

From: David M Kennedy [mailto:dmk@stanford.edu]

Sent: Friday, September 30, 2016 2:06 PM

To: McGrath, Matthew T -FS <mtmcgrath@fs.fed.us>; Blanchard, Becky P -FS <bpbblanchard@fs.fed.us>

Subject: NATURE AND PURPOSES

To: Becky Blanchard; Matthew McGrath

From: David Kennedy

RE: PNNST Nature and Purposes Draft

Dear Matt and Becky,

First, thanks for the characteristically well-organized and well-run webinar yesterday. And second, my apologies once again that teaching obligations will prevent me from being with you at the Whitefish meeting of the Advisory Council.

My principal purpose in writing now is to encourage incorporating the language “working landscapes” into the Nature and Purposes statement. I’m attaching an edited version of the draft document that shows the insertion.

My reasoning is as follows:

1. It’s truth-in-packaging. In fact, the second sentence of the relevant paragraph concedes that.
2. It’s stylistically harmonizing and clarifying. As it now reads, there seems to be a dissonance, if not an outright contradiction, between the first and second sentences in that paragraph. The first dwells on values like pristinity and wilderness, while the second sentence abruptly and somewhat jarringly introduces other elements altogether, such as farms, ranches, and communities.
3. Something further – I understand and respect Mike Dawson’s point about the statement being “aspirational,” i.e., guiding users, managers, and the public at large toward a vision of an “ideal” trail. But to that I would make two responses:
 - i. It’s unlikely to the point of being unimaginable that the trail will *ever* exclude exposure to working landscapes of one kind or another. And to the extent that’s true, why encourage an aspiration that has little or no possibility of becoming a reality?
 - ii. More importantly, in my mind, is another and different kind of aspiration -- that we can play our part in helping to migrate notions about environmental stewardship from wilderness to working landscapes. The PNNST presents an opportunity to

introduce more people to the concept that responsibly managed working landscapes are no less important, no less national treasures, often no less scenic and grand and majestic, than wilderness landscapes. Both are and should continue to be part of our heritage. Both should be not merely acknowledged, but celebrated, and properly stewarded. It's worth noting that several prominent conservation organizations, conspicuously including The Nature Conservancy and CalTrout, are beginning to incorporate those principles into their programs. I'm attaching a copy of a talk I gave a few years back to another such organization, The Institute at the Golden Gate, when I tried to develop this point more extensively. I've highlighted the most relevant parts. The passage that best captures the essence of my argument is this:

The park concept has been confined to a handful of some rather modestly scaled pieces of exotically endowed beautiful real estate. They are sometimes called "America's best places," a description with some unsettling implications for how we have thought about - and treated -- *other* American places.

Please feel free to share any or all of this with whomever you deem appropriate.

Best regards,

David

Suggested addition to second paragraph:

The trail invites travelers into the backcountry **and working landscapes of the Pacific Northwest** to seek the grandeur of glaciated peaks, tranquil lakes, boundless horizons of majestic mountains, deep canyons, storm-carved coastlines and the splendor of wild places.