Sam Evans
So you know, that's the blue line here the the the parallel bars that you see there, the red and Gray that's in RV for late closed for us.

4:42:35.950 --> 4:42:42.830
Sam Evans
So this is what it this is what we would call it over correction, right? It liquidating Lake closed for us is an overcorrection.

4:42:44.800 --> 4:43:15.850
Sam Evans
I think one more point while I'm showing pictures, this isn't just a question of the age class distribution at large. It's also about the the patch and disturbance dynamics within the ecosystem. And so if you refer to the ecozone reference conditions in the plan for Cove hardwoods, they say that you know that small gaps are by far the most common, and that and that larger patches of early successional habitat.

4:43:16.130 --> 4:43:47.0
Sam Evans
Are very rare in the code system, and if we run the timber sale program that we're talking about and and this is what spectrum says, we're gonna have much, much more acreage and large patches in the code system than we will small gaps. And that is a problem for the species associated with gaps, small gaps in the code system. And, you know, just like this problem, we don't have time to go through every ecozone. But this does this problem repeats in every ecosystem. So.

4:43:47.140 --> 4:44:12.100
Sam Evans
This these are all of the moisture classes. This is, you know, sort of a composite of all the ecozones on on the forest. And here's what Spectrum says happens to the late aged system. This is a system that ought to have a lot of land, and it even within an RV, and it trends towards zero and every system. And this is just, I think, a pretty powerful visual representation of.

4:44:12.810 --> 4:44:13.170
Sam Evans
And.

4:44:14.430 --> 4:44:22.320
Sam Evans
Yeah, you know what we think might be something to take another look at. I I'll. I'll point out to you that that the.

4:44:21.460 --> 4:44:35.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sam, Sam. Sure. Just, just real quick. The one thing didn't and I guess the question for you, I mean you know that that's modeling out 200 years. So I guess you know.

4:44:36.680 --> 4:44:38.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How how do you see?

4:44:38.960 --> 4:44:55.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The the role of, you know, monitoring and and and and what what may or may not happen within this plan cycle. I understand the long term trends but you know we have some checkpoints between now and 200 years from now hopefully.

4:44:56.270 --> 4:45:1.260
Sam Evans
Sure. Thanks, James. Yeah, and recognize that you know that we're not.

4:45:2.830 --> 4:45:27.210
Sam Evans
They were not there yet, but you know, I think we have to talk about more than just what's going to be reloaded and harvested in this plan cycle. You know, sort of moving the acres, a large number of acres

into the suitable base is an investment in those areas that's gonna play out over multiple plan cycles. And so the, I think what's clear from these graphs is that the levels and types of harvest that are.

4:45:28.0 --> 4:45:28.430
Sam Evans
Uh.

4:45:29.110 --> 4:45:35.760
Sam Evans
That his objectives in this plan can't be sustained in the long term without serious departure from NRA and and that.

4:45:36.880 --> 4:45:53.830
Sam Evans
I realized that you know that the forests are focused mainly on this plan cycle, but that's the kind of short term thinking that violates, and if not so, NIMA limits the amount of harvest that can be removed. The language I'm slipping my mind, but it's A to an amount which.

4:45:55.220 --> 4:45:56.780
Sam Evans
Can be sustained on the.

4:45:57.650 --> 4:45:59.450
Sam Evans
Let me see if I can find it in my notes.

4:46:1.130 --> 4:46:31.220
Sam Evans
Uh, it's the non declining even flow provision, the amount that can be removed annually in perpetuity on a sustained yield basis. So the, the and then under the planning rule, the sort of the related requirement that you can't produce temperate levels that are going to fail to maintain or restore ecological integrity and the whole these are technical rules. The point is that you're not supposed to create boom bust cycles with your timber harvest program with your timber production program. There are often good reasons to do ecological.

4:46:31.310 --> 4:47:1.800
Sam Evans
Restoration may maybe even an aggressive plan cycle of ecological restoration that would jumpstart young for the creation and jumpstart species composition restoration. But in order to justify that you have to go through the departure process, which requires some serious analysis and explanation of what you're in game is and and public betting of that and that's not here. It's just sort of assumption here that this is what we need to do and we need to do it through a timber production program.

4:47:1.880 --> 4:47:8.720
Sam Evans
Wanna rotational timber base? That's gonna expand significantly from the current plan and that is what Nathan says you can't do.

4:47:10.520 --> 4:47:12.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Hold on one second. Let's take a pause.

4:47:15.450 --> 4:47:15.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

4:47:16.950 --> 4:47:22.380
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, I'd like to do is dig into the resolutions and if we need to backfill any explanation we can do that.

4:47:24.740 --> 4:47:30.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And and can I ask Sam, can we have another voice here? Just give you a break.

4:47:32.330 --> 4:47:32.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

4:47:31.950 --> 4:47:33.70
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Can you hear me?

4:47:34.700 --> 4:47:35.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Where is this?

4:47:34.960 --> 4:47:35.520
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Hello.

4:47:36.690 --> 4:47:37.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Who is this?

4:47:38.710 --> 4:47:42.90
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
I'm sorry, the phone is not working very well. Can you hear me?

4:47:43.190 --> 4:47:44.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We can hear you. Who are you?

4:47:45.910 --> 4:47:49.910
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
This is Richard Melvin. I live near Highlands.

4:47:51.150 --> 4:47:51.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

4:47:51.170 --> 4:47:59.200
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Just wanted to say I don't know if the Chattooga Conservancy has made a presentation yet, but I support what they.

4:47:59.920 --> 4:48:0.620
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Support.

4:48:1.270 --> 4:48:3.30
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
And I just want that on the record.

4:48:5.10 --> 4:48:6.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Richard Richard Melvin.

4:48:7.530 --> 4:48:8.670
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
You have a lot of.

4:48:9.350 --> 4:48:12.110
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
The general recommendations all throughout the whole.

4:48:13.10 --> 4:48:15.780
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Plan. You know, going over towards Asheville and.

4:48:16.420 --> 4:48:19.340
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Murphy and so forth. But we're particularly concerned.

4:48:20.60 --> 4:48:22.240
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
With the Chattooga River watershed.

4:48:22.920 --> 4:48:24.640
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Raven Bald and Georgia.

4:48:25.400 --> 4:48:31.710
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Whiteside Mountain over towards a sapphire and the White Water River.

4:48:32.420 --> 4:48:36.840
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
All of that ought to be in a study area and not just subject to.

4:48:37.570 --> 4:48:38.410
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Clear cutting.

4:48:41.560 --> 4:48:42.830
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
That's why comment, though.

4:48:43.490 --> 4:48:50.190
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
As I said, I'm listening and trying to understand this. The phone connection is not too good. Thank you.

4:48:51.400 --> 4:48:56.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And we heard you loud and clear. We haven't heard yet from that you, Chuka Conservancy, on this point.

4:48:57.380 --> 4:49:2.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thank you. Richard, can we go there? No, just like we talked about that a lot of what he was concerned about this.

4:49:1.90 --> 4:49:3.410
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Well, I'm one of the ones who sent in letters.

4:49:3.270 --> 4:49:3.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes.

4:49:4.240 --> 4:49:4.650
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
But.

4:49:4.560 --> 4:49:9.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes, OK. So we did, Richard. We did actually address that yesterday in our conversation.

4:49:10.830 --> 4:49:12.260
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Pretty thoroughly, yeah, with it.

4:49:10.960 --> 4:49:16.370
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
But I can't hear this program very well, but I just want it on record that I support there.

4:49:17.330 --> 4:49:18.350
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Position because.

4:49:19.420 --> 4:49:23.20
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
A lot of these groups are focused on other areas, Linville and.

4:49:24.670 --> 4:49:25.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Got it.

4:49:23.980 --> 4:49:33.960
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Ohh, Snowbird Mountains and so forth, but we're focused on the Tugger River and they need to pay attention to the Chattooga River and the Ranger in Franklin.

4:49:34.820 --> 4:49:35.510
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
And.

4:49:36.940 --> 4:49:41.50
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
And really, be careful with these cuts because we're steep over here.

4:49:41.760 --> 4:49:43.120
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
So a lot of erosion.

4:49:43.970 --> 4:49:45.590
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
And a lot of problems with.

4:49:46.400 --> 4:49:50.580
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
With these cuts and there's problems of access and so forth.

4:49:52.660 --> 4:49:54.430
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
So I just want to make that point.

4:49:55.580 --> 4:49:58.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We we we hear you, Richard. Thank you very much.

4:49:59.550 --> 4:50:2.780
5974911e-7238-4754-9efc-473555bd8b8f
Alright, thank you. I'll just listen from now on.

4:50:3.730 --> 4:50:6.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Can you put your phone back on mute please?

4:50:8.710 --> 4:50:9.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

4:50:10.190 --> 4:50:12.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So let's go to to Hugh.

4:50:14.390 --> 4:50:18.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Focusing in the the best you can on to suggested remedies.

4:50:18.20 --> 4:50:26.630
Hugh Irwin
Yeah. You know, Rick, you or ask for resolutions. Uh, you know, one of the most straightforward resolutions would be to.

4:50:27.440 --> 4:50:32.260
Hugh Irwin
Redo the model analysis of and you know.

4:50:33.50 --> 4:50:48.20
Hugh Irwin
Have a supplemental EIS that has uh, you know, corrected model analysis and comparisons. You know that wouldn't be easy, but that would be probably the most straightforward, you know, resolution to this.

4:50:48.970 --> 4:51:20.400
Hugh Irwin
You know Sam focused on or you know some of the out model outcomes just in the spectrum model that are extremely concerning. If you look at both the NRV model and the spectrum model, you know it's more concerning because the inner RV model sets the baseline for the EIS analysis. And you know, spectrum analysis projects, you know, outcomes into the future.

4:51:20.820 --> 4:51:48.90
Hugh Irwin
But a basic premise of you know, using best available science is to have when models are being compared. Those models need to have a consistent assumptions. That's not the case. The NRV model has vastly different assumptions and unjustified different assumptions than the spectrum model.

4:51:48.860 --> 4:51:49.450
Hugh Irwin
And.

4:51:50.660 --> 4:51:51.340
Hugh Irwin
Uh.

4:51:52.400 --> 4:52:25.310
Hugh Irwin
You know it's not valid. It's not best available science to compare those different models with totally different unjustified assumptions to each other and to use the NRV model as a baseline and compare that baseline to future projections and the spectrum model that use uses totally different assumptions, including different thresholds of of disturbance levels. The spectrum model uses a half acre.

4:52:25.690 --> 4:52:33.930
Hugh Irwin
Well, as a threshold for disturbance, the NRV model goes down to gas phase dynamics, which is basically you know.

4:52:34.720 --> 4:53:4.690
Hugh Irwin
.01 acres threshold so you know those assumptions are important. And so you know one solution, one resolution would be to, you know, redo the analysis correctly or more validly. And you know, have a supplemental EIS. You know, they're probably are other resolutions not as straightforward, but.

4:53:4.830 --> 4:53:15.350
Hugh Irwin
You know that might be acceptable, but you know, I just wanted to flag that, you know, the current analysis has problems that are, you know, if.

4:53:16.550 --> 4:53:19.710
Hugh Irwin
Can only be soft if certain level by redoing it.

4:53:21.400 --> 4:53:21.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

4:53:24.50 --> 4:53:24.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks you.

4:53:26.370 --> 4:53:27.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you.

4:53:28.760 --> 4:53:30.510
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm catching up. Yeah, good.

4:53:33.590 --> 4:53:34.980
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Appreciate that you thank you.

4:53:36.40 --> 4:53:37.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, I'll Corinne.

4:53:47.220 --> 4:53:51.660
Karin (Guest)
Ohh sorry about that. I don't know why my hands up it shouldn't. Shouldn't be mean? Apologize.

4:53:51.590 --> 4:53:52.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

4:53:52.890 --> 4:53:55.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That's all right. No, we can take it down if you can't.

4:53:57.70 --> 4:53:57.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Then back.

4:53:56.510 --> 4:53:58.960
Karin (Guest)
I I got it. Thank you. Appreciate it.

4:53:59.130 --> 4:53:59.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright.

4:54:0.600 --> 4:54:1.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Back to Nick.

4:54:2.170 --> 4:54:2.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Miller.

4:54:3.70 --> 4:54:11.130
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. Thanks, Nancy. And I guess this is maybe a middle ground between context and we're specific resolutions as we're getting into that.

4:54:12.470 --> 4:54:32.790
Nick Biemiller
But I do think that there might be a difference in interpretation around the intent of the NRV model as it

relates to the forest plan components and the forest services responsibilities to the planning rule based on that that I'm hearing, I mean it's my understanding that the NRV model is meant to help inform.

4:54:33.520 --> 4:54:45.210
Nick Biemiller
The plan components not to necessarily establish things like ecozone specific constraints on different activities like timber harvesting.

4:54:45.830 --> 4:54:54.400
Nick Biemiller
Umm. And I just wanted to say that in addition to the idea, the concept of NRV and ecological integrity.

4:54:55.280 --> 4:55:15.230
Nick Biemiller
There should be nothing wrong with also having the Forest Service commit to managing National Forest lands for the diverse goods and services they provide, including timber production and wildlife habitat in and of their own values. Those values are part of the multiple use mission of the Forest Service and part of the multiple use sustained yield act. So.

4:55:16.290 --> 4:55:22.770
Nick Biemiller
While the NRV model I think tells us a lot about pre euroamerican conditions as a baseline.

4:55:23.500 --> 4:55:38.60
Nick Biemiller
I think it's useful, but also imperfect, and I also think we have to like, recognize that it's not all-encompassing of the demands that the public has of our National Forest lands and have the diverse goods and services that they provide.

4:55:43.250 --> 4:55:51.720
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks. Thank you. Nick, just one thing that not that the anybody needs to address this specifically, but you know.

4:55:53.0 --> 4:55:53.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I think.

4:55:55.140 --> 4:56:6.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Our folks have spent a lot of time on on the models and and and gotten a lot of feedback on that. I guess as we think about what that looks like and and and Hugh provided some thoughts on on remedies, I guess.

4:56:7.290 --> 4:56:11.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Not that it needs to be answered right now, but just to in the room like you know.

4:56:13.290 --> 4:56:24.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Knowing that all models are are in perfect, how? How do we know we've kind of hit the mark? That's good enough in in the view to to be able to inform. What does that mean for?

4:56:25.940 --> 4:56:38.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That's enough to inform this planning cycle and and doesn't set us up, I think to Sam's point for for something that's unintended long term so that that might be something that folks could address during during this time.

4:56:40.370 --> 4:56:43.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Anything else correct before we move? No.

4:56:44.180 --> 4:56:44.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That's good.

4:56:45.750 --> 4:56:47.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So over to Megan.

4:56:51.250 --> 4:56:55.660
Megan N. Sutton
I'm not gonna directly answer James's question, so if if someone else.

4:56:55.210 --> 4:56:56.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Fine, that's fine.

4:56:56.960 --> 4:56:58.430
Megan N. Sutton
OK. Just wanna make sure.

4:56:57.880 --> 4:56:59.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For all of you to ponder.

4:57:0.540 --> 4:57:1.690
Megan N. Sutton
Yeah. So.

4:57:2.780 --> 4:57:8.180
Megan N. Sutton
Without minimizing or invalidating the concerns that have been expressed about the models.

4:57:9.100 --> 4:57:9.930
Megan N. Sutton
The partnership.

4:57:11.380 --> 4:57:19.950
Megan N. Sutton
Which you all know that I've represented as lead objector reached agreement on the legally enforceable plan and its components around these topics.

4:57:20.970 --> 4:57:26.920
Megan N. Sutton
And to be more specific, we weave together protections for ecologically important.

4:57:27.720 --> 4:57:32.440
Megan N. Sutton
And disturbance sensitive places and the active management needed to restore.

4:57:33.10 --> 4:57:52.710
Megan N. Sutton
Umm. Disturbance dependent for us and species while also medium local economic and and industry needs. And so I just it feels important to name that because while I do represent the partnership and some of those voices are here are ones that you're hearing today, that's certainly not everyone.

4:57:53.580 --> 4:58:17.60
Megan N. Sutton
And so, you know, I would ask that you take a another look at our package of recommendations around this conversation, specifically that tiered objectives, amounts and languages because it includes, as many have said, a significant increase in creation of young forests, open woodland forests, as well as addressing old growth, which we haven't quite gotten to you.

4:58:17.780 --> 4:58:20.90
Megan N. Sutton
And what I wanna offer as a remedy.

4:58:21.100 --> 4:58:26.430
Megan N. Sutton
Is, you know, we're hearing today that there are many different perspectives on how much and where.

4:58:27.150 --> 4:58:51.380
Megan N. Sutton
Umm, you know related to active management of young and open for us and and we're gonna hear about old growth as well. But the partnership took the draft plan and you know as as some have I think Sam said earlier you know there was the old plan was really focused on the economics of forestry. There's this new ecological integrity component and we recognize that both are important and.

4:58:52.270 --> 4:59:1.90
Megan N. Sutton

What we did was try to meet the needs of both by incorporating ecological priority treatments into the silviculture objectives.

4:59:2.130 --> 4:59:5.70
Megan N. Sutton
So the partnership asked that the Forest Service.

4:59:6.270 --> 4:59:9.50
Megan N. Sutton
Include in the tier one objective.

4:59:9.720 --> 4:59:20.60
Megan N. Sutton
For regeneration, harvest that 25% of the regeneration harvest go towards collaboratively supported ecological treatments.

4:59:20.750 --> 4:59:51.560
Megan N. Sutton
And 50% of the thinning harvests in that tier one would go to these priority treatments and then those numbers would increase that Tier 2 levels. But we felt like this was a good path forward to trying to balance both of those needs. You know, as Sam has and others have pointed out, it's difficult to draw the connection from the plans objectives to the desired conditions. And this was a way that as a group of very diverse perspectives and thinkers.

4:59:51.730 --> 5:0:5.340
Megan N. Sutton
We were able to try to tie those two together, so I wanted to just put that in the room as a potential half forward and remedy to a lot of the different issues that we've heard about and continued to hear about throughout this afternoon.

5:0:8.520 --> 5:0:9.870
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Megan, yes, thank you.

5:0:13.770 --> 5:0:15.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Anything from either of you?

5:0:17.490 --> 5:0:19.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, I'm good. Thank you.

5:0:20.350 --> 5:0:22.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So let's go back to to Sam Evans.

5:0:28.140 --> 5:0:39.390
Sam Evans

Hey, thanks. Well, to start with, you know strongly support the the suggestions, the solutions that Megan just put on the table, I think you know the.

5:0:40.130 --> 5:0:47.180
Sam Evans
Uh, it doesn't. There's been on the table for a while. I if the you know, if those were part of the plan.

5:0:48.120 --> 5:0:52.910
Sam Evans
Uh, if we could, we could go home early today, right? Like, yeah, I think it does have been.

5:0:53.570 --> 5:1:0.770
Sam Evans
Uh, yeah, that there's have been really kind of front and center in, in, in, in, in a lot of the conversations.

5:1:1.370 --> 5:1:16.40
Sam Evans
Uh, about this, about this plant so far and you know, we just haven't seen them reflect it in the plan. And in fact, I think what we saw between the draft and the final was sort of a backsliding away from a commitment to getting the right things done in the right places.

5:1:16.560 --> 5:1:17.970
Sam Evans
Yeah, instead of.

5:1:18.740 --> 5:1:35.780
Sam Evans
And instead of sort of refining the objectives as as had been proposed, you know what we saw as sort of a retreat in a in a, you know, an effort to kind of clarify or build a mode around this idea that things don't have to be because it happened, the ecosystem scale.

5:1:36.810 --> 5:1:41.970
Sam Evans
I I wanna also can I respond a little bit to to Nick?

5:1:42.240 --> 5:2:2.0
Sam Evans
And when I disagree with one thing but then agree strongly with the more important thing, I think you know the you know, the the question on the table, I guess was whether in our V is something that just sort of generally informs what we do or if it's a requirement and the planning rule makes it a requirement. So the planning rule says that the plan must include.

5:2:2.640 --> 5:2:32.110
Sam Evans
Uh components, including binding components that will restore ecological integrity, and it defines ecological integrity as the condition of being within the RV. So that's a clear mandate. The Forest Service defined this is not. This isn't Sam's thing, but the the Forest Service defined ecological integrity for our

plan at the echoes echoes on scale. I think we all recognize that that is appropriate. So the question now is how do we move toward?

5:2:32.540 --> 5:2:37.390
Sam Evans
This reference conditions how do we get closer to the NRV during this plan cycle?

5:2:38.140 --> 5:2:42.660
Sam Evans
And how do we do it in a way that sets us up to continue making progress towards energy in the future?

5:2:44.230 --> 5:2:48.280
Sam Evans
And and and now I I guess the you know the well and then the other part of that you know does.

5:2:49.250 --> 5:3:12.220
Sam Evans
Isn't it OK to have a timber production program? Yes, absolutely, yes. That is part of the planning part of Nitha. It's been a part of the four services DNA and it's not something that we're not that we're trying to change here, but the planning role says really clearly this is 219.11 that 219.8 comes first, right. Ecological integrity comes first. And you can do timber production.

5:3:12.440 --> 5:3:14.510
Sam Evans
While meeting the requirements.

5:3:14.960 --> 5:3:18.290
Sam Evans
I'd be glad to entertain while like that, of course. Filter protection.

5:3:19.130 --> 5:3:34.20
Sam Evans
Of course, unfilter protection, so I guess that's where I would start but but but where I wanna finish is to say, you know, when it comes to Nick's point that you know, in order to get where we need to be for young, for us, he wants to see us get to Tier 2.

5:3:35.380 --> 5:3:46.650
Sam Evans
I may not be as a I'm not. I'm not rough grouse hunter, right? So you know, I have to defer to Nick about that, but I am invested in getting to tier two. I don't wanna come across today as in.

5:3:48.830 --> 5:4:18.880
Sam Evans
As if everything we're trying to do is to hold the Forest Service back, we're not trying to hold you back. We're helping. We're trying to help you go in the right direction. You know, as far as the my commitment to Tier 2 comes from the fact that I need to earn the support of others for for social support, for wilderness destination. Right. That's something that Megan mentioned yesterday is is sort

of a conditional support from from from others in the community here in the stakeholder community. And I want to earn that support.

5:4:18.960 --> 5:4:40.230
Sam Evans
Then to get there, we've we've gotta get to Tier 2. And so you know, and and in order to get to tier two, we have to fix the allocations we have to make sure we're doing the right things in the right places because if we're not, it sets us up for a fight between the people who want to see just more work done and those of us who need to see that work being harnessed for ecological ones.

5:4:43.620 --> 5:4:44.900
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright. You wanna take a breath?

5:4:48.130 --> 5:4:48.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That here.

5:4:49.400 --> 5:4:50.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, good. Thank you.

5:4:51.450 --> 5:4:55.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sam, you are to for for a minute or you wanna go on.

5:4:57.550 --> 5:4:58.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks.

5:4:56.480 --> 5:5:10.30
Sam Evans
OK, I'm gonna send you a few. Gotta start it on the models. I think we have to talk about the models and we have to talk about them. And in a in a quite a bit of detail, but it seems like we're having a good conversation about the non modeling thing. So I'm happy to wait on that.

5:5:11.550 --> 5:5:18.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And I just wanna make sure that we're getting to the the points on the resolutions and not gonna lose that for context.

5:5:19.200 --> 5:5:21.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right. So back, back to John. Cocksure.

5:5:36.840 --> 5:5:37.650
Sam Evans
Give me the tongue.

5:5:39.340 --> 5:5:43.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. And you're frozen. You're frozen. Are You Beautiful?

5:5:41.320 --> 5:5:45.480
John Culclasure
I I I was saying, I'm sorry. I did not mean to have my hand raised out from my previous comment and thank you.

5:5:46.590 --> 5:5:47.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alrighty, thank you.

5:5:48.570 --> 5:5:50.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So uh, nick.

5:5:53.760 --> 5:5:54.740
Nicholas Holshouser
This this nick.

5:5:56.830 --> 5:5:57.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That Nick was out.

5:6:2.740 --> 5:6:3.440
Ward, Michael - FS
I'm done.

5:5:56.800 --> 5:6:8.130
Nicholas Holshouser
I I'm interested party in this. It's been a great conversation so far as an interested party. This is really something that I was sort of hoping not having a chance to chime in on.

5:6:10.270 --> 5:6:17.60
Nicholas Holshouser
As a as a concerned citizen throughout the process, I saw the the hell of physical force partnership.

5:6:18.170 --> 5:6:46.780
Nicholas Holshouser
Is it is an entity comprised of lots of different people with lots of different perspectives and and I will tell you honestly as a as a citizen of the area I entrusted the partnership to represent a lot of diverse interests, and in fact those diverse interests around the phone here today and across the region. One thing that I was confused about subsequent to the final to the draft decision and the final environmental impact statement.

5:6:47.190 --> 5:6:48.30
Nicholas Holshouser
Was.

5:6:48.900 --> 5:7:20.960
Nicholas Holshouser
Why the Forest Service departed in some area significantly from the recommendations of the partnership. And just as an interested party and as a citizen, I've never heard that explanation and I think it would be beneficial for all of us, whether part of the remedy or part of our dialogue, to understand the reasons why not doing what the partnership recommended was preferable. But it was the preferable choice and that the Forest Service decision.

5:7:21.90 --> 5:7:37.610
Nicholas Holshouser
Was actually better than the partnerships decision. And just as a as a citizen in the region whose whose read this through news accounts I've never seen nor heard that that discussion or explanation from the Forest Service. So I hope as part of the remedy at least it comes out whatever differences.

5:7:38.950 --> 5:7:50.710
Nicholas Holshouser
End up happening that that there is a a full and reasonable explanation of the choices of the Forest Service made reflecting their differences with the with an inhale episco forest partnership. Thanks.

5:7:52.270 --> 5:7:53.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. Thank you, nick.

5:7:55.50 --> 5:7:58.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You wanna say anything now? But, well, I'll just.

5:8:2.610 --> 5:8:6.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'll just speak briefly on that. You know we.

5:8:7.690 --> 5:8:15.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We value greatly the input and and the recommendations from the partnership as we have from from many other groups, I think.

5:8:16.220 --> 5:8:27.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm, you know, I would say that, you know, if you look at all the the recommendations, a large majority were incorporated in the plan where we differ.

5:8:28.590 --> 5:8:46.900
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It it came down to certain things where while it is a broad spectrum of users, it's not all the all the interests that we have to ensure our our included in the plan and of course we also have our own.

5:8:48.700 --> 5:8:52.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Professional judgment and and things and and there's sometimes where.

5:8:53.940 --> 5:9:8.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We we might have differed on whether that was appropriate to have those things in the plan and some of the, you know Megans talked about some of the the triggers and those sorts of things there. There's there's differing opinions as to whether.

5:9:10.30 --> 5:9:19.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We we wanna have those incorporated in the plan when it comes to if we get to this level then we'll recommend certain wilderness and those sorts of things. So anyway.

5:9:21.640 --> 5:9:36.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We we have gone into some detail on that, but anyway it's it's I I guess it's the place to say we do not take those comments lightly and as we haven't with with all the other interests.

5:9:39.770 --> 5:9:50.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, nick. Anything or break anything back to Nick? No, I appreciate you bringing that up and and that there's a a gap in some rationale and reasoning there you'd like to see.

5:9:50.730 --> 5:9:52.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Appreciate that. OK.

5:9:53.790 --> 5:9:54.630
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Josh?

5:9:57.240 --> 5:10:2.570
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah. Thank you. And and James I think you just spoke to one of the things that I.

5:10:3.940 --> 5:10:11.670
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
That I spoke to yesterday, which is I think at a propensity for the Forest Service to use unanimity when convenient to.

5:10:12.490 --> 5:10:18.860
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Depart from the broadest possible social consensus, and I think that's something you need to take a really hard look at as you work through these objections.

5:10:20.860 --> 5:10:46.560
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)

And but on the issue of remedies, I think there are a couple of categories here and I think will continue to work through those. But one of the categories of course is some of the issues are analysis issues required by NEPA and to fix them and comply with NEPA, you there will need to be some more worked on the EIS. The problems I think that we can maybe be more constructive with right now are the ways in which that.

5:10:47.260 --> 5:11:16.250
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Deficiency in analysis translated to a lack of plan components and and plan materials, so I I support strongly Megan suggestions for the tiers of restoration treatments in the plan. I think curiously, and it's something that doesn't make sense to folks. I think particularly in the forest product side of the world is that in the plan in tier one the four service commits to quote 50% of the timber harvest being for restoration which.

5:11:17.0 --> 5:11:46.810
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I tend to interpret as being the less commercially viable harvests and then lowering that percentage in tier two that that really doesn't make sense to the the forest products industry from an economy of scale standpoint, I think that's something where you wanna build that snowball and when you start doing more timber harvest under tier two, you can probably do more restoration because you've got more economy of scale built into the timber economy. So that's just the point. I'd like to make. I think we made it in our objection also though I wanted to emphasize that.

5:11:47.180 --> 5:12:3.950
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
There should have been and still could be ecozone specific targets for young forest creation. So to me it does not make sense that there is not, for example, a low elevation pine target for young forest creation when we know that system lacks that specific structure more than any other system.

5:12:5.480 --> 5:12:13.400
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
And I so I I think that's something that could be a resolution would be egos on specific targets for young forest creation and restoration.

5:12:14.450 --> 5:12:14.810
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Thanks.

5:12:18.310 --> 5:12:19.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Josh.

5:12:20.280 --> 5:12:27.60
Sam Evans
May have for provide a visual that I think will give some context to what Josh was just saying. I'm not. I wanna make sure everybody followed that.

5:12:28.140 --> 5:12:29.230
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank thanks Josh.

5:12:30.20 --> 5:12:31.990
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And visual good.

5:12:34.830 --> 5:12:35.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Long as it's big enough.

5:12:37.610 --> 5:12:38.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There you go.

5:12:33.860 --> 5:12:44.560
Sam Evans
So Josh, correct me if this is wrong, I think this is what you're talking about for the tier one volume per acre estimate here. This is CF per acre at tier one.

5:12:45.370 --> 5:12:47.320
Sam Evans
And CCF per acre at Tier 2?

5:12:48.900 --> 5:12:51.130
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yep, good example good.

5:12:53.920 --> 5:12:54.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

5:12:58.20 --> 5:12:59.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right. All right. Ready to move?

5:13:0.570 --> 5:13:1.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Megan.

5:13:4.550 --> 5:13:5.240
Megan N. Sutton
Hi there.

5:13:6.40 --> 5:13:14.610
Megan N. Sutton
So you know, on behalf of the inhale episcope Forest partnership, you know, I appreciated Nicholas your comment and James, your response and.

5:13:15.270 --> 5:13:28.130
Megan N. Sutton
You know, we recognize that you have internal as well as external collaboration, you know and both can be equally tricky to navigate and we also acknowledge that the professional expertise of the staff.

5:13:28.780 --> 5:13:45.870
Megan N. Sutton
As well as the partners that you have and and as the partnerships representative, I just wanna make comment that one I I do affirm what Nicholas said, it would be helpful in the written response objections to better understand.

5:13:46.990 --> 5:14:0.900
Megan N. Sutton
On which issues you know there was a deviation between what the partnership suggested and and the path that was taken. And I just wanna name that. You know, I recognize that some of the solutions that we provided.

5:14:2.610 --> 5:14:22.820
Megan N. Sutton
On the face of them, may seem complex in terms of how do we do this? How? How do we make this work? How do we operationalize this? Because it's doing business differently and I I just wanna kind of name that and also just name that they're really complex issues that you know, Rick, you're spending three days hearing about all these complexities and so sometimes.

5:14:23.440 --> 5:14:42.440
Megan N. Sutton
That means complex solutions, but I've also really appreciated the innovation that the ID team has shown in, you know, certain areas with coming up with different ways of doing business as usual, looking at different, taking more of an out-of-the-box approach to thinking about.

5:14:43.120 --> 5:14:49.910
Megan N. Sutton
Different ways we could do things. And so I think that there's a lot of creativity there and I'm hopeful that you know.

5:14:51.680 --> 5:15:8.190
Megan N. Sutton
But you can meet in the middle. You know that we can kind of find a path forward because I recognize that, you know, operationalizing a plan and implementing it is that's why so many of us have invested so much time in years and effort. And, you know, that's critically important.

5:15:10.0 --> 5:15:24.510
Megan N. Sutton
And recognize that sometimes these complex problems have complex solutions that may be a little clunky to figure out. You know, how do we operationalize this? And we require some some creativity. And then I feel.

5:15:25.630 --> 5:15:32.490
Megan N. Sutton
Confident that the ID team and and you know Rick and your shop have the expertise to be able to navigate that.

5:15:33.530 --> 5:15:33.890
Megan N. Sutton
Thank you.

5:15:35.190 --> 5:15:35.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Megan.

5:15:37.880 --> 5:15:51.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So well, you're next in the queue and then I'd like to do a process check to get you to help me understand how far we are down this list and what more there is to cover in the in, in the rest of the afternoon, so well.

5:15:53.350 --> 5:16:6.800
Will Harlan
Thanks. Uh, the solutions, the remedies that are supported by the iheart physic coalition and the 750 consolidated objectors there 96% of the 36,000 public comments that have come in.

5:16:7.490 --> 5:16:17.990
Will Harlan
The largest and most populous city in the region and the largest and most populous county in the region, the solution is is quite simple, more old growth.

5:16:18.650 --> 5:16:20.970
Will Harlan
And less timber harvests.

5:16:21.650 --> 5:16:35.100
Will Harlan
And the reasons for that, I want to return to the All lands analysis for a moment. The FIS your own data shows that 11% of private timberlands are in the 2010 to 20 age.

5:16:35.190 --> 5:16:37.720
Will Harlan
A 10 to 20 year age class.

5:16:38.960 --> 5:16:42.530
Will Harlan
Less than 2% of those lands are in old growth.

5:16:43.360 --> 5:17:3.770
Will Harlan
Uh, US Forest Service numbers also say that private companies own three times as much land in western

North Carolina as the US Forest Service, and those private forests skew heavily toward young forests. So we have an overabundance of young forests on private lands and a dearth of old growth.

5:17:4.470 --> 5:17:20.670
Will Harlan
So that there is a real need for more old growth, especially in national forests, and that affects the entire plan and the goals and the models. So up front, the solutions are quite clear and important.

5:17:21.610 --> 5:17:22.630
Will Harlan
More old growth.

5:17:23.680 --> 5:17:24.860
Will Harlan
Less timber harvests.

5:17:27.420 --> 5:17:28.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you all.

5:17:28.700 --> 5:17:42.510
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you will. So so let me just ask the question. Have have those of you that are objectors and interested persons pretty much covered what you wanna cover on the NRV and early serial habitat?

5:17:43.420 --> 5:17:44.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Topics.

5:17:45.170 --> 5:17:50.460
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Now, what are we? Are we ready to believe in now to over fire fuels and thermal suitability?

5:17:52.480 --> 5:17:52.900
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Call.

5:17:51.620 --> 5:17:52.930
Sam Evans
I don't think so.

5:17:54.520 --> 5:17:55.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I don't think so. OK.

5:17:52.380 --> 5:18:4.410
Nick Biemiller
Made out? Yeah. No, I don't think. Well, I don't think we've gotten into really any of the specifics on

resolutions for those issues yet. I feel like we've really just scratched the surface of the big picture context.

5:18:5.500 --> 5:18:10.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So if we if we go there after break, we'll get, we're gonna have a break here pretty soon, but if we go there.

5:18:11.810 --> 5:18:13.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You feel like we can.

5:18:16.940 --> 5:18:17.230
Ward, Michael - FS
Hi.

5:18:14.410 --> 5:18:32.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Keep keep the pace such that we don't draw the drop off before the others are covered. That's that's my I'm. I don't know how to do that and I'm just gonna ask you to help me do that to make sure that we can cover all the topics that we wanted to for the afternoon.

5:18:32.880 --> 5:18:33.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Knowing that.

5:18:35.0 --> 5:18:36.990
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Maybe there is more than we can cover.

5:18:36.80 --> 5:18:37.190
Ward, Michael - FS
Have anything?

5:18:38.910 --> 5:18:39.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm sorry.

5:18:49.940 --> 5:18:50.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright.

5:18:42.60 --> 5:18:54.700
Sam Evans
I I think we can. I mean I'll speak for my team that we can, we can move as you know we can move efficiently through it. I I guess the the issue for us is that you know they're kind of two paths to.

5:18:55.400 --> 5:19:26.520
Sam Evans

And do a solution here one is to go back and redo the analysis, right? Like that's one option that's on the table and the other is to adopt, you know, some some ecozone scale or components or, you know, the partnership solutions that those kinds of like are there changes to the planning components since we don't know which of those is is really more more possible at this point if I think we kind of have to break down what an analysis would have to look like when you go back and do it correctly.

5:19:27.30 --> 5:19:40.550
Sam Evans
And to do that, we have to get into the model conversation. So I I I don't see any way around it unless you all are able to tell us right now how you're going, how you're gonna fix it. And and I don't expect you to be able to do that yet. So I think we got to go there.

5:19:41.850 --> 5:19:43.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That helpful approach?

5:19:44.510 --> 5:19:48.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
To to dig into the the model, the model.

5:19:50.630 --> 5:20:3.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Which is not focused on new information or resolutions to green part of the resolution. It is part of the resolution. OK, well, I'm not. I'm not telling you where to go. I just. I'm trying to help.

5:20:5.480 --> 5:20:15.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ask you to look at the time scale and and in the best way you can cover what you wanna cover. Yeah, and the and the. We could lean towards prognosis.

5:20:17.90 --> 5:20:19.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And I think we got the diagnosis.

5:20:21.510 --> 5:20:27.180
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. And I'll just say on our end for NRV and early successional habitat, we probably have.

5:20:36.270 --> 5:20:36.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right.

5:20:27.850 --> 5:20:39.40
Nick Biemiller
Three to four issues with some specific resolutions that we've dialed in for the sake of this conversation today that I can offer as part of the conversation, and then we can move on.

5:20:40.870 --> 5:20:45.630
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So let's Nick, let's do that now and then we'll take a break. When, when? After you've offered.

5:20:46.640 --> 5:20:47.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Those contracts.

5:20:50.320 --> 5:20:53.180
Nick Biemiller
OK, so you want me to share those now?

5:20:55.740 --> 5:20:58.430
Nick Biemiller
Sure. OK, great. I'll try and be as quick as I can.

5:21:0.230 --> 5:21:22.220
Nick Biemiller
So one of the issues that we raised in our objection is that the NRV model does not appear to have included in assessment of historic anthropogenic disturbance and also disturbance from Keystone wildlife species that are currently extinct or extirpated, that were drivers and maintainers of certain ecological several conditions on the landscape.

5:21:22.990 --> 5:21:35.900
Nick Biemiller
And so we talk in our objection document about broadly updating the NRV model to include those things. And then as needed, update some of the forest plan components.

5:21:36.600 --> 5:21:55.330
Nick Biemiller
Umm. But I wanted to provide us some specificity today is I think that if those things were not included in the NRV model, we feel like they should be, they should be captured as part of the historic range of variation as what we're considering a baseline to inform the plan. And then based on those updates.

5:21:56.510 --> 5:22:8.40
Nick Biemiller
You know, namely I think table three in the forest plan which is on page 66 should be updated to reflect any of those changes once those disturbances are incorporated.

5:22:8.780 --> 5:22:24.550
Nick Biemiller
And then if needed, based on the results of those updates to NRV, increase or decrease some of the integrated ecosystem and wildlife habitat objectives in the forest plan which is on page 69 of the forest plan.

5:22:28.260 --> 5:22:30.10
Nick Biemiller
So that's one.

5:22:28.260 --> 5:22:50.950
Nick Biemiller
Just hold on one SEC. One SEC. OK, good. Thank you. Go on. OK. The other issue that we have specifically that we objected to is on the way in which the spectrum model and again, I'm getting into the weeds here with the modeling, which I don't know how else to kind of cover our core topics here without doing that. So I guess I'll just do it.

5:22:51.60 --> 5:22:51.510
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Words.

5:23:3.630 --> 5:23:4.460
Megan N. Sutton
Another cup of coffee.

5:23:5.470 --> 5:23:5.940
Megan N. Sutton
No.

5:22:52.710 --> 5:23:6.680
Nick Biemiller
But the spectrum model in the FIS included human induced wildfire as contributing towards young forest creation. However, the NRV model did not include human induced wildfire and anthropogenic disturbance.

5:23:7.40 --> 5:23:9.10
Megan N. Sutton
If I had just like today.

5:23:8.420 --> 5:23:11.190
Nick Biemiller
What's that? Mega, uh, think Meghan's Mic is not good. Sorry.

5:23:10.310 --> 5:23:11.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hold on a second. Let's let's.

5:23:12.780 --> 5:23:15.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Like one second. Nick, can we get?

5:23:17.100 --> 5:23:17.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Mute.

5:23:18.490 --> 5:23:19.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Allison.

5:23:20.60 --> 5:23:23.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, she's OK. Very good. Alright, thank you.

5:23:23.870 --> 5:23:24.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sorry, nick.

5:23:24.960 --> 5:23:25.730
Nick Biemiller
Yeah, sure.

5:23:27.740 --> 5:23:38.130
Nick Biemiller
So one of our objections was on and you know Hugh mentioned this actually earlier and I think I hit and I actually agree on this issue, except we are coming at it from different perspectives.

5:23:39.230 --> 5:24:8.520
Nick Biemiller
But one thing that is an inconsistency between the spectrum model and the NRV model is that the spectrum model included human induced wildfire as contributing towards young forest creation. However, the NRV model did not include anthropogenic disturbance and so we feel like it's inappropriate to include anthropogenic disturbance and one not model, but not the other. So you know, that would basically require updating the NRV model.

5:24:8.630 --> 5:24:23.420
Nick Biemiller
To include that anthropogenic disturbance in the past, as well as updating the spectrum model and consulting social scientists on some of the assumptions around human behavior as it reduced to human induced wildfire in that model.

5:24:24.500 --> 5:24:24.930
Ward, Michael - FS
Uh.

5:24:24.880 --> 5:24:30.590
Nick Biemiller
So that's another resolution as it relates to kind of the young forests and open forest component.

5:24:31.400 --> 5:24:32.190
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, hold on.

5:24:35.10 --> 5:24:36.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good, alright.

5:24:37.910 --> 5:24:38.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Support.

5:24:39.90 --> 5:24:39.900
Nick Biemiller
Sure. Yeah.

5:24:40.150 --> 5:24:40.850
Nick Biemiller
Umm.

5:24:42.10 --> 5:24:44.610
Nick Biemiller
I mean to take up too much of the airspace here, but I'll try and be quick.

5:24:46.190 --> 5:24:48.820
Nick Biemiller
When it relates to the spectrum model also.

5:24:50.140 --> 5:24:52.590
Nick Biemiller
We're concerned that the spectrum model included.

5:24:53.750 --> 5:25:4.320
Nick Biemiller
Half acres as the minimum size for young forest patch size into in terms of how they assess young forest in the spectrum model.

5:25:5.760 --> 5:25:15.460
Nick Biemiller
And we feel like that does not adequately represent functional young forest habitat from a wildlife perspective. And so an update to the spectrum model.

5:25:17.440 --> 5:25:28.460
Nick Biemiller
Should include patches greater than one acre in size and also include an assessment of habitat quality and quantity as it relates to the function of that habitat for wildlife.

5:25:29.510 --> 5:25:41.640
Nick Biemiller
And then based on that update to the spectrum model that might require updates to both the ESE for demand wildlife species in the final Environmental Impact statement.

5:25:43.180 --> 5:26:12.0
Nick Biemiller
As well as an update to the monitoring program and the change to the indicator around, you know M Q21T1, this is getting into the weeds. I don't know if this is very useful or not. If it's too much detail, but

basically including kind of that one acre patch limit and an assessment of habitat quality and quantity and then updating multiple different plan components including the monitoring program.

5:26:13.140 --> 5:26:17.430
Nick Biemiller
Table three and the forest plan, which is on page 66.

5:26:18.820 --> 5:26:24.60
Nick Biemiller
As well as desired conditions, objective standards or guidelines in the forest plan.

5:26:27.80 --> 5:26:34.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So this might be a good time to take a breather. There is this it? Have you covered all your points or are there more Nick?

5:26:35.610 --> 5:26:44.400
Nick Biemiller
The only other one that we have relating to like young forest in the in the FIS is also with the spectrum model but so.

5:26:45.140 --> 5:26:47.410
Nick Biemiller
I can just cover that quickly if you'd like.

5:26:47.440 --> 5:26:47.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

5:26:49.170 --> 5:26:57.320
Nick Biemiller
So in addition to increasing the minimum patch size to one acre and assessing habitat quality and quantity as part of the modeling.

5:26:58.710 --> 5:27:7.540
Nick Biemiller
We also objected based on an issue that the spectrum model includes group selection treatments as contributing towards young forest conditions.

5:27:8.120 --> 5:27:36.530
Nick Biemiller
Umm, typically group selection silviculture does not result in the stand replacing disturbance event that provides functional young forest habitat, especially considering that one acre is the minimum size of a forest and should be what's considered kind of the minimum size for a standard placing disturbance event. So we would like group selection treatments to be removed as a contribution towards young forest conditions in the spectrum model.

5:27:37.400 --> 5:27:46.110
Nick Biemiller

And as a result, adjust the spectrum model to only include patches greater than one acre, and also included that assessment of habitat quality and quantity.

5:27:46.860 --> 5:27:54.60
Nick Biemiller
And then up, basically adjust both the ESE for demand wildlife species as well as the monitoring.

5:27:54.580 --> 5:28:3.320
Nick Biemiller
Umm and desired conditions, objectives, standards and guidelines in the forest plan based on that change in the FIS and in the spectrum model.

5:28:6.790 --> 5:28:12.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, so work any need to go down any path here?

5:28:13.630 --> 5:28:15.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, I got them. Thank you for.

5:28:17.100 --> 5:28:20.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you for putting some resolutions on the table. Appreciate that. Thank.

5:28:22.360 --> 5:28:23.650
Nick Biemiller
Sure, absolutely.

5:28:22.670 --> 5:28:31.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right, good. It's the topic. It's the top of the hour, and I think it's a good time for a break. 15 minutes. Return it to 15.

5:28:32.0 --> 5:28:37.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then we'll have 2 1/2 hours left to cover to keep moving on this and to cover each of the subtopics.

5:28:38.440 --> 5:28:49.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And and I just wanna ohh. I lost him. They awakens was here. Alright, we'll we'll start at the. We'll start at the at 2:15 then. Thank you.

5:28:51.860 --> 5:28:52.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yet.

5:42:34.960 --> 5:42:36.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Here we are again. Can you hear us?

5:42:38.910 --> 5:42:39.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

5:42:46.770 --> 5:42:56.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ready to rock and roll? I just wanted. I was reminding myself over break. How? In every meeting, there's an evolution of energy.

5:42:57.420 --> 5:43:8.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And this is about the the time in the meeting, 3 days of the meeting, second day, second afternoon. The energy gets to be a little bit low and and it will pick up.

5:43:9.710 --> 5:43:19.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So maybe you're feeling that maybe you're not. I I think that we're gonna. We're gonna keep moving in and ask for your grace.

5:43:21.40 --> 5:43:33.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
1st for yourself, because you've been on for two days. A lot of you and you have lots to cover and are trying to be doing it in in the most mindful way. And I what I really respect here is that.

5:43:34.650 --> 5:43:35.520
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You are.

5:43:37.380 --> 5:43:44.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Really open to taking turns and hearing voices in it. In the spirit of making.

5:43:45.340 --> 5:43:58.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Just knowing that you're you are going to have your chance to cover what you wanna cover. So I I appreciate that. Yeah. And thank you again everybody. This is very helpful. So thank you for your patience and your your taking your time to.

5:43:59.540 --> 5:44:2.270
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
To go over everything with me, very helpful.

5:44:3.210 --> 5:44:29.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So just to refocus we we are on the force management and ecological integrity, the largest block for the afternoon. We've talked a lot about NRV, including early serial habitat. We're not done with that as I if I understand that correctly. But we also want to hear what you have to say about your objections around old growth, firing fuels and timorous suitability and timber harvest in this afternoon block.

5:44:30.680 --> 5:44:31.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I have.

5:44:33.910 --> 5:44:40.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sam, do we start with you again and ask you to continue whether you finish or not, but continue with your points.

5:44:41.900 --> 5:45:2.130
Sam Evans
Sure. And you know, in the spirit, in the same spirit that Nick tried to move really efficiently, I will try to do the same. I think you know what I heard from Nick is some concerns about the, you know, the reliability of the model. And James, you know, that's the question you asked earlier. So I think if we come to that part where we're sort of tackling that that question directly.

5:45:2.670 --> 5:45:18.390
Sam Evans
It is a all models are all models are wrong. Some are useful. How long does it have to be before? It's not useful anymore. I I think you know there while Nick and I probably don't have exactly the same perspective on what's wrong with the models, or at least we're focusing on different.

5:45:19.130 --> 5:45:29.720
Sam Evans
Aspects of it. I think you know from from my perspective, the model is not is not reliable enough to bear the weight of the decision here.

5:45:30.330 --> 5:45:55.120
Sam Evans
And so, you know, I I think I would strongly support going back to get the modeling right. And I think that's where we could talk about things like the, you know, what is the best size threshold for young forests that I think I could probably get on board as Nick suggested with using a one acre threshold sort of as long as that's addressed consistently in the in the NRV model and in the spectrum model.

5:45:55.890 --> 5:46:13.180
Sam Evans
The I think consistency, since that's where I'm at at at this moment is probably where I wanna start. There are kind of two separate varieties of modeling problem. One is the consistency between an RV and spectrum. That's the what? What you've gotta start thinking about earlier.

5:46:14.60 --> 5:46:16.730
Sam Evans
And the other is just sort of.

5:46:17.900 --> 5:46:31.310
Sam Evans
Assuming that the the you know, assuming away those problems with consistency, what did the

models? What did the models miss? But but with the consistency problem the I think the single biggest problem with the EIS, which is something we.

5:46:32.220 --> 5:46:58.350
Sam Evans
We we weighed in on in excruciating detail and I'm sure lots of of the forest staff are tired of it. Is it the the interview spectrum models are based on these inconsistent assumptions. You know the the in RV model, just to reorient it says it tries to tell us how much young mid late old forces characteristic for each ecozone given that ecozones dominant disturbance regime.

5:46:59.510 --> 5:47:30.440
Sam Evans
And so the spectrum model on the other hand kinda looks to the future the the models disagree on the scale at which disturbance resets forests to young conditions. So in our V model includes small scale gaps when it's calculating how much young forest we need it or how much young forest we ought to have. The spectrum model uses a half acre threshold and below which disturbance does not create young for us. So I think the best way to sum up the problem is that if the NRV.

5:47:30.510 --> 5:47:47.930
Sam Evans
That's had used 1/2 acre cut off. They would have had a longer return interval, so a lower disturbance probability. Bigger disturbances are have lower disturbance frequencies. That's really clear in the scientific literature. So there are a couple of visuals that I think helped illustrate this.

5:47:50.540 --> 5:47:52.250
Sam Evans
That I will share really quickly.

5:47:55.230 --> 5:47:57.340
Sam Evans
And this is just a comparison.

5:47:58.270 --> 5:48:12.290
Sam Evans
Of the of the forest services in RV output and an adjusted in RV output to be consistent with the return interval that's in the ecological literature for for larger patches.

5:48:13.450 --> 5:48:24.920
Sam Evans
As you can see that the the return interval, the main RV model output is is quite a bit lower for early serial habitat. If you use a larger patch size.

5:48:29.540 --> 5:48:31.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
What did I ask her? To a general question.

5:48:32.870 --> 5:48:35.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For for the the hands that are up.

5:48:36.980 --> 5:48:43.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is where everybody is headed. Is that some redo of the modeling?

5:48:46.20 --> 5:48:47.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You can show thumbs.

5:48:48.560 --> 5:48:49.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Nick and Hugh.

5:48:56.360 --> 5:48:58.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You see that? Yeah. So so.

5:48:57.660 --> 5:48:59.530
Nick Biemiller
Sorry, could you could you restate your question, Rick?

5:49:1.380 --> 5:49:5.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm just asking you for where we're at. Is everybody who's hand is up.

5:49:5.840 --> 5:49:10.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Headed towards there's a redo of the model need.

5:49:17.570 --> 5:49:18.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No. Yes.

5:49:20.900 --> 5:49:26.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And that's one of the check in on that because yeah, so if we could walk through.

5:49:28.670 --> 5:49:32.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Or maybe focus on what that what that entails.

5:49:33.330 --> 5:49:33.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And.

5:49:34.970 --> 5:49:39.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And the the thoughts or concerns expectations around?

5:49:40.360 --> 5:49:42.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Around that as a resolution.

5:49:44.490 --> 5:50:1.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm hearing Sam do somewhat here. Yeah, yeah. Just wanted to check you out. We could call the hands. Yeah. So that's, that's where. That's where, like, everybody's gonna hit on is hit. Something needs to be redone with this modeling or different models or things within the model. OK. Thanks. Good soon.

5:50:2.310 --> 5:50:33.850
Sam Evans
Sure. Yeah. And and and from my part the the modeling is one way and and a really important way to fix the analytical framework that the plan is based on you know their hue mentioned earlier. There are other ways if we all agree and we're all on board with that, the plan is going to take us in the direction that we need to go. There may be ways to avoid that. I do think that the models I'll just throw the warning out into there and the models are the foundation for the EIS. So redoing the models means redoing the EIS and I want to be really clear about that.

5:50:34.190 --> 5:50:46.970
Sam Evans
And that that's not, you know, that's not gonna be an easy task. I think it if if the four service isn't ready to adopt plan components to address the issues today though it's an essential and just unavoidable next step.

5:50:48.770 --> 5:50:49.80
Sam Evans
Uh.

5:50:48.620 --> 5:50:49.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That are or.

5:50:50.640 --> 5:50:56.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
With model redo models, redo IS or adopt plan components.

5:50:57.970 --> 5:50:58.710
Sam Evans
I think that's it.

5:51:0.500 --> 5:51:1.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Got you.

5:51:0.110 --> 5:51:4.940
Sam Evans
And sort of the first half of the discussion today related primarily to planned components.

5:51:5.490 --> 5:51:6.940
Sam Evans
Uh, you know.

5:51:7.810 --> 5:51:13.10
Sam Evans
The for. Personally I would like to see a corrected analysis right but.

5:51:13.440 --> 5:51:30.960
Sam Evans
And I think that's really important. I think that poor service has a responsibility to get the analysis right. I think this is gonna be a model for other plan revisions in the southern Appalachians. But you know, to the extent that the plan gets fixed, we have spent a lot of time in playing our vision. And I think that is another path forward.

5:51:34.510 --> 5:51:34.860
Sam Evans
So.

5:51:34.720 --> 5:51:35.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, continue.

5:51:34.950 --> 5:52:6.50
Sam Evans
But yeah, thanks and and you know, I could say a lot more about this consistency issue and others on the on the call may want to. I wanna. I wanna share though that it matters a lot for discussion. We're gonna have in a little bit and that is how old growth accumulates over time. So if you remove small gaps from in our from the NRB model as causing young forest and instead treat them the way that the spectrum model does as a sort of continuing to accumulate an old forest, you get a much higher proportion.

5:52:6.140 --> 5:52:18.40
Sam Evans
Of need for old growth forests. And this is just the code ecosystem. But you can run. You can run those models with adjustments to be consistent with the ecological literature for any for any of the ecozones.

5:52:19.440 --> 5:52:49.570
Sam Evans
So I'm gonna. I'm gonna leave that alone for now. So I'm gonna say from now on, I'm gonna assume that that 90,000 acres is the right amount of young force and the the patch size that the Forest Service has has settled on that 1/2 acre is right and it doesn't matter which ecozones you create young forest and assume all the problems that we've talked about so far away. And you still have some really serious

problems with the spectrum model. So the spectrum model shows that we're maxing out etsh with the plan.

5:52:49.790 --> 5:53:19.810
Sam Evans
With with timber harvest levels that are actually less than the the plan objective. So the spectrum model bumps into the ceiling at at 2800 to 3000 acres a year and at that point it is either at or above the 90,000 acre level. And what this means is that if there is ESH, if there's young force, if there's a disturbance happening on the forest that isn't accounted for in the spectrum model, then those timber harvest objectives are intentionally overshooting in RB levels.

5:53:20.110 --> 5:53:50.680
Sam Evans
And now I'll run through really quickly what the there are a lot. There are a lot of acres out there of disturbance and young forests that are not being counted in the spectrum model. Probably the most important one is permanent, EH? Conservatively, we're talking about at least 15,000 acres on the forest that is in in young forest condition that's over 5000 acres of wildlife openings up to about a 7000 acres of utility, right of way and about 4000 acres involves excluding Roan Mountain. So then add Round Mountain on top of that.

5:53:51.390 --> 5:54:3.930
Sam Evans
If those levels were to just stay constant and not be expanded at all, even though the objectives call for expanding them, that's an equivalent to 1000 acres of rotational harvests per year.

5:54:4.840 --> 5:54:22.890
Sam Evans
Just fixing that problem which show a 100 you could it would show that you could take 100,000 acres out of the suitable base and still that use timber production alone to maintain the desired levels of early successional habitat and hit that 90,000 number every year so.

5:54:24.210 --> 5:54:53.300
Sam Evans
Another thing that spectrum model is missing is other management actions and the most important one here is fire the the according to spectrum, despite burning 45,000 acres a year in the objectives, only 90 to 145 acres per year are going to transition to young for us because of prescribed fire. That's less than 1/3 of 1% of turn acres. And this is way, way, way off of the.

5:54:53.390 --> 5:55:23.370
Sam Evans
Of the best available science, the best available science shows that the minimum we could expect is 1.3%. That's when you have infrequent prescribed fire, a 40 year return interval. This is our historical return interval and prescribed fire. When you have a 40 year return interval, you're still gonna get one point 3% transitioning to young forest and that's the the the the best available science that the forests put together for this planner vision. And if you are doing a more frequent application of fire, you're gonna have higher rates.

5:55:23.460 --> 5:55:46.960
Sam Evans
Of young forest creation, so the the the at Tier 2 the forest are going to be burning at a 7.7 year returned interval and when when you do that when you burn it characteristic frequencies and this is according to the forest one in our vmos as what in the NRV model tells us you're gonna get around 5% of acres transitioning into young forest. So at that 5% rate.

5:55:47.770 --> 5:55:54.670
Sam Evans
If the plan objectives for fire or not, you're gonna be creating 2200 acres a year of young forest through fire alone.

5:55:55.530 --> 5:56:9.820
Sam Evans
And you know what, what we're seeing here is, you know, an attempt in the plan to say we're gonna do our best to fully restore natural disturbance through fire and fully replace it through timber harvest. You're basically doubling your level of disturbance on the landscape that way.

5:56:19.130 --> 5:56:19.500
Jill Pyrz
What?

5:56:10.640 --> 5:56:21.230
Sam Evans
Another minor issue is day lighting. The plan says that it's going to create early successional habitat through day lighting roads as part of the intent and and that's not counted in spectrum model either.

5:56:23.760 --> 5:56:25.190
Sam Evans
I'll wrap up the.

5:56:26.220 --> 5:56:26.560
Sam Evans
Azure.

5:56:24.410 --> 5:56:26.870
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You can you hold on. Let's all good. OK.

5:56:27.290 --> 5:56:28.200
Jill Pyrz
Hello this is broken.

5:56:27.510 --> 5:56:28.700
Sam Evans
Yeah, I'm happy.

5:56:28.100 --> 5:56:28.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Go ahead. I was.

5:56:30.450 --> 5:56:39.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We're just gonna ask you to take a breath for a minute, but it sounds like you. You said you were gonna wrap up and somebody needs to mute their mic. Are you doing that? OK. Thank you.

5:56:40.320 --> 5:56:41.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Go ahead, Sam.

5:56:41.800 --> 5:56:57.450
Sam Evans
So the the last one is is as technical and complicated but and and we've talked a lot about it a lot during the process. But I'm gonna try to give the the shortest possible version of it. The spectrum model does not account for natural disturbance in a plausible way.

5:56:58.470 --> 5:57:27.760
Sam Evans
Yes. So we are probably not gonna find consensus on this call about what level of natural disturbance should have gone into the spectrum model. And that's OK. If we end up redoing the models, we can work through that when we're back at the table. But spectrum models, only 280 acres down 1,000,000 acre forest, 40 acres and moist ecozones annually of of natural disturbance. Yeah, this that rate, if you compare it to the.

5:57:27.870 --> 5:57:38.310
Sam Evans
In RV models, I'll just give you one example because I think it's pretty able to illustrative for Cove forests in the NRV model. If you have a 211 year return interval.

5:57:39.340 --> 5:57:50.890
Sam Evans
So that's how often you'd expect to see young forest or or disturbance revisiting the same location in spectrum. It's a 25,000 year return interval.

5:57:52.310 --> 5:58:22.740
Sam Evans
And that is implausible. the IT is justified as sort of backfilled in the EIS back two separate rationales. One was a historical reconstruction of historical disturbance over the last 50 years that has a lot of problems that we've pointed out in our in our written objection. I won't rehash those, but the chief among them is that it assumes that 1970s level of disturbances are gonna reset. And that's what we're going to have in 2020.

5:58:23.60 --> 5:58:24.380
Sam Evans
Or in the twenty 20s.

5:58:25.740 --> 5:58:33.930
Sam Evans
And there was no data or analysis support this idea that this is a cyclical disturbance in an era where we know disturbances are increasing.

5:58:34.540 --> 5:59:1.530
Sam Evans
And then the the to confirm that we're really low level of harvest that that there was a LIDAR analysis conducted to measure current levels of gaps. The LIDAR analysis had so many red flags in it, we were a little surprised that it made it into the final documents. There are about 25,000 acres of of openings on the forest right now. I've got the permanent openings and you've got the last 10 years of timber harvest.

5:59:2.470 --> 5:59:11.640
Sam Evans
The LIDAR analysis showed 3730 acres of human caused openings. It missed 85% of the openings that we know about.

5:59:12.400 --> 5:59:15.400
Sam Evans
And it's even worse when you look at.

5:59:16.100 --> 5:59:26.30
Sam Evans
Uh, natural disturbance. So this is sort of how the LIDAR analysis processed this fire created natural service. This is the wrong knob fire.

5:59:26.820 --> 5:59:30.480
Sam Evans
It missed 95% of the young forest.

5:59:31.630 --> 5:59:33.980
Sam Evans
In the in this in this example.

5:59:34.720 --> 5:59:39.0
Sam Evans
So just I hope that that helps illustrate the the problems the the.

5:59:39.650 --> 6:0:3.520
Sam Evans
So you know, again, we're not gonna agree today about levels of natural disturbance, but I think I hope that this helps to show that there is a lot of disturbance that should have been accounted for inspection that wasn't and every acre of disturbance that wasn't accounted for is an acre of timber harvest that is overshooting and get to get to remedies. I think I do, I do need it. I owe you that.

6:0:5.610 --> 6:0:16.160
Sam Evans

The point here for me is not that the timber harvest program needs to be radically slashed, right? Like again, I am on board for getting into Tier 2.

6:0:17.10 --> 6:0:28.140
Sam Evans
But the the the the problem is that you can't justify this level of timber harvest based on this. The rotational need for structural manipulation alone.

6:0:29.300 --> 6:0:54.750
Sam Evans
You have to have a better reason. One of those reasons would be rest or accelerating the restoration of species composition. That's the kind of thing that we're on board with is the kind of thing that we'd like to see the Forest Service do in this next planning cycle. If we can get planned components that do those sorts of things, then perhaps we can avoid the need to start over. But we've got right now the analysis that's doesn't get us there.

6:0:57.560 --> 6:0:58.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Sam.

6:1:5.790 --> 6:1:6.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

6:1:10.820 --> 6:1:12.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, my my questions are probably jumping ahead.

6:1:13.760 --> 6:1:16.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I'll I'll hold my computer my head towards.

6:1:18.110 --> 6:1:22.720
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Figure out how to implement the options that they're going to be able to all hold that for now.

6:1:24.690 --> 6:1:25.180
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

6:1:26.90 --> 6:1:28.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I would like to just.

6:1:29.670 --> 6:1:31.630
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Or on the phone a heads up.

6:1:32.320 --> 6:1:33.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That after.

6:1:34.170 --> 6:1:35.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
After we hear from Jason.

6:1:36.740 --> 6:1:40.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm going to ask anybody on the phone who wants to.

6:1:41.250 --> 6:1:46.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And are in OK, so heads up. Be ready when I ask after Jason.

6:1:46.690 --> 6:1:47.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Jason.

6:1:48.880 --> 6:2:0.950
Jason Totoiu
Well, thank you, Jason. To Toy Center for biological diversity. I just wanted to make two quick points. I think Sam really made the first point. I was gonna make. So I don't necessarily need to get too much into it, but.

6:2:1.800 --> 6:2:12.190
Jason Totoiu
That one of our other primary concerns was just exactly that, that the spec the model needs to be rerun because it's using scenarios that consider natural disturbance.

6:2:13.230 --> 6:2:23.580
Jason Totoiu
Uh. Historical natural disturbance over the last 50 years rather than into the future. We, I mean, I think that there's just a fundamental flaw in the modeling that needs to be addressed.

6:2:25.60 --> 6:2:40.830
Jason Totoiu
I was actually, I'm not a climatologist, and I'm not a forester, but what I just had, I took a look at the EIS and Forest plan and it actually has different amounts of natural disturbance that would result from in the two different tiers.

6:2:41.940 --> 6:2:52.670
Jason Totoiu
Can't quite figure out how that actually happens, so I'm leaving that there, but I think it's just another example of of how this modeling is yielding some pretty.

6:2:56.150 --> 6:2:57.0
Jason Totoiu
Unsupported.

6:2:57.160 --> 6:3:12.910
Jason Totoiu
Umm got results. OK my my my second point and it's just to return real quickly and to close the loop on the All lands approach. I think to address that deficiency which really I think comes down to.

6:3:14.240 --> 6:3:22.730
Jason Totoiu
Just that the the lack of analysis and the EIS on this issue, which is specifically that, that aspect of the planning rule.

6:3:23.930 --> 6:3:34.470
Jason Totoiu
212.2 and 212, I mean 219.2 and 219.8. Is that through a supplemental NEPA?

6:3:35.670 --> 6:4:0.70
Jason Totoiu
This could be it further examined, and this all lands analysis approach can just bear out. I guess the appropriateness of the the current direction of these these existing alternatives and then if necessary one or more alternatives that factor into this, the factor in the all nalysis analysis, all lands analysis that's all. Thank you.

6:4:2.190 --> 6:4:4.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks, Jason. Thank you, Jason.

6:4:5.970 --> 6:4:13.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, this is just to ask the people on the phone. If you want to enter into the dialogue, this is a good time.

6:4:20.960 --> 6:4:21.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

6:4:22.310 --> 6:4:22.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right.

6:4:23.920 --> 6:4:25.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Then moving to Hue.

6:4:27.780 --> 6:4:51.930
Hugh Irwin
Uh Herwin, the Wilderness Society and I wanna pivot a bit to all growth. I, you know, I do hope, we hope

talk more about all growth during this session and you know why did the inaccuracies in the NRV in spectrum models matter? You know if the public looking at the EIS they would think that.

6:4:52.70 --> 6:5:3.940
Hugh Irwin
Ohm, you know, under this plan that's, you know, being proposed that all growth would be fine, it would be more than fine with, you know under.

6:5:4.850 --> 6:5:14.200
Hugh Irwin
Ohh, the results portrayed in the EIS. We would have more old growth in the future than you know in RV.

6:5:15.240 --> 6:5:17.540
Hugh Irwin
Uh, and you know, besides the, you know.

6:5:18.90 --> 6:5:18.700
Hugh Irwin
Ohh.

6:5:20.610 --> 6:5:26.560
Hugh Irwin
That just doesn't make any sense on its face, but you know it's due to.

6:5:27.280 --> 6:5:27.900
Hugh Irwin
The.

6:5:28.670 --> 6:5:34.530
Hugh Irwin
Underestimation of old growth in the NRV model and the under.

6:5:34.790 --> 6:5:51.210
Hugh Irwin
Uh and overestimation of all growth in the spectrum future model, so it makes a tremendous amount of of difference or you know in what the EIS outcomes are and you know the.

6:5:51.290 --> 6:5:52.830
Hugh Irwin
But ohhh.

6:5:55.410 --> 6:6:16.250
Hugh Irwin
But the public is going, you know, needs to rely on in understanding the plan and understanding the analysis behind the plan. So you know, the models make a huge amount of difference in just wanted to highlight that are relative to the old growth issue.

6:6:19.540 --> 6:6:20.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you you.

6:6:22.20 --> 6:6:22.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

6:6:23.440 --> 6:6:25.990
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks you. How about Josh Kelly?

6:6:27.660 --> 6:6:35.330
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Uh, yeah. Josh Kelly with mountain. True again. Yeah, we've heard a quite a bit about the inconsistencies between.

6:6:36.150 --> 6:6:57.840
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
The NRV model and the spectrum model and Nick B Miller brought up some really interesting ideas about about how the NRV model could have included more information on human disturbances. A Native American disturbances, and disturbances from extirpated wildlife, and.

6:6:58.730 --> 6:7:21.680
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I just wanted to to point out that the NRV models use probably the dominant form of pre European settlement human disturbance, which is fire quite a bit and actually they the NRV model levels are set through studies of tree ring fire scars and those tree ring fire scars actually occur at.

6:7:22.460 --> 6:7:52.650
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Time periods, mostly from about the late 1600s, up through about 1950, in which human population densities were quite a lot higher than they were probably during the premier VM settlement times. And there are a number of very good scientific studies on that, most notably by Richard Goyette, that show the relationship between fire return intervals and human population density, and there is a pretty linear relationship where higher human population densities.

6:7:52.720 --> 6:8:4.440
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Speak to more fire historically prior to around World War Two. When that trend reverses with the use of modern aircraft and the US Forest services, aggressive fire suppression policies.

6:8:5.520 --> 6:8:30.990
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
In regards to the animal disturbance, I I tend to agree that it would be great to use that information. Unfortunately, I don't think that information exists very well. There's some really good hypothesis about the herbivore impacts on balls and things like that, but there really hasn't been any historical

measurement of of those impacts, and until there is, I think we're left about where the in our V model was with that.

6:8:31.750 --> 6:8:35.540
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
No, just that was just a a little more context there. Thanks.

6:8:37.20 --> 6:8:37.580
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hey, Josh.

6:8:38.550 --> 6:8:41.840
Nick Biemiller
Can I jump in? Because I was, I would like to respond to that if I could.

6:8:43.140 --> 6:8:52.930
Nick Biemiller
Yes. OK, great. So yeah, appreciate you saying that, Josh. I mean, I think I would argue that there is pretty good evidence at least better evidence than.

6:8:55.420 --> 6:8:56.330
Nick Biemiller
Ohh OK.

6:8:51.890 --> 6:8:59.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Did you stay home? Wait, could you announce before before you go on would just announce who you are again. Yeah, sure. Nick the Miller.

6:8:58.180 --> 6:8:59.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I know we've heard from you.

6:9:1.650 --> 6:9:2.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

6:9:0.610 --> 6:9:4.380
Nick Biemiller
Sure. Nick D Miller with the Rough Grass Society in American Woodcock society.

6:9:5.730 --> 6:9:6.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks nick.

6:9:5.310 --> 6:9:35.860
Nick Biemiller
So I mean I I think that there is pretty good evidence out there, I mean not as good as we might like for the purposes of informing the interview model. But, you know, in the spirit of best available science,

there's more than nothing out there that if it wasn't looked at and incorporated, it probably could be including a paper by Milner and Chaplain from 2010, which highlighted that across the entire central hardwood region since at around 1500 AD.

6:9:36.60 --> 6:10:4.780
Nick Biemiller
Which again is, you know, a large portion of the eastern United States, including Western, North Carolina, Native Americans could have impacted the landscape as low as 7% of the landscape and settlements alone and up to 43% of the landscape could have been impacted by more of their diffuse land use practices. And so that includes burning. I agree, Josh and some of that burning was captured through the tree ring data in the NRV.

6:10:5.480 --> 6:10:12.340
Nick Biemiller
Model that's currently in the plan, but it also included other things like sweet and agricultural practices.

6:10:13.340 --> 6:10:19.670
Nick Biemiller
You know, shifting human settlements and land use fuel wood gathering in different things, so.

6:10:20.820 --> 6:10:27.540
Nick Biemiller
Yeah, I think that there's something there that seems to have been discounted in the NRV model or ignored.

6:10:29.840 --> 6:10:49.950
Nick Biemiller
And you know, I'm. I'm I'm still a little confused as to how, you know, some folks have drawing conclusions about the interview model, cause I've drawn very different conclusions looking at the facts and to me, by not including some of those historic disturbances in the NRV model.

6:10:50.800 --> 6:10:57.270
Nick Biemiller
The NRV model actually probably discounted the amount of young and open forests that were historically on the landscape.

6:10:59.170 --> 6:11:6.730
Nick Biemiller
And likely if those things are incorporated, we might see, you know, a higher thresholds for those different levels of young and open forest.

6:11:9.320 --> 6:11:10.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, next.

6:11:8.550 --> 6:11:38.790
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
And just to respond to that like they can, we've had this conversation, but primarily the lands included

Nantahala, Pisgah National Forest are not agricultural lands, they're mountain lands, the lands that are agricultural and settlement lands are primarily on private. There would have been some degree of swidden agriculture and settlement, National Forest lands. But what it would have been disproportionately low percentage of the landscape because again, these are steeper mountain lands that ended up on our national forests. And you said up to 40% of.

6:11:38.870 --> 6:11:59.980
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
But the land base would have been impacted by Native Americans. Well, I think the NRV model and and fire ecology would indicate that as actually closer to 70% on this forest. And I do think that is captured in the NRV model and fire return intervals. So I actually think maybe my interpretation of the model is that humans were impacting more of the land than perhaps your stating.

6:12:1.940 --> 6:12:18.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So. So Josh, Nick, thank you very much. It just feels like we're going in a circle here with model analysis and I'm not sure it's helping. Rick, can you, can you say whether it is helping or not and redirect if it isn't? Yeah. Well, it's interesting. I.

6:12:19.770 --> 6:12:34.500
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, long time ago for my masters. It did population modeling, so it's, you know, it's it's interesting trying to trying to hear paths forward and opportunities for resolution. What I've heard is.

6:12:35.790 --> 6:12:38.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Through earlier and in in this discussion too is.

6:12:39.430 --> 6:12:39.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know.

6:12:40.720 --> 6:12:56.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Folks feel a need to redo the model and redoing the model would be going back to the EIS. Earlier we heard some offers for a supplemental EIS or adopting plan components and a couple things that are on my mind, I wonder.

6:12:58.240 --> 6:13:1.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, a lot of times when we get into to modeling it, it's a.

6:13:2.430 --> 6:13:4.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It's a quagmire of sorts.

6:13:5.190 --> 6:13:9.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is would any model results be acceptable?

6:13:9.790 --> 6:13:39.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
When we don't like the answers because there's a, there's only one model that may be acceptable as a one to one relationship to reality, which is impossible. Any model has to, you know, hold things constant and reduce reality and generalize parts in order to key on things. So that's all my mind. I just wanted to share this on my mind is when we don't like the outcome, we don't like the model. And so if we were to agree on a, a model, would we actually agree on a model?

6:13:40.480 --> 6:14:9.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I go and and when I talk about, you know, was playing it forward in my head is like, OK, you know, going back to redo the model, which would be to redoing the IEIS besides probably a lot of retirements that North Carolina would face, that could be 5 to 10 more, more years of work just because as soon as you take on a big effort and exhausting effort and then, you know, other things happen, life happens and things like that that you know that.

6:14:10.280 --> 6:14:18.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Because I'm thinking about redoing the model, I'm not saying not to get things right. I'm just thinking about, OK, practically what would that look like? And that could be?

6:14:19.620 --> 6:14:31.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
5 to 10 more years of planning. And then I was thinking, well, even then, if there's if there's disagreement on the results, there would be the the models easy thought or for.

6:14:31.810 --> 6:14:32.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Or.

6:14:33.300 --> 6:14:33.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh.

6:14:34.700 --> 6:14:35.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know.

6:14:36.980 --> 6:14:50.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For disagreement, for for criticism and cause. Again, every model has to hold pieces of the world constant, which is, you know, is not reality. So it's always, always.

6:14:51.980 --> 6:15:3.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ripe, ripe for disagreement. And so. Yeah, but, but that's all my mind just wanna share was on my mindset. OK, it's just kind of thinking this through. Like, how would how would this.

6:15:5.460 --> 6:15:6.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How would you know?

6:15:7.210 --> 6:15:9.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How would you know? How would you?

6:15:10.280 --> 6:15:11.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How you do this?

6:15:12.400 --> 6:15:21.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And and still may may do all that and why it might be some different people in the room, some of the same ones and still having the same conversation because there's.

6:15:22.100 --> 6:15:23.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There's not a.

6:15:25.260 --> 6:15:30.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. And there's some nuance disagreement. So yeah, just, you know, kind of sharing what's on my mind. I don't know if that's helpful or not.

6:15:32.20 --> 6:15:38.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I just wanted to recognize they got a couple new voices raising hands and maybe we want to hear from them before we go back.

6:15:39.290 --> 6:15:40.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Nicole.

6:15:42.840 --> 6:15:43.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Taylor.

6:15:45.390 --> 6:15:47.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For the Tutuka Conservancy.

6:15:45.970 --> 6:15:49.420
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Uh, yeah. Sure. Yeah. Uh, thank you.

6:15:51.880 --> 6:16:2.300
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
You know, we we obviously we're well, we made some comments and I've been listening intently to the conversation about modeling by people that have spent quite a bit of time.

6:16:2.980 --> 6:16:32.830
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Studying it and also discussing these issues amongst themselves and and I hear you, Rick and I think we've got pretty you know we've arrived as Sam summarized it a little while ago. We can either look again at the models and correct the known flaws that I think people have agreed are need some more look at you know some more work or we can look at the plan components and and both you and will have made.

6:16:32.910 --> 6:16:37.190
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Some suggestions about what's going on actually with the planned components.

6:16:38.360 --> 6:16:52.830
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
And part of our objection, name some of these components that we have, you know, very strong objections to specifically about old growth. Now the four service has identified an old growth network, but actually.

6:16:54.240 --> 6:17:3.640
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
40% two percent of the old graph network is not old growth, and and that's a real basic problem that we have objected to.

6:17:4.510 --> 6:17:19.790
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
UM and counter to that. You know, we have known old growth on the ground that's being targeted for cutting, so you can't preserve old growth or restore old growth if you're gonna go ahead and cut it down where it's known and inventory.

6:17:20.500 --> 6:17:29.590
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
All the existing inventoried, all growth, plus what's newly discovered on the ground needs to be preserved, full stop on that.

6:17:30.860 --> 6:17:39.870
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Umm and that's my comment to, you know, bring us down to the ground on this discussion in my mind.

6:17:40.670 --> 6:18:9.840
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Also, you know the public, as he's pointed out, is going to be looking at what's going on in the ground. I think everybody knows that we've been fighting a 10 per sale up in the Nantahala District for about four years where we have a stand of existing old growth, this scheduled to be cut and it also contains populations of green salamanders, very significant populations. And these are the sorts of conflicts that we were hoping to make progress on with the New Forest plan. And it doesn't seem like we're getting there.

6:18:13.960 --> 6:18:16.870
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Nicole. Thanks, Nicole and the.

6:18:17.720 --> 6:18:21.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You're talking about the 42% of the network is not old growth.

6:18:21.900 --> 6:18:23.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But then known old growth.

6:18:24.510 --> 6:18:27.380
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It is not in the networking get cut down.

6:18:29.520 --> 6:18:30.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Would that be where?

6:18:31.450 --> 6:18:34.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Some mechanism is needed when it is discovered.

6:18:37.840 --> 6:18:46.990
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Yes, the mechanism that is defined in the forest plan is that the district range will have discretion to either save it or cut it. And we have witnessed.

6:18:48.840 --> 6:19:0.200
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
That, at least in the this this real world example that I'm citing, that the decision was to go ahead and cut it even when it was inventory that meets Region 8 ogra standards.

6:19:3.240 --> 6:19:8.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And the the region at old growth standards being the old growth characteristics.

6:19:6.810 --> 6:19:10.520
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Guidelines. Excuse me. I'm sorry. It's the guidelines.

6:19:14.540 --> 6:19:17.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And so the district Ranger having the discretion.

6:19:19.340 --> 6:19:20.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You'd like to see.

6:19:22.430 --> 6:19:23.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Something else?

6:19:25.810 --> 6:19:30.280
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Yes, I would like to see protection for old growth. Don't cut it down.

6:19:38.850 --> 6:19:43.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There are more than just District Ranger had the discretion when it's when it's discovered.

6:19:44.150 --> 6:19:44.710
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Correct.

6:19:47.50 --> 6:19:48.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Very good. Thank you.

6:19:49.0 --> 6:19:52.680
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Henry Henry is your point on the old growth.

6:19:59.50 --> 6:19:59.520
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

6:19:55.460 --> 6:20:0.500
Henry Gargan
Yes, I was hoping to transition there if that would be OK, but I'm happy to speak on that whenever you think it's appropriate.

6:20:1.470 --> 6:20:2.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, I think this is good.

6:20:3.780 --> 6:20:9.10
Henry Gargan
Blossom, thank you so much. And my name is Henry Garden. I am another.

6:20:10.410 --> 6:20:20.160
Henry Gargan
For person with the Southern Environmental Law Center, and it's great to be here with you all. Thanks for having us. I'm excited to transition into old growth right now.

6:20:21.470 --> 6:20:52.380
Henry Gargan
Because I I do think the FBI does a great job of explaining why old growth is so important to the forest, why it's so important to the people here, why it's important to ecological integrity. But I wanna echo Nicole. I think our primary problem with old growth, or rather with how the plan handles old growth, is that we think that the forests approach is primarily motivated by a desire to avoid dealing with old growth and avoid dealing with surveys for old growth at the project level.

6:20:52.920 --> 6:21:3.710
Henry Gargan
And this is not speculation. These are the four zone words, and I'm quoting here a primary goal. We want to see accomplished is to remove the debate over old growth at the project level.

6:21:4.870 --> 6:21:20.220
Henry Gargan
But in our view, that's inconsistent with the forest sniper requirements. It's inconsistent with region, its own guidance, and this is not really an oversight either. The forest know that this violates their guidance and they know that we know that this violates their guidance.

6:21:21.660 --> 6:21:51.630
Henry Gargan
And they are also aware and remarkably clear, I think about some of the drawbacks that this approach I'm again reading just from some of the forest own words about some of the drawbacks to not convict conducting site level for old growth surveys. So quote this language, meaning the approach that's adopted by the plan to basically keep the old growth network a fixed size throughout the life of the plan. This language does not ensure that existing old growth.

6:21:51.730 --> 6:22:22.740
Henry Gargan
Yet to be identified will be managed as old growth, and we agree with that and we think that's a problem. 2 still quoting objectors may claim that this is inconsistent with the current rate guidelines, meaning region 8. Again, we agree it is flatly inconsistent with them. Three, there is no additional opportunity to make any changes to the parts of the network that are not the best candidates for all growth management until the next planning cycle. And again, we could not agree more. Finally, the forest acknowledged that this approach is not consistent with the approach of neighboring forests.

6:22:23.430 --> 6:22:53.960
Henry Gargan

So the forest of understood that there are some problems with keeping the old growth network that a fixed size, even though more old growth may be and will be discovered at the project level. And we think that these reasons should have been conclusive. And So what we see is a plan that does achieve the forest primary goal to remove debate overall growth, the forest, or rather at the project level. But the problem is that this is done not by simply excluding old growth from projects, it's done by removing the possibilities to debate.

6:22:54.120 --> 6:23:1.460
Henry Gargan
Whether these projects contain old growth in the 1st place by failing to conduct those surveys and so on.

6:23:2.830 --> 6:23:4.970
Henry Gargan
So we think that this is a problem.

6:23:5.670 --> 6:23:12.390
Henry Gargan
We think that the the, the old growth network and the process for deciding which patches to.

6:23:13.190 --> 6:23:28.760
Henry Gargan
Included in the old growth network have to be consistent from plan to plan because the nature of the resources such that if you are willing to change U, what qualifies as part of the network from plan to plan without really any explanation, then the network itself is not really useful.

6:23:30.120 --> 6:23:57.370
Henry Gargan
And what we see here in addition to this failure to commit to surveying for and protecting old growth when it's found at the project level is actually a failure as well to carry forward patches that were designated as part of Amendment 5 process under the old plan. And if you could just give me a second here, I can pull that, that visual that gives you a sense of the scale of what is being omitted again without much explanation. So let's see.

6:23:59.850 --> 6:24:1.800
Henry Gargan
All right, so we have a map here.

6:24:3.620 --> 6:24:20.870
Henry Gargan
Umm, so the regional guidance for designating patches is somewhat complex, but I hope this just gives you a brief sense of the scale. Essentially, these are compartments on the forest where under the Amendment 5 region 8 guidance there should be patches designated specifically small patches.

6:24:22.190 --> 6:24:46.870
Henry Gargan
At some point and so I have other maps that show patches that we know we're not carried forward. But the point is that the guidance requires that in these compartments, there be patches designated. Now

the old growth network that has been established, that has been proposed under alternatively does a great job of bringing forward the large and medium sized patches for the most part. But these small patches are important as well. I'm going to show you here.

6:24:48.30 --> 6:24:54.190
Henry Gargan
A couple patches here in purple that we know of that are not part of the old growth network. This is upper scintilla.

6:24:54.800 --> 6:24:55.820
Henry Gargan
And here's Harmon den.

6:24:57.250 --> 6:25:16.300
Henry Gargan
So this is just a small example of what we think is an arbitrary and capricious elimination of an obligation that should stand the test of time, unless there is a real explanation of why the protections that were established previously are no longer important to old growth.

6:25:16.940 --> 6:25:17.430
Henry Gargan
So.

6:25:18.80 --> 6:25:24.210
Henry Gargan
I know you guys have been asking this little time. What are we asking the forest to do here? What is the resolution here? Let me get rid of this.

6:25:25.190 --> 6:25:25.640
Henry Gargan
Uh.

6:25:28.50 --> 6:25:40.280
Henry Gargan
So I think what's important to us primarily is first, that the patches that the old growth is designated as part of the network all be brought forward. But second perspectively, I think it's really important to us as well.

6:25:40.950 --> 6:26:0.960
Henry Gargan
That there be a plan in place for when the forest do encounter old growth at the project level, and that's exactly what Nicole was saying earlier in our objection. We I think along with the partnership proposed a compromise cap and trade where as the plan proposes now they're be a set size for the old growth network.

6:26:1.370 --> 6:26:24.880
Henry Gargan
UM and that network stays the same size throughout the life of the plan, but when high quality old

growth is discovered at the project level, it can be added and then acres that are part of the old growth network that are maybe not best managed. Just part of that network can be taken out. We think that's just one supportable way for the forest to deal with this problem. But what the forest cannot do.

6:26:25.530 --> 6:26:30.740
Henry Gargan
What they cannot do with respect to their new obligations with respect to their own guidance.

6:26:31.350 --> 6:26:56.70
Henry Gargan
Umm is just fail to do anything to fail to have a plan at all, and So what we're asking today is for the force to adopt some plan that accounts for old growth and protects old growth and patches that have already been designated as ideal candidates, or at least worthy candidates for protection as part of the network. I'm happy to take any questions right now, but that's the gist of our argument.

6:26:57.600 --> 6:26:58.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks Henry.

6:27:0.590 --> 6:27:11.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Again, thanks and have read and seen the the CAP and trade, but that that helped hearing it again and that that explanation to get that you know no no terms or.

6:27:12.630 --> 6:27:21.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Came up in different context and trying to reconcile on my head's like, OK, how would that work? So thank thanks for explaining that as well and.

6:27:25.440 --> 6:27:31.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And yeah, called the part about the, you know, the the small patches excluded. And that needs explanation.

6:27:33.420 --> 6:27:34.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And.

6:27:37.560 --> 6:27:40.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, yeah, the the thing. Thank you for that, Henry.

6:27:41.960 --> 6:27:43.430
Henry Gargan
Absolutely. Thank you.

6:27:44.690 --> 6:27:45.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Work.

6:27:42.570 --> 6:27:49.450
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
So if I could I I have something to add about the small patch designations that in and we spoke about.

6:27:49.70 --> 6:27:49.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
What?

6:27:50.590 --> 6:27:51.720
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And who is this please?

6:27:51.640 --> 6:27:54.320
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
This is this is Josh Kelly with mountain true.

6:27:55.320 --> 6:27:58.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hey Josh, I can't tell that when you're talking, but now I can.

6:27:57.950 --> 6:28:1.560
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
OK, alright. No problem. Yeah, I know there's a lot of different faces on the screen.

6:28:2.290 --> 6:28:2.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

6:28:2.680 --> 6:28:14.160
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
And so if, yeah, just briefly, those small patch designations were made during NEPA processes at the project level and they were required under the current forest plan.

6:28:14.770 --> 6:28:15.890
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
And again.

6:28:17.190 --> 6:28:37.960
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I think there may be some justification that some of those small patch designations like like some other designations, were made out of convenience rather than merit. I can tell you, though, that some of those designations were absolutely made on merit, and the upper santella project there were stands that are of equal quality as Joyce Kilmer Memorial Forest.

6:28:38.290 --> 6:28:54.880
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
A compartment 51 stands, 6 is a great example of that where I visited that stand with Dave Casey. We saw the five foot in diameter trees there and we're both incredibly impressed and that ended up being in all growth designation in that project. And I do think it.

6:28:56.190 --> 6:29:10.210
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
It leads me to have much less confidence in the forest commitment to restoring and preserving old growth when stands like that are discarded with no analysis, and I really think the force needs to have a process for dealing with.

6:29:22.840 --> 6:29:24.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, somebody wasn't talking.

6:29:30.410 --> 6:29:31.200
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Technical.

6:29:32.50 --> 6:29:35.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Pause here. Hold on to Josh. You come back.

6:29:34.120 --> 6:29:35.790
Hugh Irwin
Lost the Forest Service.

6:29:36.110 --> 6:29:40.200
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Yeah, I think there was a technical failure on the Forest Service and.

6:29:40.950 --> 6:29:41.740
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Hey, you're back.

6:29:42.280 --> 6:29:44.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Like we're going back. Ohh good. Yeah.

6:29:43.580 --> 6:30:7.270
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah, you're back. Well, yeah. In conclusion. Yeah, I think a a rigorous process, inconsistent process for dealing with those small patch designations. And if you all don't want to bring all of them forward, some sort of decision making matrix for excluding some and bringing others forward as needed. And it, and of course the easier step would just be to bring them all forward. And I would be a minimal to.

6:30:7.430 --> 6:30:12.380
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
A you know some sort of CAP system that brought this forward as well, but.

6:30:13.870 --> 6:30:17.980
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
There there's there's value in some of those that can't just be discarded.

6:30:20.130 --> 6:30:21.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. Thank you, Josh and.

6:30:22.590 --> 6:30:30.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Make sure I caught that where you talked about that you you visited the five foot diameter trees that that was in the.

6:30:31.240 --> 6:30:35.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
What was in the designation and now it's not.

6:30:35.570 --> 6:30:42.160
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
That's correct. It was designated at the project level and there was no effort made by the district to systematically.

6:30:42.240 --> 6:31:11.870
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
A a catalog that and pass it back to the to the Forest Supervisor's office, and as a result the planning team did not have that information in order to consider it appropriately for the forest plan. And that's is a huge problem, particularly potentially representing 20,000 plus acres and foliar materials. We have seen that the forest started to grapple with that problem and did not complete that exercise. They have an excel sheet of those projects, some of which.

6:31:12.250 --> 6:31:18.170
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
We've begun to be filled out and some never were, and the the process was just never completed.

6:31:19.630 --> 6:31:20.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And so that point.

6:31:21.80 --> 6:31:29.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm, that, that that point is part of the objection process. So it's being evaluated. Yeah. OK. OK. Thank you.

6:31:30.610 --> 6:31:30.940
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So.

6:31:30.570 --> 6:31:31.450
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
You're welcome. Thank you.

6:31:32.360 --> 6:31:50.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

Thank you. So I I appreciate the direction we're going moving through the old World. I just want to call out Curtis Smalling with the Audubon. You had your hand up for a while. You no longer have it up as what you had to say, no longer relevant or did we miss an opportunity?

6:31:51.580 --> 6:31:52.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Curtis. Molly.

6:31:52.650 --> 6:32:2.190
Smalling, Curtis
Hey, thank you. No, I was going to say something on the the discussion we were in before, before old growth, just kind of to put a plug in for.

6:32:2.990 --> 6:32:3.500
Smalling, Curtis
Umm.

6:32:4.930 --> 6:32:19.330
Smalling, Curtis
Sam had talked about two paths, you know redoing the modeling or adding planned components. And I would say you know, the the kind of third leg of that stool for me, if if plan components are the way and others have talked about it too is is making sure that we have a very.

6:32:20.170 --> 6:32:36.240
Smalling, Curtis
Robust cocreated monitoring plan that the final monitoring plan helps us deal with some of this uncertainty and I'll be providing some comments tomorrow during that part of the discussion. But I would just refer you to a couple of our.

6:32:36.790 --> 6:32:44.0
Smalling, Curtis
Umm, remedies in, in Audubon's objection to we've got some specific, you know.

6:32:44.480 --> 6:32:54.70
Smalling, Curtis
I'm plan elements that we that we kind of call out under this. The topic of today and then others for tomorrow, but I'll I'll talk about it a little bit more tomorrow.

6:32:56.750 --> 6:32:57.380
Smalling, Curtis
Yeah. Thank you.

6:32:55.840 --> 6:32:57.790
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks, Curtis. We'll hear from you again.

6:32:58.890 --> 6:32:59.240
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

6:32:59.970 --> 6:33:1.660
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So back on old growth, Megan.

6:33:6.170 --> 6:33:9.960
Megan N. Sutton
Hi there Megan Sutton on behalf of the Nihill Pisgah Forest Partnership.

6:33:10.950 --> 6:33:11.460
Megan N. Sutton
Umm.

6:33:12.730 --> 6:33:24.980
Megan N. Sutton
So we haven't yet heard, I think, a diversity of opinions on all growth, but I'm sure that we will for this is over and I just wanna name that you know.

6:33:26.330 --> 6:33:39.330
Megan N. Sutton
In spite of the diverse opinions that we have heard within the partnership, that there has been a strong consensus generally around protecting existing old growth as a way to smooth project implementation.

6:33:40.790 --> 6:33:58.680
Megan N. Sutton
And you know, uh again, focusing on conflict resolution has been a kind of a key Nexus point that we have really spent a lot of time on with the partnership. And we've heard both sides of this argument, and I'm sure there's many between but really having.

6:33:59.400 --> 6:34:11.350
Megan N. Sutton
A cogent strategy to protect old growth has has a a path forward that allows conservation stakeholders the freedom to support projects that otherwise might be seen as a threat.

6:34:12.630 --> 6:34:15.650
Megan N. Sutton
And the the alternative.

6:34:16.340 --> 6:34:36.190
Megan N. Sutton
Umm side sort of, because the forest is aging and we've heard that it we have a middle to late forest largely there's been a concern that a standard allowing designation of newly found O growth could result in an ever shrinking suitable timber base. So we've kind of grappled with this within our.

6:34:37.620 --> 6:34:38.970
Megan N. Sutton
Partnership and.

6:34:40.410 --> 6:34:41.180
Megan N. Sutton
We really.

6:34:42.150 --> 6:34:50.600
Megan N. Sutton
Love the idea that that the draft plan gave us different options in the alternatives, pretty radically different about, you know, different ways to handle old growth.

6:34:52.170 --> 6:34:52.660
Megan N. Sutton
But.

6:34:53.490 --> 6:35:2.650
Megan N. Sutton
I think the points that others have made and I just want to put a fine point on today, are the final plan doesn't resolve a couple of issues.

6:35:3.800 --> 6:35:5.910
Megan N. Sutton
Umm, one of those being?

6:35:7.880 --> 6:35:8.480
Megan N. Sutton
You know.

6:35:9.500 --> 6:35:11.790
Megan N. Sutton
What do we do when we find old growth of the project level?

6:35:12.690 --> 6:35:22.330
Megan N. Sutton
You would give discretion to the district Ranger, do we not? How do we handle it? What are the guidance to that district Ranger? We don't see on plain components that really provide that guidance.

6:35:22.910 --> 6:35:36.440
Megan N. Sutton
Umm. And the way that the partnership has agreed to deal with this as we came up with three remedies and one of those was supporting Alternative C, which is a smaller.

6:35:37.280 --> 6:35:42.440
Megan N. Sutton
Slightly smaller old growth network, so it's 256 thousand acres of old growth.

6:35:43.620 --> 6:35:51.130
Megan N. Sutton
With a cap and trade approach, so alternative C at that 256 thousand acre threshold would be the cat.

6:35:52.270 --> 6:35:59.690
Megan N. Sutton
For the CAP and trade and then as Henry mentioned, you know, as old growth that is found that is.

6:36:0.810 --> 6:36:3.390
Megan N. Sutton
On the, you know, found on the forest as we're.

6:36:4.160 --> 6:36:9.320
Megan N. Sutton
Moving about the forest doing projects, that type of thing that is of better quality, we would.

6:36:10.690 --> 6:36:21.320
Megan N. Sutton
Trade some of the 256 thousand acres out and put them into suitable the suitable timber base and trade sum in thereby you know not growing.

6:36:22.70 --> 6:36:24.590
Megan N. Sutton
That the old growth network but.

6:36:26.260 --> 6:36:30.790
Megan N. Sutton
Preparing, you know, creating a better, more robust old growth network, if you will.

6:36:31.350 --> 6:36:36.900
Megan N. Sutton
Umm, so that was one of the things that's really supporting that, that alternative seed threshold.

6:36:37.730 --> 6:36:48.620
Megan N. Sutton
With the CAP and trade approach for refining the network with better quality, patches are found and then the other. The other thing is really having a clear process in the plan.

6:36:49.450 --> 6:36:52.460
Megan N. Sutton
For how to identify old growth during projects?

6:36:53.20 --> 6:37:14.470
Megan N. Sutton
Umm. And I know that in our 2020 comments we we noted how the George W, the GW Jefferson, what they've done. That's one way there could be other ways but having some criteria for how to the guidance for the implementers on the ground for how they need to identify.

6:37:15.750 --> 6:37:20.340
Megan N. Sutton
The projects and plan accordingly when they're when they're.

6:37:21.390 --> 6:37:36.60
Megan N. Sutton
You know, doing project design, so I just wanted to kind of just jump in and say that we've wrestled this bear and we feel like a collectively come up with a path where which could could work.

6:37:37.340 --> 6:37:42.310
Megan N. Sutton
And so I just wanted to put that on the table again as an opportunity to revisit.

6:37:44.70 --> 6:37:46.570
Megan N. Sutton
Those remedies as a as a way forward.

6:37:47.440 --> 6:37:47.800
Megan N. Sutton
Thanks.

6:37:51.760 --> 6:37:54.870
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There's two at the beginning. Did you say there was three or did I miss her? You.

6:37:55.650 --> 6:38:10.30
Megan N. Sutton
Well, I think there's three. There's one setting it at the alternative seed level, then building in the cap and trade approach and then figuring out how to deal with growth. New old growth when we find it at the project level.

6:38:13.630 --> 6:38:17.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You got it? Yeah. I put C in the want it together, so thank thanks.

6:38:19.170 --> 6:38:25.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So we've got, we've got a couple folks in the queue that we've heard from before. I wanna just invite.

6:38:26.570 --> 6:38:31.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
People on the line that might have perspectives that haven't been shared.

6:38:32.560 --> 6:38:35.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
To enter in here, is there anyone who would like to do that?

6:38:41.80 --> 6:38:44.850
Elliot, James
This is Rob Elliott with the representing North County Forestry Association.

6:38:47.570 --> 6:38:49.540
Elliot, James
Our objection filed.

6:38:50.710 --> 6:38:52.120
Elliot, James
On this old Grey's topic.

6:38:53.970 --> 6:38:58.20
Elliot, James
Is is very similar to what Megan just.

6:38:59.10 --> 6:38:59.620
Elliot, James
Presented.

6:39:2.540 --> 6:39:7.50
Elliot, James
It is important that we have a functional system in place to.

6:39:8.100 --> 6:39:12.860
Elliot, James
Handle old growth when it's found at the project level and.

6:39:13.590 --> 6:39:17.160
Elliot, James
That we recognize current existing old growth as well.

6:39:19.560 --> 6:39:22.60
Elliot, James
I myself have been in the industry for.

6:39:23.220 --> 6:39:28.910
Elliot, James
But 20 years and have dealt with this topic in my entire career.

6:39:30.630 --> 6:39:36.650
Elliot, James
Both from forest management side of the equation and also from a harvesting and procurement side of the equation and.

6:39:38.630 --> 6:39:42.180
Elliot, James
I feel like this is our opportunity to to do something.

6:39:43.490 --> 6:39:45.210
Elliot, James
That can help us work through this.

6:39:46.210 --> 6:39:51.620
Elliot, James
Going at forward for the next 20 years and it's desperately needed because it can be a a very.

6:39:53.460 --> 6:39:59.540
Elliot, James
Very intense topic of conflict at the project level, so without better guidance.

6:40:0.990 --> 6:40:2.290
Elliot, James
I'm concerned that.

6:40:3.260 --> 6:40:13.780
Elliot, James
That we will continue to see that conflict. So our remedy again is along the lines of what Megan just submitted to you as well.

6:40:14.740 --> 6:40:15.240
Elliot, James
Umm.

6:40:16.260 --> 6:40:21.550
Elliot, James
That the alternative C 256 thousand acres at the plan level.

6:40:22.370 --> 6:40:26.860
Elliot, James
Umm be set and that just basically.

6:40:30.770 --> 6:40:39.730
Elliot, James
Doesn't exceed the desired conditions that are established in the NAV model, but in order to do that, did there we do support this concept of?

6:40:40.490 --> 6:40:52.840
Elliot, James
A you know, cap and trade where there is a clear clear guidance given to how that could be implemented. When you encounter a new high quality old growth.

6:40:54.180 --> 6:41:0.870
Elliot, James
At the project level in the future, so I just wanted to echo that and restate our.

6:41:2.740 --> 6:41:6.450
Elliot, James
Our remedy and objection from the NFA. Thank you.

6:41:8.440 --> 6:41:9.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks rob.

6:41:10.100 --> 6:41:11.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank. Thank you, rob.

6:41:11.780 --> 6:41:18.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So other perspectives. Oops, sorry, James. Yeah, just just on that. Thanks, rob. And Megan and and and Josh.

6:41:18.730 --> 6:41:19.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm.

6:41:22.150 --> 6:41:26.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I I'm wondering, just hearing what Josh was talking about with some of those.

6:41:28.70 --> 6:41:35.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Smaller patches that weren't incorporated in this idea of a cap and trade. If we could dig into that just a little bit and and like.

6:41:36.260 --> 6:41:38.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm, you know, one of the things that you know.

6:41:40.650 --> 6:41:41.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We'd like to.

6:41:42.260 --> 6:41:45.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, going that route? Is there a way to?

6:41:46.790 --> 6:41:48.30
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Not have that.

6:41:49.240 --> 6:41:59.90
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Analysis of the of what might be included in this cap and trade be a a lengthy thing, so that that it's like.

6:41:59.840 --> 6:42:15.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

You know, number one, looking at the those those places that that Josh mentioned that that weren't included, but then moving forward at the project scale, how can we simplify that identification of those?

6:42:16.110 --> 6:42:23.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Patches that we might encounter so it doesn't become another, you know, analysis that's needed if it if there's.

6:42:25.30 --> 6:42:31.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Certain consensus and we're good with it, kind of a thing rather than having to document it it some some.

6:42:32.850 --> 6:42:33.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But.

6:42:34.100 --> 6:42:35.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Really complex way.

6:42:39.890 --> 6:42:40.200
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

6:42:40.910 --> 6:42:42.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Does that make sense as a question?

6:42:43.730 --> 6:42:45.420
Megan N. Sutton
Yeah, I'm happy to address that.

6:42:47.220 --> 6:42:49.460
Megan N. Sutton
And and then here are others perspectives.

6:42:51.0 --> 6:42:56.510
Megan N. Sutton
So our 2020 comments go into a bit of detail about what.

6:42:57.290 --> 6:43:1.640
Megan N. Sutton
What would be the initial 256 thousand acres?

6:43:3.580 --> 6:43:8.260
Megan N. Sutton
Yeah, basically those would be Group 3 and Group 4 management areas.

6:43:8.930 --> 6:43:9.770
Megan N. Sutton
And.

6:43:11.580 --> 6:43:16.950
Megan N. Sutton
That, you know, clear plan direction that old growth management and these management areas is intended to be.

6:43:17.860 --> 6:43:18.830
Megan N. Sutton
Consistent with.

6:43:20.170 --> 6:43:24.60
Megan N. Sutton
Not more restrictive than management area level direction.

6:43:25.220 --> 6:43:34.630
Megan N. Sutton
And so, you know, I'm. I'm welcome. I'm happy to go into more details. I don't know. I don't know how much detail you want to go into, but I do think that there.

6:43:43.50 --> 6:43:43.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

6:43:35.670 --> 6:43:43.480
Megan N. Sutton
This is one of those you know, complex topics. We're requiring a complex solution and and I.

6:43:44.320 --> 6:43:59.410
Megan N. Sutton
I totally hear you on implementation. You know, we want to make something that is streamlined and efficient and makes sense to people that are on the ground doing common stand exams and, you know, doing other things such that they're getting the right information back.

6:44:1.50 --> 6:44:9.440
Megan N. Sutton
And I think would be happy collectively to work with you on that. But I also do think that there are some details in our comments in 2020 that might be useful.

6:44:13.620 --> 6:44:22.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So we've been talking about all growth. We want to keep talking about it as much as we need to, but is there anything new or other remedies you wanna focus on?

6:44:23.50 --> 6:44:29.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

I I because I am looking at the the next two topics that we have an hour left to cover and again you know how long.

6:44:30.500 --> 6:44:36.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, you know how to manage your time better than I do, but but that will in the queue.

6:44:37.310 --> 6:44:39.180
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Nick B&Q.

6:44:40.560 --> 6:44:41.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Say I'm in the queue.

6:44:44.910 --> 6:44:45.300
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well.

6:44:47.90 --> 6:44:51.980
Will Harlan
Thanks. This is. Will Harlan iheart Pizza Coalition 750 consolidated objectors.

6:44:52.480 --> 6:45:22.210
Will Harlan
I just wanted to make a few last points about old growth before we move forward. First, as it relates back to the to the modeling, there should be far more old growth on this forest than the current models reflect. And I think just as a starting point, we should acknowledge that there should be a significantly more there should be significantly more old growth than the modeling predicts and that's it's vastly underestimated just out of the gate there.

6:45:22.300 --> 6:45:45.410
Will Harlan
It should be closer to half of the forest and we're starting at a much lower mark to begin with. Second, just wanted to mention, as you all know, we have an executive order from the Biden administration to catalog all existing old growth. So I think that's a really important part of the discussion that we're having right now. And I wanna just elevate that. And finally we'll talk about this more tomorrow, but.

6:45:46.180 --> 6:45:52.710
Will Harlan
The most important climate action that the Forest Service can take is to protect its mature and existing old growth.

6:45:53.880 --> 6:46:16.310
Will Harlan
It has neglected its responsibility to adequately address address climate change in the in the current plan, but the mature and old growth forests of the pigskin inhaler National Forest are the largest carbon

stock in the state, and it is the forest services, legal and civic responsibility to identify and protect that old growth.

6:46:19.130 --> 6:46:20.710
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks, will. Yeah. Thank you, will.

6:46:22.340 --> 6:46:30.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So, Bill, you joined us again, Bill Floyd, this afternoon. I don't know how long you've been on, but we're talking about old growth.

6:46:36.960 --> 6:46:42.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For horn. Horn, I'm sorry. I thought this was Bill Floyd. Who are we? Bill? Bill Ford.

6:46:45.370 --> 6:46:46.560
Bill (Guest)
Are you talking to me?

6:46:47.740 --> 6:46:50.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I am and I didn't. I thought I was talking to somebody else.

6:46:51.180 --> 6:46:51.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Go ahead.

6:46:50.350 --> 6:46:57.20
Bill (Guest)
No, this is not bill. Sorry. You you, you get a different perspective today. I'm Bill Horton. I live.

6:46:55.930 --> 6:46:57.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, your bill guest.

6:46:58.40 --> 6:47:0.160
Bill (Guest)
Yeah. Yeah, I was with you all yesterday.

6:46:58.900 --> 6:47:0.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Your Bill Gates. So what's your last name?

6:47:2.20 --> 6:47:2.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Weren't.

6:47:1.270 --> 6:47:4.280
Bill (Guest)
Corton HRTON. Yeah, I'm one of your.

6:47:3.980 --> 6:47:4.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you very much.

6:47:5.460 --> 6:47:14.310
Bill (Guest)
Yeah, I just wanna add a couple things on the old growth topic and Rick, I live over in the cashier's area near the Chattooga watershed.

6:47:15.490 --> 6:47:43.800
Bill (Guest)
I had an opportunity. Some of you may know a forester named Charlie Tarver, who was a past President, American Forestry Association. I actually had a chance to walk that patch that Nicole mentioned about the green salamanders with Charlie about a year ago. And and with his permission, I'd like to read a 2-3 lines of an e-mail he sent me after we took our hike. He said, quote, to be honest with you, when I first heard about the opposition of the South Side project about a year ago.

6:47:44.390 --> 6:47:50.690
Bill (Guest)
I just passed it off as yet another example of radical tree huggers opposed to a timber harvest, and I did not dig in.

6:47:51.500 --> 6:48:7.930
Bill (Guest)
Boy, was I wrong. Exclamation point. I've managed forests for decades and harvested lots of timber, so I'm not opposed to timber harvesting, but I can truthfully say that I have never been responsible for butchering a site like the proposed Brushy Mountain sail would do. End of quote.

6:48:8.750 --> 6:48:12.200
Bill (Guest)
And the reason I share this with you is when you get on the ground.

6:48:12.960 --> 6:48:44.510
Bill (Guest)
And you start looking these old growth forests as we know are there for a reason. They're in very unaccessible areas. They're in steep areas. It's dangerous work for the loggers. They represent major issues for our watersheds, particularly in the area where we live. You know, our rainfall over here in the cashier's area, it's double what they run into in Asheville. And I agree with will that that protecting these old growth areas is critical. Right now, I'm a surgeon and I look at this from a public health perspective.

6:48:45.530 --> 6:49:0.830
Bill (Guest)
It is clear, and the growing science around the role of old growth is a keystone species for buffering and

for protecting the health of our soil or water and our air. We have got to be extremely careful playing these cards because we don't have many of them to play.

6:49:2.10 --> 6:49:32.880
Bill (Guest)
I shared a Charlie Tarver story just because I agree with, I think it was Nicole that said that we really should not leave newly discovered patches up to the discretion of the of some, you know, a Ranger on duty. And I I think back to Jerry Franklin and his comment that old growth is is heterogeneity rules and the world of old growth. And I think that's a critical insight that tells us that these small patches each are unique and different and they each matter.

6:49:33.340 --> 6:49:46.100
Bill (Guest)
So however, we solved this modeling problem, we need to account for these small patches and newly discovered patches, and be sure we're refining and updating our modeling. Our planning is those insights are are gained along the way.

6:49:46.820 --> 6:49:47.230
Bill (Guest)
Thank you.

6:49:49.800 --> 6:49:50.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, bill.

6:49:51.160 --> 6:49:54.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
If that. Thank you, bill. I captured talked about the.

6:49:54.860 --> 6:50:9.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Brushy Mountain sail and talk about the old growth and these they're in these inaccessible steep areas protecting these old growth areas or vital and it's keystone for for our species. And then what you added.

6:50:10.120 --> 6:50:17.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There's a resolution is to not just leave it up to the Ranger and you also the heterogen heterogeneity rules.

6:50:18.690 --> 6:50:20.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
These small patches are unique and and needed.

6:50:24.770 --> 6:50:25.520
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thank you.

6:50:24.180 --> 6:50:53.480
Bill (Guest)
Yes, thank you. And I I just, I think we need to recognize that we're still learning both in terms of where they are and the quality of what they are. So all this stuff we've had about modeling today, it's super important. But as a scientist that deals with the human body, I know the weakness is a modeling. We've got to be able to stay dynamic over the next several years and and as we refine this plan, I think you know the next 20 years needs to assume we're still learning about the old growth and we've got to treat it very, very carefully because we can't.

6:50:53.750 --> 6:50:55.450
Bill (Guest)
You know, recall it if we throw it away.

6:50:57.840 --> 6:50:59.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you very much, Bill. Thank you.

6:51:1.130 --> 6:51:9.540
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So again, we've got a few more voices and I encourage you to to not repeat what we've already heard so that we could keep moving, but will.

6:51:10.430 --> 6:51:12.250
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Be Miller. You're in the line up.

6:51:13.240 --> 6:51:17.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That next. Nick. Nick. I'm sorry Nick Miller.

6:51:26.390 --> 6:51:28.550
Nick Biemiller
Sorry. So would you like me to go? I kind of missed that.

6:51:29.90 --> 6:51:31.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes, I I I got I mixed up.

6:51:32.360 --> 6:51:59.890
Nick Biemiller
OK, great. Yeah. So I don't wanna restage stuff that's already been said. I just want to highlight one of our objection issues around old growth in the forest plan. So table three in the forest plan which is on page 66, establishes desired conditions were for a range of old growth informed from the NRV model of 430 to 560,000 acres because the long term target.

6:52:1.240 --> 6:52:32.210
Nick Biemiller
Yet what we see in the spectrum model uh in tables 45 and 46 in the final environmental impact

statement is that we can expect to see upwards of 700 and 7000 acres of old forest, closed canopy, several state created over time through passive force management. And so just to drive that home that we are supportive of increasing the proportions of both young forest and old growth forest on the landscape.

6:52:32.900 --> 6:52:37.570
Nick Biemiller
That's part of that overall mosaic of habitat diversity that we wanna see.

6:52:38.250 --> 6:52:57.260
Nick Biemiller
But we are worried about the the implications of the model and of the forest land use to where we're gonna end up with what the forest Plan says as over 100 and 100 / 150,000 acres more old growth on the ground than what the NRV model says that we should have.

6:52:58.380 --> 6:52:59.970
Nick Biemiller
So with that in mind.

6:53:1.0 --> 6:53:30.830
Nick Biemiller
And that's kind of a compromise. I just want to offer our support towards what the partnership has put forward and what Rob mentioned in his comments. We think capping the amount of old growth at something like 256 thousand and adopting a CAP and trade system could be a good compromise as a way to both ensure that we don't end up with more old growth on the landscape than NRV says we should have while also addressing some of the folks concerns that we're hearing here today.

6:53:34.210 --> 6:53:34.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

6:53:36.140 --> 6:53:36.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, nick.

6:53:38.720 --> 6:53:40.320
Nick Biemiller
That. I'm sorry. My I think the.

6:53:39.90 --> 6:53:40.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Josh is you're in?

6:53:41.40 --> 6:53:47.550
Nick Biemiller
The COVID hay is a starting to hit in a little bit, so I apologize if my comments aren't as clear as they were this morning.

6:53:49.960 --> 6:53:50.710
Nick Biemiller
OK, great.

6:53:48.730 --> 6:53:50.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, very clear, never know.

6:53:52.470 --> 6:53:53.160
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I think Josh.

6:53:52.530 --> 6:53:57.190
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah, Nick, you're more articulate with COVID than I am in perfect health. So impressed.

6:53:52.300 --> 6:53:58.80
Nick Biemiller
I doubt that, Josh.

6:54:0.510 --> 6:54:1.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And.

6:54:2.190 --> 6:54:2.760
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hey.

6:54:0.440 --> 6:54:4.280
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah, Nancy, I think you're about to calling me. This is Josh Kelly with mountain true.

6:54:5.600 --> 6:54:6.30
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah.

6:54:3.880 --> 6:54:12.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well, first, Josh, Josh, one SEC. James James had a comment. And Josh, I I don't. I wanna hear your perspective on this and and one of the things.

6:54:14.310 --> 6:54:18.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Maybe you could touch on two is like, you know the.

6:54:19.240 --> 6:54:41.470
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, I I hear you on those kind of smaller patches and and some of the values in some of those stands, but also as I understand really like the medium and large patches is really where you get the the

the full kind of ecological benefits of that older forest type. So maybe you can hit on that as well in your comments.

6:54:42.810 --> 6:54:43.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Or any thoughts on that?

6:54:42.650 --> 6:54:51.520
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Uh, yeah, sure. Yeah. No, I did want to address your your request for a workable solution to dealing with old growth, both at the plan and the project level.

6:54:53.510 --> 6:55:24.420
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
And so yeah, I do have have some thoughts on both of those topics. I mean, number one, I do think that the, the small, generally small, though not always patches of forest that have never been logged on the Nantahala, Pisgah, our great National treasures, and there needs to be a lot of difference in the part of the Forest Service and being careful when you all may be encountering those in a timber project. So I think 1 pretty simple way to deal with those is to simply.

6:55:26.140 --> 6:55:38.520
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Be conservative. I mean, we know from the age class distribution of the forest that the vast majority of the forest is less than 120 years old and there's a big lump of forest in that 82120 year age class.

6:55:39.800 --> 6:55:47.470
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
And so I think that that that portion of the forest is where we have a lot of consensus. If there is good access and things of that nature.

6:55:47.560 --> 6:55:52.420
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Uh, it's for, for support for habitat management and timber harvest.

6:55:54.940 --> 6:55:57.90
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I think it's also notable, though that.

6:55:58.90 --> 6:56:3.120
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
That 100,000 acres of the proposed old growth network and alternative E is less than 100 years old.

6:56:3.960 --> 6:56:34.250
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
So as far as identifying the proper old growth network, I don't think that's the portion that we need in the old growth network. I think. And I also think that there's this opportunity, as Mr Harlan mentioned, with the Biden Administrative Administration Executive order on mature and old growth forests. I think

there's an opportunity for the forest to do a high level analysis and identify that, say the oldest, 25% of the forest, the oldest 250,000 acres in this forest and say that is the old.

6:56:34.350 --> 6:56:35.30
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
With network.

6:56:35.710 --> 6:56:48.180
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
And and we we know that, you know that may not necessarily be convenient all the time. Some some of the areas that would be convenient to protect are gonna be in wilderness, but they might be young forest on the other hand I think it will.

6:56:49.660 --> 6:57:20.810
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
It will help a lot in complying with the executive order and could help quite a bit at the project level and I think just to conservative attitude, when your staff are out identifying areas for 10 per sales and they encounter areas with large old trees, they should try to find some other areas to meet those timber harvest targets and if they can't, they can have a conversation with stakeholders and trying to convince us that that is the right way to go is to just to cut those trees. But I don't think there's really a way to get around dealing with this at the project level. I just think that the smooth way to do it the easy way.

6:57:21.230 --> 6:57:26.640
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
The lower or the way that would resolve conflict is is just to have a conservative attitude and.

6:57:27.720 --> 6:57:33.240
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
And and defer when when when you do encounter those small patches at the timber sale level or the project level.

6:57:35.510 --> 6:57:42.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And just a just a quick question that came to mind is are are there times when within the old growth patches?

6:57:43.120 --> 6:57:54.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That there's other needs within it or, you know, maybe maybe thinning out younger trees within it to give the old growth characteristics of it's got.

6:57:55.960 --> 6:57:59.800
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, coming in with red Maple, yellow Poplar, things like that, that there's.

6:58:0.740 --> 6:58:11.690
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS

There's still may be a needs to enhance the old growth characteristics is I just wanted to kind of book in what we're talking about with preserving old growth. Of course managing growth.

6:58:8.660 --> 6:58:34.530
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
My my, my opinion as an ecologist is absolutely not. All forests have the same structure, and so if if you happen to be working in a dry oak forest that is very dense and has a younger cohort of mesophytic species like red Maple, I think it makes a lot of sense to take management actions to reduce those mesophytic species and to open up the structure of those forests. And those forests can still be old growth. You can have old growth.

6:58:34.730 --> 6:58:42.0
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Woodlands and savannas that are also have those old trees, but also provide that woodland and Savannah structure. So I don't think.

6:58:43.460 --> 6:59:12.390
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
This is and again, this is my personal opinion and informed depending as a biologist and ecologist. No, I don't. I don't think there's one old growth structure. I think certain systems have different types of old growth. I do think it's notable though, however, that when you're talking about old growth, the most unique structures are the large trees and the dead trees that are in that system and the systems where those are most important are those moist ecozones like the Cove ecozone in the northern hardwoods, ecozone the music. OK, ecosoc.

6:59:12.600 --> 6:59:27.70
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
And it's no coincidence that those are the ecozones that have the largest deficit of all growth, according to the natural range of variation. So there's a lot of work that needs to be done in those ecozones in particular those those ecozones that have the capacity to grow large trees.

6:59:29.720 --> 6:59:30.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks.

6:59:31.610 --> 6:59:36.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So, Josh, were you were you bringing some other thought to the table here?

6:59:37.330 --> 6:59:38.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
In addition to your response.

6:59:37.520 --> 6:59:57.570
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I don't know. I I I concluded my thoughts. I think that there are things that can be done to make the old growth network more efficient in, in meeting the needs for old forest and certain management

strategies that the project level that can resolve conflict. And I hope I've articulated does if I haven't we can continue the discussion outside this meeting.

6:59:57.420 --> 7:0:26.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Just one other question maybe for for you Josh and and a few others that you mentioned that you know what what we've identified there's there's a a percentage that is younger for us that that might not be the best I guess any thoughts on one of the things that the team was trying to look at was also kind of like the ecosystem representation within the network. Can you speak to the importance of that? You know there's the.

7:0:27.340 --> 7:0:32.460
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Of the current age is, but there's also kind of that, that representation across the network.

7:0:33.400 --> 7:0:44.50
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Oh yeah, absolutely. I think you want your representation to be proportional to the proportion of ecozones on the forest and the proportion of.

7:0:45.70 --> 7:0:59.540
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Old forest within the ecozone. So as I mentioned, historically those music ecozones had a higher proportion of old growth than the drier ecozones simply because of their natural disturbance regimes. The drier ecozones had larger and more intense disturbances in the form of fire disturbances.

7:1:0.200 --> 7:1:0.800
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
So.

7:1:2.60 --> 7:1:6.430
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah. And it's also the case, as I mentioned that those muzikos zones.

7:1:8.80 --> 7:1:33.660
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Tend to have more young forests because they have been more targeted for timber harvest, both recently and in the past. Then the dryer ecozones, so it's going. It will be the case that you will have some younger forest included in your whole growth network, but if you are to say identify the oldest you know 25% of every ecozone I think that would or or maybe just the oldest 25% period. I think that would be a good way to approach it.

7:1:36.90 --> 7:1:37.120
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
But again.

7:1:38.430 --> 7:1:47.560
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)

As you set out early on, you know reasonable minds can differ on these issues, and that's just my my perspective on that. I I do hope that you all come to.

7:1:47.680 --> 7:1:51.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Breaking up a little bit just, just, just, just, we can't hear you here.

7:1:52.10 --> 7:1:56.430
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
OK, you're breaking up for me on my end too. Can you hear me now? No.

7:1:57.110 --> 7:1:57.690
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Who's in it?

7:1:58.180 --> 7:2:1.680
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
OK. Well, we can we can continue this later when we have a better connection.

7:2:1.420 --> 7:2:1.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Well.

7:2:2.490 --> 7:2:6.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And we're gonna. We're gonna move on and then hopefully you'll be able to.

7:2:10.140 --> 7:2:10.540
Elliot, James
Today.

7:2:6.910 --> 7:2:10.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Get back. Yeah, we're frozen. Not hearing it.

7:2:11.610 --> 7:2:15.820
Elliot, James
This is Rob Elliott with NFA, could I just add 11?

7:2:14.270 --> 7:2:16.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, yeah, you frozen now so.

7:2:18.920 --> 7:2:20.30
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So let me keep moving.

7:2:21.270 --> 7:2:38.20
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sound is the last person in the queue here and I just wanting now to ask you to I if it's old growth you've

got to. You wanna speak to, that's fine, but then let's direct our attention to the lead objectors on fire and fuels and timber suitability, OK.

7:2:40.230 --> 7:2:40.580
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Sam.

7:2:41.140 --> 7:2:47.630
Sam Evans
Sure. And I I heard Rob trying to get into. I don't wanna take airtime away from him. I.

7:2:46.850 --> 7:2:49.870
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OHS, OHS. It might be us.

7:2:51.320 --> 7:2:51.680
Elliot, James
I.

7:2:51.860 --> 7:2:58.420
Elliot, James
If if you want I can just. It's just say, stay quickly. This is Rob Elliott and CFA.

7:2:58.130 --> 7:2:58.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Comes up if you can.

7:3:2.650 --> 7:3:3.90
Elliot, James
Yeah.

7:3:2.260 --> 7:3:4.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Can you hear us, Sam? No.

7:3:5.550 --> 7:3:6.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Megan, you can hear us.

7:3:6.180 --> 7:3:7.870
Sam Evans
I can. I can hear you. Yeah.

7:3:9.320 --> 7:3:11.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But Sam, can you hear us?

7:3:11.540 --> 7:3:12.850
Sam Evans
I can hear you, yes.

7:3:15.920 --> 7:3:17.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, poor network quality.

7:3:17.950 --> 7:3:26.610
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you. And maybe we, I I wonder if we just take a quick tech break, maybe we hang up and reset my might help. I think there's some stuff on our end.

7:3:27.30 --> 7:3:34.530
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
When you agree, like maybe 5 minutes, yeah, 5 minutes, 5 minutes shall wait. Let's make a sign. At least they can't hear it.

7:3:34.610 --> 7:3:34.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
This.

7:3:36.230 --> 7:3:38.810
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
5 minutes break. Put that in front of it, yeah.

7:3:40.230 --> 7:3:40.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

7:3:41.710 --> 7:3:41.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah.

7:3:38.890 --> 7:3:42.120
Nick Biemiller
Well, we'll figure out some solutions while you guys are gone. Don't worry about it.

7:3:48.580 --> 7:3:49.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
First time that's happened 2 days.

7:3:51.660 --> 7:3:53.30
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah, that was convenient, wasn't?

7:3:51.80 --> 7:3:53.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
It's pretty good so.

7:3:54.160 --> 7:3:55.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We need to reset.

7:3:55.160 --> 7:3:55.730
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
On my connect.

7:3:58.730 --> 7:3:59.340
Nick Biemiller
Yeah.

7:6:28.260 --> 7:6:28.880
e07b0844-31e4-4185-b33e-02a7e5d5f9f5
Ohm.

7:6:53.920 --> 7:6:55.290
e07b0844-31e4-4185-b33e-02a7e5d5f9f5
Why do you like?

7:9:10.600 --> 7:9:10.910
e07b0844-31e4-4185-b33e-02a7e5d5f9f5
Sorry.

7:11:1.870 --> 7:11:2.140
e07b0844-31e4-4185-b33e-02a7e5d5f9f5
Yeah.

7:12:8.170 --> 7:12:8.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks.

7:12:12.860 --> 7:12:17.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So everybody's ohh, we think we got this back.

7:12:21.470 --> 7:12:30.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You don't see anybody's picture. There we go. OK, you can hear us. Well, do you mind just saying a few things so we can make sure you're we're we were you.

7:12:29.810 --> 7:12:31.720
Ben Prater
Got you. Loud and clear, folks.

7:12:31.580 --> 7:12:32.950
Henry Gargan
Yeah, y'all sound great.

7:12:34.800 --> 7:12:37.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We're wondering if our owl is getting ready to fly away.

7:12:38.800 --> 7:12:39.80
Sam Evans
Yeah.

7:12:38.260 --> 7:12:39.880
Ben Prater
Yeah, I think the all need a break.

7:12:40.100 --> 7:12:42.550
Sam Evans
While you were gone, we were singing Kumbaya together.

7:12:43.150 --> 7:12:43.630
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah.

7:12:44.620 --> 7:12:45.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How about that?

7:12:45.190 --> 7:12:48.80
Nick Biemiller
Yeah, we solved all the problems. Guys. I think we can close out this meeting now.

7:12:49.910 --> 7:12:50.700
Nick Biemiller
Just just kidding.

7:12:49.930 --> 7:12:50.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK so.

7:12:53.210 --> 7:13:3.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Being with Sam was a we we have an hour left with you on this topic and Sam is in the queue to I believe address.

7:13:4.130 --> 7:13:19.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I told both, but Sam, once you're done with that, would you mind shifting to timber suitability next? Because I believe you're elite objector there too, and that'll get us, I guess I've got this out of order conversion ability needs to go reply to before fire and fuels.

7:13:20.190 --> 7:13:20.730
Sam Evans
Sure.

7:13:19.910 --> 7:13:20.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So fam, I don't.

7:13:21.750 --> 7:13:22.170
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But.

7:13:21.620 --> 7:13:31.160
Sam Evans
Sure, sure. Yeah, I think I I think that last conversation, at least from my perspective, I I think it's not gonna take a whole lot of time.

7:13:32.680 --> 7:13:34.970
Sam Evans
So I didn't wanna acknowledge.

7:13:35.650 --> 7:14:5.220
Sam Evans
Uh, next question or a concern about or what the spectrum models show us on old growth. I do think it's really important to, you know, look hard at what you know with the data we have show us and and and think about what you know what what it really means for the process, you know the it's it. It definitely emphasizes why the modeling is so important because when you know science minded, reasonable people look at.

7:14:5.660 --> 7:14:13.450
Sam Evans
You're EIS and have such different reactions. You know, I think it it just it points to some of the.

7:14:14.130 --> 7:14:19.680
Sam Evans
The points to some of the problems that we've talked about all day long, you know the. So I I wanna bring out one.

7:14:21.580 --> 7:14:24.840
Sam Evans
When visual here that maybe helps. So this is just a.

7:14:25.620 --> 7:14:34.670
Sam Evans
A snapshot from the this is raw outputs from spectrum graph and excel for the Cove hardwood system. This is all E Tier 2.

7:14:35.990 --> 7:14:50.480
Sam Evans
And was it showing us? So I mean I think this is the, this is what the red line is, what is is what Nick Nick's comment was primarily about, right? The we've got old growth sort of accelerating recruitment of old growth that kind of.

7:14:52.120 --> 7:14:53.780
Sam Evans
You know that that hits a level.

7:14:55.120 --> 7:14:59.220
Sam Evans
For at least at the landscape level, that is according to spectrum over.

7:14:59.990 --> 7:15:2.890
Sam Evans
Uh, over the NRV for old growth.

7:15:3.940 --> 7:15:34.510
Sam Evans
And of course, you know, putting a pin in the fact that we're we we've had some disagreement today about how much old growth there ought to be in an RV. I just wanna look at what this graph is telling us. So if you, if you kind of look at the mirroring between the Gray line and the blue line here in the 1st, 40 years of the plan, what you're seeing is these, this Gray middle-aged forest is being recruited into old forest, right? So that that is a that's sort of a bolus of of forests moving from the mid age into the late age.

7:15:34.990 --> 7:15:56.430
Sam Evans
You'll see that mirrored again from roughly period #4 year 40 to 80, where that same bolus of forests is moving out of the late age and into the old age. And at that point the the the old Age class is essentially stays the same.

7:16:4.260 --> 7:16:4.830
e07b0844-31e4-4185-b33e-02a7e5d5f9f5
No.

7:15:57.340 --> 7:16:28.350
Sam Evans
And if you on that same time scale, if you look down at what's happening in mid and late and early 100% of the early forest is being created from mid and late in these later peers, primarily the mid aged stuff in mid aged for purposes of Cove goes all the way to 100 years if you if you were wondering and following along with that so, so essentially in the in the second-half of the graph here mid age just going into early.

7:16:29.160 --> 7:16:48.0
Sam Evans
Late aged, as is basically you know down to zero and the reason that spectrum does this is because there's an assumption built in that that natural disturbance isn't happening in old growth. If natural disturbance was happening in old growth, you'd have to see some higher level of of late age.

7:16:48.700 --> 7:17:3.630
Sam Evans
Uh, sort of continuing persisting in the long term in order to replace it. So you'd see some of the old

growth going into the young forest and some of the late Forest continuing to go into the Old forest. That's not happening. So that's the the graphs, I think show that really clearly.

7:17:4.790 --> 7:17:24.790
Sam Evans
And the implications of that, I think are pretty serious the, you know, when you look again at this, I've I've showed this one already, but just to take another look at it, the late Age class is being liquidated across all ecozones, right that there is no natural disturbance in the spectrum model happening in old forests. And we know that's just not reality.

7:17:25.480 --> 7:17:37.600
Sam Evans
And it, you know, as climate change increases as natural disturbances happen that from due to fire as prescribed fire turns over for us in the in the old age class.

7:17:39.210 --> 7:17:46.360
Sam Evans
We're not going to have the resilience to replace it because of of what we're you know, of of how you're manipulating the age classes.

7:17:55.560 --> 7:17:55.930
e07b0844-31e4-4185-b33e-02a7e5d5f9f5
2nd.

7:17:47.290 --> 7:18:1.250
Sam Evans
With, you know, especially in primarily this this late age class, I just wanted to point out that issue and and and so I'll I'll move kind of quickly and stop sharing here. I can figure that out.

7:18:3.50 --> 7:18:16.420
Sam Evans
Into the you know the final topics for today we you know, we've talked a little bit about timber suitability in connection with other discussions. I don't actually have an additional.

7:18:17.540 --> 7:18:21.690
Sam Evans
Objection. Points to raise their, at least from the SLC perspective.

7:18:22.950 --> 7:18:44.430
Sam Evans
We've got, you know, I I do think that like the biggest issue for suitability is the same issue as allocations, right, like we're talking we we talked a lot yesterday and and hopefully we'll find more time before our three days are over to revisit that allocations discussion. But when we're talking about allocations, we're primarily talking about.

7:18:45.650 --> 7:19:2.930
Sam Evans
Allocating acres into suitable versus unsuitable management areas and the implications for that. And so

I think you know that's that's really the discussion that we needed to be having and and along those lines it just one more thing and and I'm I'll shut up for a while.

7:19:4.250 --> 7:19:16.540
Sam Evans
The I heard a couple people kind of pick up on something that that I said as a as a shorthand and probably should have been more clear about earlier. As far as our paths forward, one being.

7:19:17.360 --> 7:19:41.880
Sam Evans
You're fixing the analysis starting over with the models and the other being adding planning components. I really you know that that adding planned components in that that's not gonna be enough without fixing the allocations as we talked about yesterday. So you wanna be really clear that allocations, that's where the plan components come into play. The planning components apply to acres and that's an allocations question. Just wanna make sure that that was really clear that we weren't just sort of.

7:19:43.130 --> 7:19:46.990
Sam Evans
Dropping dropping that other thread, but thanks. Thanks so much.

7:19:47.900 --> 7:19:53.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thanks for filling in that gap there on that. Still having to fix the allocations even with.

7:19:53.860 --> 7:19:55.430
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh. And components?

7:19:58.530 --> 7:20:0.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, moving to Nick also our.

7:20:14.200 --> 7:20:14.570
e07b0844-31e4-4185-b33e-02a7e5d5f9f5
Yeah.

7:20:5.110 --> 7:20:35.230
Nicholas Holshouser
Thank you. I I did some. I'm the only one in the queue, so I'll I'll keep with this. I wanted to to get to. I have a secondary objection and I had had some e-mail traffic with with Debbie about where to put it since it was, it was pretty specific and and so I mean I'm an interested party here, but I'm also I probably should have been categorized over in the in as a primary objector just for the record on timber suitability analysis. I I don't wanna. I don't wanna interrupt the flow.

7:20:35.490 --> 7:20:35.720
e07b0844-31e4-4185-b33e-02a7e5d5f9f5
Yeah.

7:20:35.380 --> 7:20:40.190
Nicholas Holshouser
With what is a pretty specific and and and very.

7:20:41.420 --> 7:20:58.320
Nicholas Holshouser
Small objection, but it's in the timber suitability of topic and I can then follow it up with a little bit about about the modeling stuff, not to not to drag us back into there. My second objection actually resolved around the sustained yield calculation.

7:20:59.400 --> 7:21:9.130
Nicholas Holshouser
Which is, at its core, depended on the temper suitability, analysis and and what what base of the acreage is determined to be suitable for timber.

7:21:10.700 --> 7:21:20.630
Nicholas Holshouser
Again, without really, I don't wanna drag everybody here into the specific details of that. My objection was that I I had a differing.

7:21:22.90 --> 7:21:52.520
Nicholas Holshouser
Read of the actual took 2012 Planning Rule 3629 chapter Part 219 blah blah blah it's it's it's it's in my it's in my objections. I don't want to restate all that simply about how the sustained yield was calculated, the methodology that was used in decisions that were made about categorization of riparian management zones and and and where do they fit in the sustained yield calculation and the temporal suitability analysis and what the point I really want to make is that I think this is.

7:21:54.40 --> 7:22:6.450
Nicholas Holshouser
I I think this is widely applicable across all forest plans throughout the nation is that this is the the, the the determination of a sustained yield is something required in every single plan and and my hope is that.

7:22:7.740 --> 7:22:37.100
Nicholas Holshouser
Whatever the the forest has has decided or or determined is the the way that they're approaching the the very prescribed methodologies. Step One, Step 2. Step three that's in the the 2012 planning rule that that is actually sort of agreed upon it forest level at a higher level and this is how we are going to calculate sustained yield limit and this is how we are going to determine suitable timberlands and then it's applied across every National Forest. So that we you know so that so that the public can.

7:22:37.190 --> 7:22:41.200
Nicholas Holshouser
And have consistency in that. So so my remedy for that is that.

7:22:42.70 --> 7:22:52.990
Nicholas Holshouser

What, whatever the outcome of my objection, is whether you agree with it or disagree with it that it's a it's a recognition on the Forest Service part that this is the official way we interpret that rule.

7:22:53.670 --> 7:23:23.860
Nicholas Holshouser
So that going forward, myself and other parties can understand, you know what the forest position is and and if it whatever it needs to be taken further to some to some higher educator that that would be that would be the solution. So again I don't wanna drag us into that detail, it's clear my objection. I just wanted to highlight that to me the remedy is simply understanding that the forest is conscious of the of the way they did the analysis and that that's the way they did it on that it the Forest Service level nationwide.

7:23:24.80 --> 7:23:31.60
Nicholas Holshouser
They have decided this is the way to determine timber suitability for the purposes of sustained yield and for subsequent analysis.

7:23:31.720 --> 7:23:34.510
Nicholas Holshouser
Umm. And just to to touch back.

7:23:35.340 --> 7:23:47.200
Nicholas Holshouser
Because it also deals with my prior objection, the riparian mapping, the calculations, the numbers that are presented out of the sustained yield limit are dependent on the riparian zones. They're dependent on the modeling.

7:23:48.790 --> 7:23:58.620
Nicholas Holshouser
In this case, I think it's a matter of, you know, four service is, is, is overpromising when they don't really need to. If if the analysis was done the way I read the rule.

7:23:59.830 --> 7:24:0.380
Nicholas Holshouser
And.

7:24:1.750 --> 7:24:31.800
Nicholas Holshouser
To the point of multiple parties, discussion of modeling and that we may need to go back to it. I would only point out there that my prior discussions around the right pairing management zones, if you if you look at the process right of building these bottles and the way the forest in this EIS built their models, they started with the riparian management zones, they subtracted that from the suitable timber base, OK and the accuracy.

7:24:32.40 --> 7:24:33.580
Nicholas Holshouser
Of those very initial.

7:24:34.360 --> 7:25:6.250
Nicholas Holshouser
Decisions in a model, apart from assumptions that are made later on as to you know what the size of a of a patchy opening is, et cetera. Those original constraints that you put that you know how much acreage is actually in the sustainable timber base significantly influence the outcome of your model results. And so I would just stress that as that was one of the reasons why I actually made the right perian management objection as well, it's because it's such a lead in point of data for all subsequent modeling and analysis.

7:25:6.350 --> 7:25:15.760
Nicholas Holshouser
That that, that was done in the IS, it's just to me it's just a critical starting point that needs to be right because you know when you're extrapolating, when you're building models.

7:25:17.440 --> 7:25:25.910
Nicholas Holshouser
The the farther off your initial assumptions are that the way farther off your answer can be because of that, and so thanks, that's that's what I have on that.

7:25:27.110 --> 7:25:27.420
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yes.

7:25:37.500 --> 7:25:38.950
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you can.

7:25:39.790 --> 7:25:40.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
That's OK.

7:25:41.240 --> 7:25:47.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. So Megan, do you have something on the 10 pursuit ability? Just wanting to know where we go. Yes, OK, go ahead.

7:25:50.910 --> 7:25:54.730
Megan N. Sutton
Yeah. So I think so these two days have.

7:25:55.430 --> 7:26:12.990
Megan N. Sutton
To me, led to kind of a momentous occasion which is on behalf of the partnership, being able to say that the partnership fully supports commercial utilization of lands and the suitable base like hard stop, like we have collaborative agreement around that and that is a big deal.

7:26:14.310 --> 7:26:16.450
Megan N. Sutton
And the reason that we can support.

7:26:17.420 --> 7:26:29.30
Megan N. Sutton
Suitable land having this rotational harvest is with the right management area and allocations and really reflecting that consensus approach that I've talked about earlier.

7:26:29.760 --> 7:26:49.990
Megan N. Sutton
And hand in hand with this, this piece about the land allocations is really a strong commitment collaboratively to achieving these Tier 2 active management goals. And you know we recognize that that you all are bound by the fiscal capability requirement of the planning rule.

7:26:51.380 --> 7:27:11.0
Megan N. Sutton
So you know we we recommended that your tier one be even higher than it is. And so for us it's even more important that Tier 2 levels of management for all interests are achieved. And so one of the things that I wanted to point out on behalf of the partnership was our read of the materials.

7:27:12.60 --> 7:27:16.290
Megan N. Sutton
Show that the timber harvest strategy that's that's in your materials.

7:27:17.900 --> 7:27:20.870
Megan N. Sutton
Yields a higher volume per acre in.

7:27:22.680 --> 7:27:33.910
Megan N. Sutton
In Tier 2 then it does in tier one and this doesn't you know. So for things like forest products and non salt tumor products this.

7:27:34.770 --> 7:27:36.920
Megan N. Sutton
Does not help us achieve our restoration goals.

7:27:37.530 --> 7:27:59.570
Megan N. Sutton
And it doesn't help us to contribute to local economies and industry. And so I just really wanted to flag that the interpretation of the materials really seems like it should be flipped and that the plan we would like to see the plan pursue a timber harvest strategy that yields higher volume per acre in tier one than in Tier 2.

7:28:0.840 --> 7:28:15.390
Megan N. Sutton
And so I just wanted to kind of come in and name that as we're talking about timber harvest and timber

suitability and I'll stop there. There is one other thing that I wanna mention, but I'll just stop there and see if you have any questions about that.

7:28:17.930 --> 7:28:18.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No, no questions.

7:28:19.570 --> 7:28:46.830
Megan N. Sutton
OK. The other thing that I wanted to mention is that between getting the original version of the agenda versus the one that we got just before the meeting started, it seemed like open woodland forest went off the agenda and that was something that the Forest Partnership raised in our objection. And so I just wanted to to just put a pin in this. I'm not sure if that was a time management thing.

7:28:47.200 --> 7:28:52.510
Megan N. Sutton
But it's really important as a mechanism to meet ecological integrity.

7:28:53.490 --> 7:29:23.680
Megan N. Sutton
That this open force woodland objective we recognize it's so hard to do right. I know it's hard to do. We're doing it on our own lands. I totally understand. It's difficult to do and it takes a lot of intensive management. We really appreciate this from the partnerships perspective, but the amount that's recommended to target silver culturally just doesn't even come close to meeting the need which is outlined in the EIS. So as a whole.

7:29:24.100 --> 7:29:39.290
Megan N. Sutton
One of the things that we again wanna just put a fine point on is that, you know, open woodland forest types is one of the most ecologically departed, the most in need of attention and with partner assistance and resources.

7:29:40.280 --> 7:29:49.20
Megan N. Sutton
We would like to see Tier 2 be significantly higher than it is, so I just wanted to name that because it's seems to have gotten the little lost in the shuffle.

7:29:56.860 --> 7:29:58.100
Megan N. Sutton
Yeah, I did. Thank you.

7:29:50.830 --> 7:30:2.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, it it got lumped into the whole ecological integrity it it. Did you hear that? OK. Sorry. Got. Yeah. You don't see it, but it was intended to be in here, so thanks for bringing it up.

7:30:3.850 --> 7:30:4.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

7:30:5.710 --> 7:30:8.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Megan. Moving to nick.

7:30:9.540 --> 7:30:10.50
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
E-mail her.

7:30:11.40 --> 7:30:19.940
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. Thanks, Nancy. Nick Bemiller, representing the Rough Grass Society in American Woodcock society. So we had one objection issue.

7:30:20.630 --> 7:30:28.360
Nick Biemiller
That was specific, not the timber suitability, but to the timber volume outputs and the plan and then the FIS.

7:30:29.780 --> 7:31:1.50
Nick Biemiller
So I think something that stands out to me is that there appears to be inconsistent information across different sections of the FBI S relating to what the timber volume outputs from actions are gonna be with the plan. There's one section on page 5 three 537. Excuse me, which shows that alternative E is gonna have less timber volume output than the alternatives BC and D yet there's another section on Page 3.

7:31:1.140 --> 7:31:17.290
Nick Biemiller
5:45 which states that alternative E will have a higher timber volume outputs than alternative BC and D, So I think these statements appear to contradict each other and and leads to kind of lack of clarity which I think is creating issues both for us and also for other other stakeholders.

7:31:17.960 --> 7:31:19.310
Nick Biemiller
So want to flag that.

7:31:20.330 --> 7:31:51.140
Nick Biemiller
But it is suggested that there will be less timber volume outputs for alternative E compared to the other alternatives that were considered and it's described in a couple different places. The reason why that might have been assumed and part of that is because of increased group selection, harvesting and Co forests, rather than even aged harvesting and increase noncommercial treatments in more Zurich forests as a way to meet some of those open forest.

7:31:51.230 --> 7:31:51.720
Nick Biemiller
Conditions.

7:31:53.150 --> 7:31:56.980
Nick Biemiller
And so this is a concern for us kind of a number of different ways.

7:31:57.100 --> 7:32:9.290
Nick Biemiller
Umm, one, you know, we feel like even aged treatments, silvicultural treatments need to be on the table for individual projects that are developed when dealing with some of our music forests.

7:32:10.370 --> 7:32:40.780
Nick Biemiller
Especially when thinking about, you know, to some degree in code for us, but also some more of our music, oak forests, but also I think the assumption that more of the open forest conditions in more dry forest types or ecozones being achieved noncommercially I think is a missed opportunity for the forest to play more of an active role in helping utilize and grow local forest product markets for low grade small diameter materials and to utilize that.

7:32:41.200 --> 7:32:56.220
Nick Biemiller
In its pursuit of some of those restoration objectives. So what I did was took some so some of that scenario objections, but I wanted to provide some more specific resolution items then what was provided in our objection document.

7:32:56.960 --> 7:33:3.290
Nick Biemiller
So I think for us that that could be resolved by in chapter three of the FIS.

7:33:4.350 --> 7:33:17.540
Nick Biemiller
Go back and look at those inconsistencies and perhaps provide some clarity on what the timber sale volume outputs will be with alternative E compared to the other alternatives cause it's seems to be slightly different in different places.

7:33:19.340 --> 7:33:28.330
Nick Biemiller
And then I think the other parts of that can be solved by some forest plan components. So the objective.

7:33:29.690 --> 7:33:52.650
Nick Biemiller
I ECO 05 in the forest plan, which is on page 70, could include a management approach which states that the forest will pursue opportunities to achieve the higher levels of thin and burn treatments at Tier 2 levels by taking advantage of existing pulpwood markets and emerging forest product markets for low grade materials.

7:33:53.580 --> 7:34:12.490
Nick Biemiller
And also to work with partners to attain those higher levels of open force conditions through both commercial and noncommercial means. So I think both stretching that by utilizing partner capacity and utilizing emerging and existing markets for low grade materials.

7:34:13.190 --> 7:34:13.790
Nick Biemiller
Umm.

7:34:14.510 --> 7:34:23.80
Nick Biemiller
And then additionally on page 71 of the Forest plan, under the integrated Ecosystem and wildlife habitat Management Approaches section.

7:34:24.500 --> 7:34:25.850
Nick Biemiller
I think you could include.

7:34:27.310 --> 7:34:40.980
Nick Biemiller
Under the ecosystem moisture class music section, I include a statement which which states that even aged and uneven aged regeneration harvests will be implemented in music forest types to create high quality young forest habitat.

7:34:42.50 --> 7:34:43.100
Nick Biemiller
Additionally.

7:34:44.890 --> 7:34:52.500
Nick Biemiller
I think just providing, yeah, just more clarity kind of under the management approach as described above would help resolve our objection.

7:34:54.370 --> 7:34:55.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Reconnect.

7:34:54.260 --> 7:34:57.450
Nick Biemiller
So very specific, but I wanted to provide some specific resolution.

7:34:58.380 --> 7:34:59.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Very good. Thank you, nick.

7:34:59.850 --> 7:35:0.150
Nick Biemiller
Sure.

7:35:1.700 --> 7:35:2.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

7:35:2.830 --> 7:35:3.880
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Back to the other neck.

7:35:5.470 --> 7:35:7.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Nick too. Nick #2.

7:35:6.840 --> 7:35:36.450
Nicholas Holshouser
Yeah, I did. I I hadn't necessarily attend to to to follow up there, but I just because of my interactions with the IDT and understanding some of the analysis, I I happened to discover what both Megan and and the other Nick mentioned in some different values that were found in different tables. Some tables simply like you know next to each other in the document and the result in this kind of goes back to what you Irwin talked about much earlier.

7:35:37.250 --> 7:36:1.240
Nicholas Holshouser
You know the answer was that the values were different and specifically something like a a timber timber yield per acre was different because the table is actually relied on different underlying analysis that was a constant frustration. I didn't object to it. There are other people who made comments, I think even Graham County made a comment about, you know sometimes data was internally inconsistent.

7:36:2.830 --> 7:36:31.460
Nicholas Holshouser
And so I just wanted to follow up on it. That's why, you know, I think made those comments is I I just happened to stumble upon you know an answer from the IDT which was well, the tables are different because the data underneath them is different, which I found to be a an odd practice in, in, in, in a document of like an EIS. So that just gives you some some background on why some of those numbers might have been different. It goes back to the analysis and different different methods and different inputs, right.

7:36:31.590 --> 7:36:47.250
Nicholas Holshouser
Generating data that was used. I hate to sit. You know, I don't. I don't wanna see indiscriminately, but I can't think of another word right now. Right? Because the this data appears literally next to each other in the EIS without an explanation underneath it that, you know, this is assumption A and this is assumption B, right?

7:36:49.310 --> 7:36:51.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, very good. Thank you, nick. Good.

7:36:52.720 --> 7:36:53.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And then Rebecca.

7:36:59.540 --> 7:37:0.890
Rebecca King (Guest)
Hi sorry I have.

7:37:2.460 --> 7:37:9.500
Rebecca King (Guest)
Taking my hand down, but I will go ahead and say what I was gonna say there I was. This. This I'm Rebecca king.

7:37:9.980 --> 7:37:13.190
Rebecca King (Guest)
Umm. And part of the iheart Piska coalition.

7:37:14.370 --> 7:37:21.320
Rebecca King (Guest)
I'm just wanted to comment on next comment about the low grade timber.

7:37:23.320 --> 7:37:40.210
Rebecca King (Guest)
Of industry and and timber, the low grade timber quality market. And it just raises some concerns with me around climate change due to the biomass industry and the fact that a lot of the southeastern forests have already been.

7:37:40.940 --> 7:37:41.370
Rebecca King (Guest)
Umm.

7:37:42.390 --> 7:38:5.520
Rebecca King (Guest)
Harvested for that and uh, there's been over 800 scientists that have written the UK. All of that is, most of it is, is sent over seas to Europe. But there's over 800 scientists that had contacted the European Union in a letter stating how that is not a sustainable green energy and it does make climate change. It does not help climate change.

7:38:7.10 --> 7:38:7.400
Rebecca King (Guest)
So.

7:38:8.680 --> 7:38:9.360
Rebecca King (Guest)
And thank you.

7:38:10.80 --> 7:38:11.320
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you for pointing that out.

7:38:12.670 --> 7:38:16.740
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So is this a good time to shift to fire and fuels?

7:38:18.610 --> 7:38:27.580
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I don't see any other hands and is SLC the lead objector? Ohh, here's John Hatcher. Good. So let's go to John first.

7:38:28.700 --> 7:38:55.570
John Hatcher
Yeah. Thank y'all. Sorry for my technical difficulties. Earlier today. NCAA would just like to echo a rough grouses position on tumor cell quantity. We we really feel like it's it's a a big tool in the management toolbox to accomplish a lot of these wildlife objectives and we think that between the creation of a young forest conditions and utilizing.

7:38:56.910 --> 7:39:1.810
John Hatcher
Clear cutting where necessary is the most cost effective means to achieve those.

7:39:3.70 --> 7:39:3.700
John Hatcher
Targets.

7:39:5.450 --> 7:39:34.160
John Hatcher
Yeah, I'll just say this, I I've missed a lot of the conversation today, but when you look at the industry in Western North Carolina, what it was 20 years ago versus now, it's just rather unfortunate that we can have a a highly sustainable yield from the National Forest in Anhelo Piska support local communities and achieve these wildlife objectives, say for us. Yeah, while we still have industry out there, I mean that, that's.

7:39:34.230 --> 7:39:51.370
John Hatcher
Every bit of party's missing is to support those local communities and supply that fiber to local. So thank you all for y'all's time. I look forward to joining the rest of this meeting and not have any technical difficulties tomorrow. So thank you.

7:39:52.980 --> 7:39:58.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, John. So, Nicole, you've raised your hand up before you go. I would like to just.

7:39:59.360 --> 7:40:6.270
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And make one last call for any of the things we've talked about before we get into fire and fuels from anybody on the phone.

7:40:7.360 --> 7:40:8.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
For a voice we haven't heard.

7:40:10.290 --> 7:40:11.540
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Make a little space for that.

7:40:15.950 --> 7:40:16.300
John Hatcher
Umm.

7:40:22.780 --> 7:40:23.210
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

7:40:24.420 --> 7:40:28.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So then let's go to Nicole and then Josh.

7:40:30.310 --> 7:40:35.480
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Yeah, Nicole, with the hell with should see the Conservancy. Umm, before we leave this subject.

7:40:36.180 --> 7:40:36.780
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Umm.

7:40:37.880 --> 7:40:58.170
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
And following up on some of the modeling in statements that have been made, I one of our objections that I would like to name right now is that based on the numbers, this final plan is targeting the Nantahala portion of the National Forest. We're heavily for the commodity extraction.

7:40:58.870 --> 7:41:27.740
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
And as a matter of fact, it's about 90,000 acres more and it's an injection we like to receive resolved by balancing out the commodity is extraction when it has to happen across force, but it's also paired with a question and maybe Michelle, can you know, shed some light on this. But what was the what was the basis for this disproportion that?

7:41:28.750 --> 7:41:32.200
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Targeting of the Nantahala portion of the forest for timber yield.

7:41:34.10 --> 7:41:43.30
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Thanks, Nicole. I think a lot of that has to do with with the with the modeling, it wasn't something where we said we're gonna do.

7:41:43.710 --> 7:41:53.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
We're we're targeting the nantahala for X amount more than the Pisgah it, it just had to do with the with with some of the modeling in the FIS.

7:41:58.570 --> 7:42:1.520
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Well, thanks for that explanation. And I guess we've.

7:42:3.130 --> 7:42:6.340
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Spent a lot of time on the modeling, so I don't think we need to backtrack on that.

7:42:6.890 --> 7:42:7.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

7:42:9.130 --> 7:42:10.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, ready to move?

7:42:12.460 --> 7:42:13.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Josh?

7:42:14.260 --> 7:42:16.50
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yeah, just a couple things.

7:42:17.310 --> 7:42:27.400
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I just like to put in a a word of concurrence there with rough grouse society and Nicole's Hauser. When John Hatcher and Megan Sutton about.

7:42:28.400 --> 7:42:33.310
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
You know, some some more realistic projections and some consistency of numbers on the.

7:42:34.70 --> 7:42:38.10
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Yield calculations being useful and once again just a.

7:42:38.900 --> 7:42:56.740
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Uh, putting in a A some support for those partnership strategies where you actually have better quality timber on average and more yield per acre under tier one than they do under Tier 2, because I think we do need to build if we're gonna be doing this restoration harvests, the economics are gonna require that we build up to that.

7:42:57.520 --> 7:43:5.330
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I mean, then finally I thought that was really interesting question by Nicole. I've noticed the same thing that there is about a 90,000 acre.

7:43:5.610 --> 7:43:14.600
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Uh, 90,000 more acres of matrix applied to the the to the Nantahala National Forest, then to the Pisgah. And, you know.

7:43:15.430 --> 7:43:42.450
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
I don't, I'm not aware of any spatial modeling by the forest that would it would have led to that. So I would. I would be curious if there is that that would be something I'd like to see in the final plan that would explain that discrepancy and that that made. But then again, more than even more than that, I I would much prefer the land allocations to be fixed so that that the special areas of the Nantahala would be protected to a similar degree as a special area. So that is good.

7:43:43.500 --> 7:43:43.950
Josh Kelly - MountainTrue (Guest)
Thanks.

7:43:45.30 --> 7:43:45.560
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Makes Jeff.

7:43:46.930 --> 7:43:51.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So are we ready now to move to the last topic, fire fuels?

7:43:57.830 --> 7:43:58.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

7:43:58.920 --> 7:43:59.480
Sam Evans
Sure.

7:44:0.350 --> 7:44:0.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Damn.

7:44:4.670 --> 7:44:5.80
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Was.

7:44:1.530 --> 7:44:9.780
Sam Evans

Yeah, I think you were looking to me to kick things off. And I'm gonna be very quick the you know the so we've touched on.

7:44:10.940 --> 7:44:40.830
Sam Evans
One of these issues already, and with apologies to Nicole, I am gonna backtrack us into modeland just real briefly, you know, so two issues related to to fire for us. That one, the first is just the analysis of the facts. We think that the it's really ambitious and and positive that the Forest Service has been willing to be responsive to input from the public about increasing its.

7:44:41.190 --> 7:44:52.280
Sam Evans
Increasing aspire program. That's so. So that's something that we support. We don't think you've done a good job of of Tooting your horn on what effects that is gonna have on the landscape, so.

7:44:53.20 --> 7:45:22.250
Sam Evans
It's like fire is going to have an effect. You know the the the reason for adding fire back in is because the the the models tell us that we have a lack of disturbance that is causing, you know, different structural conditions to accumulate over time. So adding that fire back in is going to have effects. We would like to see those effects disclosed so that it helps us understand how much disturbance needs to be replaced. The other issue we haven't touched on as much or maybe at all and I'm a little.

7:45:42.740 --> 7:45:43.100
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm.

7:45:44.300 --> 7:45:44.580
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
But.

7:45:22.350 --> 7:45:52.510
Sam Evans
As I'm thinking about to our modeling conversation, I'm surprised nobody brought this up. But management lock has been a really big problem with our ability to trust the modeling that the EIS is is based on. And so I don't know if that rings a bell for folks on the call and and then the room, but management lock it is a limitation of the spectrum model in which the spectrum won't allow acres to have multiple kinds of treatment, so.

7:45:52.580 --> 7:46:6.430
Sam Evans
You know if if acres go into a burning prescription, then they stay in that prescription, they may get burned again in the model, but they wouldn't move. They wouldn't sort of jump over into a hardest prescription. Same is true if it starts in harvest prescription.

7:46:7.950 --> 7:46:8.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
2.

7:46:7.440 --> 7:46:9.340
Sam Evans
And and I think you know this is.

7:46:10.400 --> 7:46:10.790
Sam Evans
Go ahead.

7:46:11.620 --> 7:46:11.970
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
No.

7:46:12.610 --> 7:46:19.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
James no. I was just gonna say could you explain management lock and you just did. OK, you're good, alright.

7:46:17.780 --> 7:46:41.480
Sam Evans
Oh, cool. Thank you. Thanks. Yeah. And that's my understanding of it. You know, I'm, I'm not. I'm not you're hating. So I I can't explain it probably nearly as well as he could but but it does have some implications I think for you know for what we're trying to get out of the spectrum model and it just it's spectrum is sort of incapable of modeling the kind of.

7:46:41.780 --> 7:47:1.860
Sam Evans
Complex prescriptions that we want to see applied and and we wouldn't want that to limit what the you know what the force service actually does in the future, right. So we've got we know that restoration of dry forest communities is one of the areas where we have more consensus and a higher potential for success.

7:47:3.280 --> 7:47:12.730
Sam Evans
You know, because of the availability of fires that follow up to to, to the silvicultural prescription and so that's something that again it's not.

7:47:14.110 --> 7:47:16.640
Sam Evans
Spectrum model is not really capable of handling.

7:47:17.340 --> 7:47:35.720
Sam Evans
And and and I I think there are some ancillary problems with that with one of which is that it likely inflates the need for the suitable base to be bigger, because once spectrum allocates acres to that prescribed fire for prescription.

7:47:36.310 --> 7:47:45.900
Sam Evans

And if they're not available for other kinds of harvesting, we know in reality those you know, those those acres are gonna pull double duty during the plan.

7:47:48.910 --> 7:47:49.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

7:47:50.910 --> 7:47:54.70
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Pick anything. No, thank you for that thing.

7:47:54.950 --> 7:48:0.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So, are there other objectors or interested persons that would like to speak to fire and fuels?

7:48:1.370 --> 7:48:2.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Nick B.

7:48:3.790 --> 7:48:9.480
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. So are we. Are we lumping open forest Woodlands into this category?

7:48:10.770 --> 7:48:11.990
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Yep.

7:48:11.940 --> 7:48:23.90
Nick Biemiller
Yes, OK. Alright. So we have three objections that were kind of specific to the forest handling of open forest conditions in the plan and the FBI S.

7:48:24.880 --> 7:48:30.260
Nick Biemiller
I'm trying to think about the most effective way for me to kind of communicate some of our resolutions to these issues.

7:48:31.680 --> 7:48:37.800
Nick Biemiller
Can't think of a better way to do it than just to try and go through it all in a time effective matter. If that works for you all.

7:48:40.40 --> 7:48:40.830
Nick Biemiller
So.

7:48:42.520 --> 7:48:50.330
Nick Biemiller
One of the things to highlight, I guess is that the both the spectrum model in the FBI S but also.

7:48:51.930 --> 7:48:56.790
Nick Biemiller
Objective EC OO05 in the forest plan.

7:48:57.850 --> 7:49:11.40
Nick Biemiller
Appear to assume that open forest conditions will be created primarily as permanent Woodlands on the landscape that are created and then maintained in certain places in perpetuity.

7:49:12.290 --> 7:49:23.340
Nick Biemiller
It's also implied as Sam actually just mentioned, that commercial timber harvesting will not occur in some of those places that are managed to create open forest conditions.

7:49:24.450 --> 7:49:27.110
Nick Biemiller
Which leads us to the conclusion that.

7:49:27.930 --> 7:49:58.280
Nick Biemiller
The concept of open forest conditions might be too narrowly defined in the forest plan, and we're not considering opportunities to create forest conditions that are more open, more temporally, as part of silver cultural rotations on the landscape. So the modeling and management approach and the plan, we feel like too narrowly defines pathways towards creating and maintaining open force conditions across the different management areas on the landscape and so.

7:49:58.880 --> 7:50:6.950
Nick Biemiller
We do it in and develop some more specific resolution options than what was just included in our objection letter.

7:50:7.590 --> 7:50:16.140
Nick Biemiller
And I think there's a couple of different sections of the forest plan components that could address this concern.

7:50:17.300 --> 7:50:18.460
Nick Biemiller
Namely, I think.

7:50:19.120 --> 7:50:29.510
Nick Biemiller
Developing two pathways for achieving open forest conditions that are tiered primarily to management areas and the intent of those management areas.

7:50:30.270 --> 7:50:32.340
Nick Biemiller
So as an example.

7:50:33.910 --> 7:50:50.480
Nick Biemiller
I think there could be room in the forest plan on page 71 under the integrated Ecosystem and wildlife habitat Management approach section to include two pathways towards creating open forests, one that includes open forests.

7:50:51.150 --> 7:51:15.470
Nick Biemiller
Open forest conditions provided by creating and maintaining permanent Woodlands, which right now seems to be the underlying assumption of what open force conditions are in the plan, and that would you know, for example, more be aligned with more restrictive land use designations like Backcountry or other areas where silver cultural rotations are not part of the intent.

7:51:16.530 --> 7:51:18.850
Nick Biemiller
And then the second pathway, pathway 2.

7:51:19.830 --> 7:51:25.420
Nick Biemiller
Could be a creating an open forest places open forest conditions in certain places.

7:51:26.580 --> 7:51:35.630
Nick Biemiller
Temp temporarily through silvicultural treatments as part of a shifting mosaic, which would be more appropriate for things like matrix management areas.

7:51:36.910 --> 7:51:47.810
Nick Biemiller
And basically I think laying that out out will open up more options in terms of making progress towards achieving those open open forest condition desired conditions on the plan.

7:51:48.950 --> 7:52:10.100
Nick Biemiller
But also the spectrum model and the FEIS should also incorporate those different trajectories as it relates to the way that open forest conditions are modeled long term in the plan. And I recognize that other partners and stakeholders might have, I mean this is something that we haven't really talked that much about. It's kind of a new suggested resolution.

7:52:11.700 --> 7:52:16.170
Nick Biemiller
But I think could provide more flexibility and could capture kind of this.

7:52:17.580 --> 7:52:26.230
Nick Biemiller
Like I say issue, but this may be conflicting sense of what qualifies is open forest conditions. That seems to be throughout kind of the forest plan.

7:52:28.940 --> 7:52:29.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Right.

7:52:30.510 --> 7:52:38.260
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks nick. And and Sam and I, you know and and Megan, you you talked about woodland as well and.

7:52:39.760 --> 7:52:50.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I do want to recognize that, you know, I I hearing that there's some problems with the modeling and things, but it's seems like we're all in agreement the importance of.

7:52:51.750 --> 7:53:5.910
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Of increasing our prescribed fire program as we've been doing the last couple of years working towards those woodland conditions and knowing that it's not an easy thing to achieve. There's there's issues with you know.

7:53:6.710 --> 7:53:15.600
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
There's questions about doing more of that prescribed burning may create more disturbances than than were than we're modeling, but.

7:53:16.250 --> 7:53:22.180
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, I just wanna recognize the fact that while there's questions about exactly what it looks like, I think.

7:53:23.280 --> 7:53:31.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
This is a very good zone of agreement that worried we have been and continue to do great work in on the forest.

7:53:33.530 --> 7:53:34.140
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you.

7:53:33.250 --> 7:53:34.900
Nick Biemiller
So there there were two other.

7:53:35.440 --> 7:53:35.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

7:53:36.280 --> 7:53:43.270
Nick Biemiller
There were two other objection issues I had on Woodlands. Do you want me to state those now or I'm happy to also give space to others to talk and come back to them later.

7:53:45.410 --> 7:53:46.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Go ahead, finish.

7:53:48.10 --> 7:53:48.450
Nick Biemiller
OK.

7:53:50.640 --> 7:53:54.230
Nick Biemiller
So one other concern that we had is that.

7:53:54.310 --> 7:54:5.370
Nick Biemiller
Umm again, at least in the spectrum model, there appears to be a prioritization for creating open forest canopy conditions first.

7:54:6.50 --> 7:54:12.280
Nick Biemiller
And then creating young forest conditions second sequentially during forest plan implementation.

7:54:13.20 --> 7:54:42.870
Nick Biemiller
Umm. And I guess what we're concerned about is that that if that's assumed in the model, is that also part of the intent of the forest implementation strategy to create more open forest conditions over the next 10 years and not make as much progress towards creating young forest conditions and just to be clear, that concern is coming from the rate of decline that we see for many species that depend upon young forest, including rough graphs, but others.

7:54:43.210 --> 7:55:8.790
Nick Biemiller
That, I mean, let's be honest, the next 10 years for species like rough grass is gonna be really critical in terms of the amount of young forests we're able to see on the landscape. So we support seeing open forest conditions created. We support seeing young forest conditions created. We're concerned that if the focus for the next 10 years is gonna be on creating an open forest conditions at the expense of young forests, that that's not gonna be acceptable for us. So.

7:55:9.910 --> 7:55:32.380
Nick Biemiller
Our resolution there is to prioritize young forests creation as much as all of the other underrepresented forest habitat conditions, and to include perhaps a either a management approach or an objective in the forest plan which states that as part of the strategy or the management approach for implementation.

7:55:33.380 --> 7:55:37.880
Nick Biemiller
So that's one objection and one resolution. I've got one more and then I'll yield the floor.

7:55:39.920 --> 7:56:9.750
Nick Biemiller
So this is Megan mentioned this you kind of already but we feel like the the forest plans objective which is ECO 05 on page 70, the objective for thin and burn treatments to achieve again either those permanent open Woodlands or those open conditions created through silvicultural rotations. We feel like that thin and burn treatment objective is very low compared to.

7:56:9.990 --> 7:56:12.660
Nick Biemiller
The NRV targets and desired conditions.

7:56:14.650 --> 7:56:44.80
Nick Biemiller
You know, table 48 in the FIS shows that will only achieve long term 86 to 180,000 acres, whereas the NRV model says we should have 360 to 480 acres. So we're not really setting ourselves up for success in terms of achieving those conditions. And it appears that part of that is that it's assumed in the model at least that 80% of the thin and burn treatments.

7:56:44.190 --> 7:56:53.500
Nick Biemiller
In Zurich, Zurich, Forest and dry forests will be achieved noncommercially and so again kind of to our previous point about timber volume outputs.

7:56:54.190 --> 7:57:15.40
Nick Biemiller
This objective is really too low and it ignores kind of current and emerging markets for low grade small diameter wood products as a cost effective way to be able to achieve those conditions. So we'd like to see those numbers of thin and burn treatments on page 70 increase by quite a bit.

7:57:16.480 --> 7:57:28.830
Nick Biemiller
The Forest Partnership recommended 3100 acres treated annually to contribute towards that objective. We feel like that would be a great start.

7:57:29.610 --> 7:57:54.820
Nick Biemiller
And in addition to that, we'd like to see some language under the management approach for that objective that that states how those higher levels of thin and burn treatments will be achieved by both taking advantage of pulpwood markets and emerging markets for low grade materials and that the Forest Service will work with partners to complete more of that work through different agreements on the ground to help with capacity.

7:57:58.320 --> 7:57:59.830
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, nick. Yes, thank you.

7:58:0.420 --> 7:58:1.130
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. You're welcome.

7:58:2.870 --> 7:58:4.640
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Going over to Bill Horton.

7:58:6.760 --> 7:58:24.430
Bill (Guest)
Yeah, thanks. Just one other quick comment on fire and I was on most of yesterday. I apologize if this was already brought up, Rick. But just to, I don't know if you've been to had a chance to visit Panther Town. I live about a quarter of a mile from the bottom corner of Panther Town. As you throw a rock, so I know it very well.

7:58:25.930 --> 7:58:53.740
Bill (Guest)
Fire has a role. Everybody agrees with that. I think the one thing to call out again is to be sure and solutions that we pay particular attention to recreate heavy recreational areas. I know that some of the spots that were originally targeted for prescribed burns included Black Rock, which is probably one of the key places that people go to observe the valley. You know, it has the nickname of the Yosemite of the South for a good reason. It's a, it's a breathtaking place.

7:58:54.800 --> 7:59:25.450
Bill (Guest)
And the other area is a little green that was targeted, which is a huge part of the view from salt rock gap. So just to say as a solution to please be sure when you're looking at locations for prescribed burning, I know you've got large management concerns as well, but to pay real attention to what the recreational uses are and how that would affect that, you know, we have communities, we're not as big as Asheville, but we have, you know, Silver, cashier's, highland sapphire tops away Glenville. Brevard people come from all over.

7:59:25.710 --> 7:59:34.600
Bill (Guest)
To enjoy Panther town. And of course, you can always lean on the friends of panthertown folks for input on that. But just to under score the recreation and decision making, thank you.

7:59:35.380 --> 7:59:36.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Good. Thank you.

7:59:36.880 --> 7:59:38.770
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks, Hugh. Next.

7:59:39.490 --> 7:59:40.520
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Wilderness society.

7:59:41.570 --> 7:59:43.0
Hugh Irwin
Yeah, wilderness society.

7:59:43.80 --> 7:59:51.110
Hugh Irwin
No. Just wanna connect some dots that maybe apparent, but may not be as well.

7:59:51.650 --> 8:0:0.210
Hugh Irwin
Uh, you know the inaccuracies in the spectrum model. Basically the management lock of.

8:0:2.130 --> 8:0:12.340
Hugh Irwin
You know as important issue because you know the plan gives a blueprint for managing the forest, the environmental analysis the EIS gives.

8:0:14.160 --> 8:0:25.50
Hugh Irwin
Away for the public and the Forest Service to understand. You know how the planet, what the plan effects will be overtime.

8:0:26.210 --> 8:0:32.840
Hugh Irwin
You know, I've been on a lot of project field trips where we've talked about.

8:0:32.920 --> 8:0:49.360
Hugh Irwin
Ohh, you know application of prescribed fire and you know to be clear we support, you know, prescribed fire. It's an important in natural dynamic and particularly you know the drawer ecozones.

8:0:50.900 --> 8:1:19.410
Hugh Irwin
But those are always paired with or. You know, they're often paired with management actions and you know, with a model that's essentially locking out, you know, if you have fire, you can't have a, you know, harvest if you have harvest, you, like, can't have fire is a fundamental, you know, flaw, you know, as far as resolution of that.

8:1:19.490 --> 8:1:27.300
Hugh Irwin
You know, I I think you know it does if the model is redone to be more accurate, that would do it.

8:1:27.840 --> 8:1:37.40
Hugh Irwin
Uh monitoring also, you know, I I think there has to be monitoring to inform, you know.

8:1:38.430 --> 8:1:47.600
Hugh Irwin

What happens when you pair a harvest with and other management activities with fire? You know, I think.

8:1:48.320 --> 8:1:54.800
Hugh Irwin
You know, in the current EIS, you know that's obscured because of this management law.

8:1:58.390 --> 8:1:58.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

8:2:0.280 --> 8:2:6.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right. You anything else? Anything. No, no, thank you for that. OK, very clear. Alright.

8:2:7.760 --> 8:2:9.590
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Move moving to.

8:2:11.740 --> 8:2:12.860
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
John Hatcher.

8:2:14.410 --> 8:2:17.940
John Hatcher
Sure. I'll just. I'll just be real quick on the.

8:2:18.900 --> 8:2:20.620
John Hatcher
A thin and burn treatments.

8:2:21.940 --> 8:2:52.250
John Hatcher
Not to really get wrapped up in the modeling discussion, but just more of an encouragement. You know, this is we understand the plan is not the project level, but we would encourage you all to really look at the project level and where feasible really look at more commercial, commercially viable thinnings because you you do have great markets locally and we really do feel like that that would allow you to achieve more the wildlife restoration goals that many.

8:2:52.400 --> 8:2:55.970
John Hatcher
On the line have spoken about today, so that's all I have. Thanks.

8:2:56.710 --> 8:2:58.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK. Thank you, John.

8:2:58.920 --> 8:3:0.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you, Nicole.

8:3:6.660 --> 8:3:31.470
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Yeah. Before we leave the topic of fire, this is the concern that we woven throughout our objection and I know we have referred to several times. So you know how different the two watershed is maybe from other parts of the nehale, Pisco National Forest. And that's particularly true for the use of five. We believe for the the use of fire here and the fire return interval that we're seeing on the ground.

8:3:32.470 --> 8:3:46.740
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
The she too watershed is a temperate rainforest that gets you know, upwards of 100 inches of rain a year. And it's also known in the scientific community as a salamander capital of the world, and we believe these species are getting.

8:3:48.130 --> 8:3:55.60
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Impacted by the fire and the monitoring you know is not there to show that they're not.

8:3:55.810 --> 8:3:57.290
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
And so we.

8:3:58.140 --> 8:4:4.600
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
Would like to see that brought In Sync with our special ecosystem here that is so moist on an annual basis.

8:4:5.270 --> 8:4:12.350
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
And not, you know, have the models that are for different parts of the force pulled over here where we, we have a special case.

8:4:13.350 --> 8:4:15.640
Nicole Hayler (Guest)
With our salamanders and our rainfall.

8:4:18.300 --> 8:4:19.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thank you. Yes, thank you.

8:4:21.100 --> 8:4:28.290
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So I'm assuming that Bill and John you're hands aren't lowered, but you want them lowered.

8:4:29.260 --> 8:4:30.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And same with Nicole.

8:4:31.60 --> 8:4:31.650
John Hatcher
Correct.

8:4:32.480 --> 8:4:34.550
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, so back to Sam Evans.

8:4:38.350 --> 8:4:45.120
Sam Evans
Hey, thanks. And I'll be brief to you, Nick. You, you brought up the thin and burned prescription.

8:4:46.150 --> 8:4:58.20
Sam Evans
There there's a I I was not thinking about that when I spoke earlier and we we do have one additional objection point related to then and burn specifically that I think is an easy one.

8:4:58.710 --> 8:5:11.990
Sam Evans
And the eco O 5 is the objection. The objective I'm talking about here. But that's where your targets for thin and burn treatments are. Those are not limited to Zurich forest types.

8:5:13.250 --> 8:5:23.640
Sam Evans
On the other hand, the spectrum model does have that as a rule, so it only the spectrum model only applies then and burn in the Zurich moisture class.

8:5:24.800 --> 8:5:40.400
Sam Evans
And that makes a lot of sense, and it's something that we think you know if if that's where the analysis shows effects we we'd like to see the A planned component correspond to that. You know we have seen a lot of attempts and failures to.

8:5:41.380 --> 8:6:5.570
Sam Evans
To apply that type of prescription in more and more moist for us, where it's not really appropriate that have either failed or have required incredible amounts of follow up treatment to try to get that desired condition on the ground. So making sure that those are happening in, in the right places, even limited to the the dry ecozones if something that we'd asked for in our direction as well.

8:6:7.40 --> 8:6:9.130
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Hey, Sam, just on that point.

8:6:9.210 --> 8:6:25.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Umm on that the I Michelle showing me that piece and then on the next page it talks, there's there's management approaches and it talks about the Zurich sites and you know really pointing out the woodland thinning and burning is that.

8:6:26.780 --> 8:6:33.370
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You think it needs to be more more clear about the the linkage there, huh?

8:6:33.940 --> 8:6:40.910
Sam Evans
So yeah, I I mean, we haven't really talked about the management approaches yet because well, I'm not sure why, but the.

8:6:41.690 --> 8:6:43.420
Sam Evans
The management approaches are not playing components.

8:6:44.640 --> 8:6:45.720
Sam Evans
So you.

8:6:46.510 --> 8:7:2.50
Sam Evans
To the extent that you're, you know, you're like you and like what you analyze in the IIS are planning components and what you do or or or plan components obviously try to do the management approaches as well, but they're not in any way binding management approaches that is.

8:7:5.410 --> 8:7:15.490
Sam Evans
So I think that actually has implications for other things we talked about too. While among the soapbox here, you know, we've, you know, we've talked some about the need to add priority treatments.

8:7:16.190 --> 8:7:21.330
Sam Evans
As a as one possible solution to to figuring out sort of how we align.

8:7:22.770 --> 8:7:32.410
Sam Evans
The you know the existing sort of cultural objectives with the ecozone reference conditions and you know that's something that I think is really important. Some of those strategies.

8:7:33.130 --> 8:7:40.850
Sam Evans
Are are already reflected in the management approaches, but again those are not planning components and and and they need to be.

8:7:43.440 --> 8:7:43.700
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK.

8:7:44.530 --> 8:7:45.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Any follow up, John?

8:7:47.800 --> 8:7:49.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, good. Thank you, Sam.

8:7:50.430 --> 8:8:2.900
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So before we go to Nick, I just want to make one last call for any interested persons or objectors or anyone on the phone who wants to weigh in on fire and fuels.

8:8:13.190 --> 8:8:14.220
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
OK, nick.

8:8:15.950 --> 8:8:16.410
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Me.

8:8:16.900 --> 8:8:33.540
Nick Biemiller
Yeah. Thanks, Nancy. I just wanted to respond to Sam's comment quick on that and say, you know, I I think there is a need for thin and burn treatments in all of the fire adapted ecosystems on Nantahala and Pisgah.

8:8:34.980 --> 8:8:48.170
Nick Biemiller
Obviously the fire return interval as we understand it from a restoration perspective is different with, you know, music oak compared to shortly pinoak and that's that's understood. But I'd feel uncomfortable.

8:8:48.950 --> 8:9:5.920
Nick Biemiller
Kind of only including those more dry forests within that objective, I feel like we should just a more elegant solution that I feel like most folks who get on board with would be just describing it as fire adapted ecosystems, which would include all of our both forests and hard pine forests.

8:9:8.840 --> 8:9:9.310
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Thanks.

8:9:11.350 --> 8:9:36.500
Nick Biemiller

I also think that some of the what could help here and I got into this with my multiple pathways for achieving and open forest conditions. I think adding more context around how the Forest Service is defining or thinking about thin and burn treatments would also be useful because the way it's framed right now it seems like what's implied is that then and burn treatments are the pathway to creating permanent Woodlands.

8:9:37.240 --> 8:9:58.30
Nick Biemiller
But in some of our more, more music oak types that are in the matrix, for example, you might be doing a shelter, would burn technique or midstory removal treatment that's that will create open forest conditions but is not like a, quote, UN quote permanent woodland. So I think more clarity on what that is and could also help the plan.

8:10:0.750 --> 8:10:1.480
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
All right.

8:10:2.350 --> 8:10:7.780
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So no one is in the queue. I've done all last call. I think we're winding up.

8:10:8.590 --> 8:10:10.0
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So Rick?

8:10:11.150 --> 8:10:13.730
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
James, Are you ready to close for the day?

8:10:16.360 --> 8:10:26.650
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah, I think so. And one of the circle back at the beginning of the day, Sam, you had brought up that, you know, would we have time to go back to wilderness? And I think where we're at is when.

8:10:27.680 --> 8:10:34.110
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, when we discussed that there might have been people that were on that were not on now that would not be afforded the same opportunity.

8:10:34.850 --> 8:10:42.570
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Uh, so we we've got your objection. We've got your points on that. We have the discussion yesterday if that sounds acceptable.

8:10:45.540 --> 8:10:55.40
Sam Evans
Yeah, I I think you know, if we had been able to figure out a way, a fair way to do it, I think it would have been preferable to have a little additional discussion. But respect your decision on that.

8:10:56.280 --> 8:10:59.330
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Alright, thank you for that. Times you have some.

8:11:1.180 --> 8:11:4.930
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Closing words. Yeah, I'm a it was a.

8:11:5.10 --> 8:11:9.820
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The big day talking about some some really tough issues. I I I.

8:11:11.360 --> 8:11:12.10
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I'm.

8:11:12.990 --> 8:11:15.960
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Continually humbled by the the.

8:11:17.180 --> 8:11:25.520
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How much folks have really dive in on the issues and and have really thoughtful dialogue around that so.

8:11:25.590 --> 8:11:50.850
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ohh appreciate that all today and I do I do. I I I know we we've done this before but I I do wanna brag on the fact that I think the last two years we've done more of prescribed burns than than we've seen in the mountains for a long time and and really doing some cool stuff with partners using technology and other techniques to do that so anyway.

8:11:51.550 --> 8:11:55.360
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I I'm I'm proud of where we're going and I think.

8:11:56.270 --> 8:12:13.490
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The more, more great work to be done in that arena and and at the end of the day, you know, we probably in terms of management actions around around forest, we probably we touch more acres with prescribed burning than any other.

8:12:14.190 --> 8:12:18.350
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
You know, technique that we can use. So it's it's really a critical tool in toolbox.

8:12:21.330 --> 8:12:22.280
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Yeah. Well, again.

8:12:23.510 --> 8:12:44.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
This has been extremely, extremely helpful for me and a lot of information, but I I need a lot of information that the enormity of the task, the, the, the weight of the the decision and the complexity of everything involved and all of all of your help is greatly appreciated.

8:12:45.20 --> 8:12:52.750
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Get get putting your thoughts into the room and you know, drilling down when we need to drill down, getting getting down to the the.

8:12:54.450 --> 8:12:56.840
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Ideas. Thoughts. Remedies. Resolutions.

8:12:57.550 --> 8:13:6.340
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
I can't tell you, you know, enough. Just thank you for that. This is a lot to we've got to navigate and.

8:13:7.400 --> 8:13:13.890
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
To really when I when I see the the the level of commitment from well there's.

8:13:14.820 --> 8:13:18.920
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
The people in this room, there's people in our our virtual room. It it just.

8:13:19.710 --> 8:13:49.400
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Is very impressive and thank you all for your your commitment to the National Forest. Thank you for your commitment to this force planned in the future in in especially being able to offer up solutions and and then be able to discuss them when there's different points of view. My hats off to everybody here for for having that having the forest in mind as we try to work through this excellent work. So thank you very much. Looking forward to tomorrow.

8:13:49.970 --> 8:13:52.540
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And and then I've gotta figure out.

8:13:53.350 --> 8:13:54.40
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
How we're going to?

8:13:55.480 --> 8:14:11.450
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Now where we go from here. So thank you so much. So we also recognize that some of you that are on today with us may not be with us tomorrow and we thank you again for being here through today. If if this is your last day.

8:14:12.790 --> 8:14:15.670
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And just a reminder that the transcript.

8:14:16.370 --> 8:14:24.120
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
From this and the recording from this meeting will be located on the forced website in a week or so.

8:14:24.860 --> 8:14:27.430
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
And that ricks?

8:14:28.960 --> 8:14:38.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Letter of of what do you call it? Sorry. Final final response, final response letter and documents will be out in the fall.

8:14:39.390 --> 8:14:56.520
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So with that, I think we're ready to close for the day tomorrow. We're back at 8:30 again to cover wildlife plant and aquatic species from 9 to 11. Oops, 9 to 11. Oh yeah. Because we have an opening opening at 839 to 11 on wildlife plan and aquatic species.

8:14:57.290 --> 8:15:1.620
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Tier one and two objectives from 11:15 to noon, so 45 minutes.

8:15:3.110 --> 8:15:13.440
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Climate change from one-on-one 4545 minutes on climate change and then monitoring for half an hour before we close at three.

8:15:14.610 --> 8:15:28.60
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
So starting starting at 8:30 and if you can try to join about 8:15 so we can get all the technology worked out before we kick things off at 8:30 sharp. Yeah, that's been working really well. And again, I also appreciate so much your.

8:15:28.760 --> 8:15:33.390
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Your engagement, how you're engaging in such a a constructive and respectful way.

8:15:34.190 --> 8:15:35.150
Dispatch, NCNCF01 -FS
Have a good evening.