

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
24212	11/19/2014 9:35	General comment	This is just a test of the comment tool to verify functionality.	no map point
25018	11/21/2014 12:19	wilderness	"NC Mtn Treasures" as recently published by TWS is the guide to follow in selecting areas for recommendations for inclusion in the national Wilderness System. These areas have been extensively reviewed by TWS, Sierra Club, WMCA, Wild South and SELC, among others, after many meetings and personal experience in these places. Chief among these, in my own opinion are the Black Mountains, Tusquittee, Bald Mtns on the TN border (adjacent to protected area in TN), and Cheoah, but all of the areas in this publication are worthy additions. In the Pisgah Ranger District, S. Mills River and Laurel Mtn qualify, but my preference, because of extensive current recreational use including biking, would be to create a Pisgah National Recreation Area, where any logging would be subservient to recreational objectives, i.e. trails and views would be protected.	no map point
25606	<i>Reply Received 11/24/2014 22:02</i>		<i>The 6 existing Wilderness areas in Nantahala-Pisgah NF = 66,550 acres. NC Mtn Treasures = 373,075 acres. Designating "worthy additions" of 439,585 acres or 42% of our forest as Wilderness is not a balanced approach for wildlife or mountain biking.</i>	
25750	<i>Reply Received 11/25/2014 13:47</i>		<i>There is no proposal for all of NC Mountain Treasures to be designated as Wilderness. These are simply areas identified after years of research as having high conservation values, and which deserve to be protected on some level and not simply cut for the sake of timber production or to enhance game.</i>	
25797	<i>Reply Received 11/25/2014 19:19</i>		<i>How many years of research did it take to insert a picture NOT from Nantahala or Pisgah NF into the NC Mountain Treasures report? Page 18. Sandy soils and tree species not endemic to the Southern Blue Ridge indicate the photo is not from our mountains.</i>	
25805	<i>Reply Received 11/25/2014 19:39</i>		<i>In which academic journal was NC Mountain Treasures published? Subjecting one's work to the rigors of scholarly peer review is essential to establish credibility.</i>	
26396	<i>Reply Received 12/02/2014 13:34</i>		<i>in what year was your "balanced approach" researched, documented, and peer reviewed? Mountain Treasures analysis follows basic conservation biology principles - protect large core forests for connectivity, climate resilience, sensitive species. And what photo are you talking about, specifically?</i>	
26397	<i>Reply Received 12/02/2014 13:34</i>		<i>in what year was your "balanced approach" researched, documented, and peer reviewed? Mountain Treasures analysis follows basic conservation biology principles - protect large core forests for connectivity, climate resilience, sensitive species. And what photo are you talking about, specifically?</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
26902	Reply Received 12/07/2014 11:09		<i>I assume the first responder's "balanced approach" concerns actually prioritizing science-based forest management in the new plan, as opposed to a solution that prioritizes adding more restrictive designations to our Forests. It's hard to pinpoint exactly when science-based forest management started, but the first school of forestry in North America was actually at Biltmore. So North Carolina, and western North Carolina specifically, has gone from being "First in Forestry" to having special interest groups obstruct most forest management activities on National Forests in our region. Since we're talking academics, my thoughts on restrictive designations are summed up by Dr. Stephen Pyne: "It does little good to set lands apart for special protection if they rot away from the inside." Green Fire Meets Red Fire; Environmental History Meets the No-Analogue Anthropocene</i>	
27447	Reply Received 12/10/2014 13:52		<i>Due to the threat of fire, invasive species and lack of diversification on even aged second growth stands the proposed "Wilderness" areas need to have serious analysis on their current conditions before restricting timber management practices. Most of the Pisgah/Nat National forests suffer from mature even aged stands that that were regenerated by second tier growth from forests unsustainably harvested over a century ago. Foreign invaders (Hemlock Aphid, Blight other 2nd vector pests) can easily form insitu breeding grounds on "Wilderness tracts" that create problems over time. Proper forest management (SPECIFICALLY) controlled timber thinning and species diversifications promotion as well as invasive controls are a better method of proper forest management than an outdated act that has not evolved with the close to nature practices that could create a better working forest for multiple uses. This will also allow for more carbon sequestration through promoting more regenerative growth from younger trees.</i>	
28428	Reply Received 12/17/2014 10:46		<i>Overall I think that the people here are more environmentally concerned than ever before. Unfortunately, I have saw private lands being carved up into upscale subdivisions with no access except for rich property owners. Our public Forest Service lands are in many places all the common working class people have left...we can't go anywhere else to enjoy outdoor recreation because there isn't anywhere to go. Some people who have the means can go out of state but not all of us can do that. Very recently one environmentalist said at a meeting that he was a grouse hunter and while hunting in Canada he got his limit every day but had only bagged one in WNC. He also indicated that he was an employee of the Wilderness Society and they only wanted a few more areas for wilderness in our county. I don't understand the logic behind his statements but what do I know is our public lands are owned by everyone. Everyone should be able to use them, not just paid special interest groups .</i>	
25186	11/22/2014 7:27	General comment	Bent Creek Experimental Forest needs more paths for hiking only.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
26028	<i>Reply Received 11/28/2014 12:37</i>		<i>The USFS should publish the aggregate linear miles of trails (water and land-based) within the National Forest System and compare the available for each type of recreational opportunity against the overall participation rate for that activity. If hikers are allocated 99% of the trails but only have a 50% participation rate, more trails should be made available to bikers. Similarly if 98% of the water trails are available to boats, reducing that to 50% would allow more river miles for fishing and swimming activities. The EIS should correlate the miles of available trails to the miles needed and reassign proportionally the trails available to various forms of activities.</i>	
25354	11/24/2014 3:12	General comment	For folks with any color discrimination issues, this map is a nightmare, trying to match the background colors with the small examples in the Legend Box.	no map point
25355	11/24/2014 3:14	Nantahala	This point is labelled "4", but the legend does not, as far as I can see, have a separate "4" callout. So what is it?	see on map
25359	11/24/2014 3:17	General comment	For each comment, you have to reenter the name, email and address. Can't you program this to have the same info pop up by using cookies? In addition, after entering a comment, the map defaults back to a large scale, so you have to go thru the process of again rezooming in on a particular area.	no map point
25360	11/24/2014 3:23	Nantahala	Is this area being named (or called) the YellowHammer Extension or Branch? You can't tell from the map.	see on map
28864	<i>Reply Received 12/22/2014 16:32</i>		<i>what ever the name is we do not need any wilderness here.</i>	
25462	11/24/2014 11:48	Pisgah	This becoming a wilderness area would restrict access by bikes to Bracken Preserve via 475-C. Compromise could be to keep to west of 475-C as it is to the north of Art Loeb.	see on map
25487	11/24/2014 12:17	Pisgah	I am happy for applications to go in for more wilderness areas in Pisgah that are protected from logging and road building etc. However, working for a program that takes Warren Wilson College students into Pisgah, I ask that groups up to 15 be allowed to travel on established trails and camp at established camp sites in the proposed wilderness. In particular allowing for groups over 10 to travel on the Appalachian Trail, Art Loeb Trail and Mountains to Sea trail would be helpful for many outdoor programs and other groups such as camps, School groups and other educational groups.	no map point
25645	<i>Reply Received 11/25/2014 07:58</i>		<i>A group size of 10 is large for a wilderness area. If a group is larger, split into 2 groups to create less impact on the land. It's an unfortunate truth that the trampling of even the best intentioned feet create impact. The more feet, the more impact. Perhaps larger groups could seek out backcountry areas outside of wilderness.</i>	
28389	<i>Reply Received 12/17/2014 06:12</i>		<i>I think that the maybe the best solution would be to not support the addition of wilderness areas with the additional restrictions...splitting larger groups into 2 groups is not a reasonable solution. Unless my math is bad 2 groups of 10 equal 20... the same number of people equal the same impact.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
25488	11/24/2014 12:19	Pisgah	While it is exciting the possibility of a larger wilderness area that is protected from logging and roads I have some concerns about the standard restrictions on group size in wilderness areas. The proposed expansions will have a large impact on the local colleges and universities for both classes and student led outdoor programs. If the group size can be up to 15 that would help include these important institutions.	no map point
28827	<i>Reply Received 12/22/2014 11:31</i>		<i>Why is the possibility of larger wilderness areas exciting? Wilderness areas only restrict access and future use. Why would we want to leave our children with public lands with limited uses.</i>	
25508	11/24/2014 13:37	General comment	This are should not be considered for wilderness and should be managed primarily for recreation for all non motorized groups. Mountain bikers help maintain these trails. This area is close to major roads and highways and offers immediate access to these areas from Hendersonville, Asheville and Brevard. To make it wilderness or to manage for logging will only limit access and the ability for the area to gain additional trails to help handle the increase of future trail users.	see on map
30389	<i>Reply Received 01/04/2015 16:11</i>		<i>Absolutely no Wilderness designation here. In fact, I favor the NFS emphasizing more mountain bike and multi-use trail development in this area. These recreational uses provide great economic impact to the surrounding areas, while having minimal neg impact on the forest.</i>	
25635	11/25/2014 7:21	wilderness	I support all proposals to add wilderness areas and extend acreages of extant areas. Wilderness areas draw tourists and users, that enhances the value of the national forests, and weans the emphasis away from logging and the manipulations conducted in support of timber farming.	no map point
28465	<i>Reply Received 12/17/2014 13:28</i>		<i>I do not agree, wilderness areas restrict use and access of our public lands. Lands that are owned by all of us and all us have a right to the land. I have heard it said that our national forests are the most visited in the USA. Our visitors aren't all coming for wilderness areas. Some are coming here for recreational activities that can't be done in a wilderness area.</i>	
25660	11/25/2014 8:37	Pisgah	We support the addition of "Bald Mtn" (formerly known as the Shelton Laurel Backcountry Area) as wilderness. This is a remote area adjoining Cherokee NF and very close to Sampson Mtn Wilderness on the Cherokee. This would provide a wonderful wildlife corridor travelling up the spine of the Appalachians which is expected to be important as climate change sends some species northward. The area has waterfalls, rock outcrops, lovely cove forest, and is topped by the AT. Just don't make the mistake made with the first 3 wilderness areas and make a wilderness map that would encourage overuse such as at Shining Rock or Linville.	see on map
28392	<i>Reply Received 12/17/2014 06:19</i>		<i>Wonderful idea I think that we should all have our own personel wilderness area not on any maps. Where do I sign up for one. ha-ha</i>	
28681	<i>Reply Received 12/19/2014 09:01</i>		<i>If overuse of this area is indeed a concern if made a Wilderness Area why would one want to do this. All of the above special items mentioned above can and are being maintained under the current designation. If something is working don't try to fix it.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28914	<i>Reply Received 12/23/2014 13:18</i>		<i>This is only wild and unique to outsiders who don't get out much. Talk to the bear hunters in Shelton Laurel, see if they all want to start using horse and buggy to access hunting grounds in that area. Wilderness designation would prohibit the roads maintenance and repair that could be done in this area, and the fact that roads exist in this area, also disqualifies this for serious consideration of Wilderness.</i>	
29741	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 09:14</i>		<i>Lets not promote this area to never having the opportunity to escape the same fate of both Shining rock and Middle prong being wildlife food deserts. Keep this area of Shelton Laurel with the opportunity to manage with prescribed fire and timber harvest to enhance wildlife diversity by opening up the woods. Fact is, when you label it wilderness, they end up loving it to death like shining rock and linville.</i>	
25678	11/25/2014 9:26	Pisgah	This area known as Wolf Ford Horse Camp has significant Forest Service & volunteer improvement, is one of only two camping facilities for stock overnighting in the Pisgah RD & should be preserved for recreation	see on map
25681	11/25/2014 9:31	Pisgah	This area, Turkey Pen Trailhead is concentrated recreation because users including mtn bikers & stock users stage from this trail head into the surrounding areas. The trails in this area include old forest logging roads, narrow gauge railroad beds & trail machine improved trails, in other words, not "untrammelled by man".	see on map
28445	<i>Reply Received 12/17/2014 12:43</i>		<i>South Mills river (Turkey Pen) is currently used for hiking, mountain biking and horse riding. The imprint of human use is everywhere. Forget 'Wilderness' - the current 'roadless' designation is sufficient.</i>	
30399	<i>Reply Received 01/04/2015 16:45</i>		<i>Please do not consider the Turkey Pen/South Mills River area for Wilderness designation. It is a primary area for significant recreational user that include equestrians and mountain bikers. Maintaining and even adding to trail opportunities in this area should be emphasized.</i>	
25684	11/25/2014 9:35	Pisgah	This area, Woodlawn/Woods Mtn contains many old logging roads, trails that are 12' wide with gravel bases, culverts etc that are currently being used by mtn bikes & stock. They do not fit the "untrammelled by man" category	see on map
29590	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 07:37</i>		<i>No wilderness here! Has already been managed and altered.</i>	
30385	<i>Reply Received 01/04/2015 16:05</i>		<i>Wilderness not needed here. Continue to develop for multi-use recreation. Great economic gains could come to this area should its hiking and biking be further developed.</i>	
30731	<i>Reply Received 01/05/2015 13:20</i>		<i>I am affiliated with two very respectable Wilderness Therapy Outfitter Guide Programs who have been permitted and operating in these areas for 15 years. Neither of these programs are permitted to operate in designated wilderness areas. Unless the stipulations on their permits change as well, the proposed wilderness area additions in these districts will eliminate their ability to operate in NC. Along with the significant amount of revenue both programs provide to the USFS every year; I believe their stewardship of the land, trail maintenance, and support of other users has been a benefit for the USFS and community.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
25689	11/25/2014 9:49	Pisgah	This area, known as Wash Creek Horse Camp is currently a fee income producer, has a sweet smelling toilet & represents one of two horse camping facilities in the Pisgah RD. It should be considered concentrated recreation area & the surrounding areas preserved for recreation, with a buffer for timber harvest	see on map
25694	11/25/2014 9:58	North Carolina	WNC economy is dependent on intact, visually appealing forests. Tourism is a major economic industry for the communities surrounding by the Pisgah and Nantahala National forests. Creating more early succession habitat should not be a major consideration in this plan as none of the species are endangered or threaten and there is plenty of private land that serves as early succession habitat. Hunting is decreasing and activities such as mountain biking and paddling are increasing. The plan should take into consideration these trends and cut as little forest as possible in order to help sustain a healthy economy and quality of life for all who use these forests or will use them over the next 20 years.	no map point
25862	<i>Reply Received 11/26/2014 07:42</i>		<i>WNC economy is dependant on the diveristy and the multi-use tourism that these forest bring to our surrounding counties. Suggesting that stuggling wildlife shouldnt be a concern till its threaten and or endangered is not a proactive approach . Having wildlife migrate to private land to seek early successional habitat seems very radical to me. Hunting is just a small part of what benefits from wildlife health. Wildlife viewing/ photography and birding are also groups that benefit and spend money in our local areas. I enjoy mt.biking, paddling, hunting , hiking , camping, wildlife viewing sometimes all at the same time. Lets not make this about division lets make this about the Forest and Wildlife Health, for not just the next 20 years, but generations to come.</i>	
28983	<i>Reply Received 12/24/2014 09:07</i>		<i>Approximately 9 million people visit the Great Smokey Mountains National Park each year it is the most visited NP in our nation. Of that 9 million many visit Cades Cove and The Cataloochee Valley. They visit these sections of the park not for a old growth timber wilderness experience but for the wildlife present here. The wildlife is present here because these areas contain large open areas and areas of early successional habitat which has been maintained by mechanically. Unfortunately, this type of habitat cannot be maintained in a wilderness area due to current restrictions against mechanical interventions. These people are the base of our tourism. Increasing wilderness areas may in fact be detrimental to our economy.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29563	Reply Received 01/02/2015 07:08		<i>This is a REPLY to Original Comment: # 25694, Submitted 11/25/2014...hey Mr. WNC economy....get over the dang Viewshed and realize Foodshed is much more valuable. The Viewshed, and your perspective of what denotes a visually appealing forestâis anthropomorphic (human-centered). Food for our native wildlife species and local people who still need to subsist off what is harvested on usfs lands is more critical, than your eye pleasure. One of the major reasons hunting participation IS declining, especially in WNC, is due to lack of early successional habitat which provides foraging source, (insects and plants) for yes, many game species like deer, rabbit, northern bobwhite, etc. BUT these habitats are also needed for priority species, according to the ncwrc WAP (wildlife action plan) that are not game species like the whip-poor-will, prairie warbler, coal skink, smooth greensnake, and timber rattler, etc. What ever happened to folks like you who want Diversity?</i>	
29564	Reply Received 01/02/2015 07:11		<i>When one also studies what kind of hunting is declining (USFWS reports), they will learn that it happens to be that type that is dependent mostly on fields/shrubby scrubby areas, young forests...small game/bird hunting. You just don't find the numbers of quail, dove, grouse, rabbit etc. any longer. Even private lands farms often stink nowadays because of clean farming practices. So, no, private land with golf courses is not the quality early successional-habitat needed by these critters. Wake up and realize that the economy of WNC can benefit tremendously from HUNTING TOURISM TOO. And local people who used to depend on being able to harvest timber in the region, could also thrive from timber production for local sawmills and such. The economy shouldnârevolve simply around catering to outsiders who understand nothing of the local culture and native wildlife needs.</i>	
29565	Reply Received 01/02/2015 07:12		<i>...and by improving hunting lands locally, we could finally keep more of our locals here to hunt, along with their expenditures, instead of losing it primarily to the states of Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia. http://www.fws.gov/southeast/northcarolina/economicimpact-nc.html http://www.fws.gov/southeast/georgia/economicimpact-ga.html Take note of the differences in simply Hunting expenditures (let alone wildlife watching) between these two statesâa colossal difference.</i>	
25764	11/25/2014 15:12	wilderness	I think with the old growth stands, remote feeling and solitude, and lack of mountain bike access(since that's such an important recreational activity in other parts of the forest) that this is a prime and wonderfully attractive area for a real Wilderness recommendation.	see on map
26174	Reply Received 12/01/2014 07:47		<i>I think the solitude experience offered in the Mackey Mountain area makes it a great candidate for Wilderness. It contains the largest un-broken tract of old growth in Pisgah NF, and is used primarily for hiking and backcountry camping - consistant with wilderness uses. However, the boundary drawn on this map should be altered so that the wilderness area does not abut the private property on the south end.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28196	<i>Reply Received 12/15/2014 19:10</i>		<i>Mackey Mt deserves Wilderness status: remote, wild, rugged, old growth, perhap even virgin, watershed water supply, separated from Jarrett Cr only by Curtis Cr road, and from Woods Mt only by a road, a fine large wild area. Viewshed from Parkway.</i>	
28585	<i>Reply Received 12/18/2014 08:08</i>		<i>The old growth forest here is precious and should be protected with wilderness status.</i>	
28853	<i>Reply Received 12/22/2014 15:31</i>		<i>The forest service mission statement is: The Forest Service mission is captured by the phrase "Caring for the Land and Serving People." Our mission, as set forth by law, is to achieve quality land management under the sustainable multiple-use management concept to meet the diverse needs of people. Notice it says multiple-use not just to establish wilderness areas, Let them manage the forest there isn't much to manage in a wilderness area</i>	
29336	<i>Reply Received 12/30/2014 06:36</i>		<i>This area deserves cinsideration as wilderness.</i>	
30729	<i>Reply Received 01/05/2015 13:19</i>		<i>I am affiliated with two very respectable Wilderness Therapy Outfitter Guide Programs who have been permitted and operating in these areas for 15 years. Neither of these programs are permitted to operate in designated wilderness areas. Unless the stipulations on their permits change as well, the proposed wilderness area additions in these districts will eliminate their ability to operate in NC. Along with the significant amount of revenue both programs provide to the USFS every year; I believe their stewardship of the land, trail maintenance, and support of other users has been a benefit for the USFS and community.</i>	
25771	11/25/2014 15:19	Pisgah	I think with the huge number of hikers, mountain bikers, runners, and organized groups in this area... that a designation protecting the backcountry feel and solitude of this area against logging and other mechanized activites but still allows access to recreation activities including mountain biking would be ideal.	see on map
28198	<i>Reply Received 12/15/2014 19:16</i>		<i>Jarrett Cr deserves Wilderness status, close as it is to Mt. Mitchell and Mackey Mt. Water supply watershed, Parkway viewshed. Have been here and like it.</i>	
28683	<i>Reply Received 12/19/2014 09:16</i>		<i>There is an old saying" you can't have cake and eat it too" Wilderness areas and some recreational activities do not mix. With the proposed increase in wilderness areas also there must be a decrease in available recreational areas which will in time result in these areas being overused. I would rather put up with some occasional mechanized activity rather than lose use of the area forever.</i>	
29338	<i>Reply Received 12/30/2014 06:38</i>		<i>We support considering this area for wilderness.</i>	
29762	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 09:41</i>		<i>In fact, there are many folks like myself who also hunt here and contribute to the economy (not hikers and runners, etc.). But many are spending there money in other states because habitat is becoming so poor here because no one understands the purpose of ecological timber harvest and prescribed fire. Both of these tools are prohibited in wilderness areas, and thus, effectively ruins hunting opportunities further. I would prefer to harvest free range venison from my local usfs foodshed, instead of having to purchase Earthfare's grassfed beef.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30727	Reply Received 01/05/2015 13:18		<i>I am affiliated with two very respectable Wilderness Therapy Outfitter Guide Programs who have been permitted and operating in these areas for 15 years. Neither of these programs are permitted to operate in designated wilderness areas. Unless the stipulations on their permits change as well, the proposed wilderness area additions in these districts will eliminate their ability to operate in NC. Along with the significant amount of revenue both programs provide to the USFS every year; I believe their stewardship of the land, trail maintenance, and support of other users has been a benefit for the USFS and community.</i>	
25841	11/26/2014 5:06	General comment	I support additional land to be protected. I also hope that logging on these lands will not be allowed, as well as hunting ! Our region is growing in human population and we are at a critical point in time to protect as much of the wilderness as possible... it is our Treasure, let us not give it away.	no map point
28656	Reply Received 12/19/2014 04:20		<i>I don't think That the Forest Service plans to give anything away but if they are... where can I get in line for some. I want my own little bit of land where I can hunt , fish and log just as much as I want. I would post the property from trespass just to keep the environmentally minded folks away...ha-ha not likely. The forests are for every one not just a few special interest groups.</i>	
25859	11/26/2014 7:15	wilderness	The WSA's in this area have a long history of controversy and should be removed from consideration in this plan so a different protective designation can be found that won't sit in limbo for another 20 yrs. A designation that that serves the environment and also satisfies the people who want to use the land would be well received by recreationalists that include bikers and hunters. This should also satisfy the tourism agencies, those who want their views protected, and the politicians who have struck this down in the past.	see on map
26011	Reply Received 11/27/2014 22:40		<i>I am not educated as to what types of designations are in play here, but I hope one can be found that allows for the Grandfather Area to be protected and remain untouched, but also allow for recreation like hiking and camping. I'm not sure what Grandfather's current designation is, but it seems to be working. I am concerned, however, about how close some houses and roads are to the Grandfather Mountain Profile Trail.</i>	
26029	Reply Received 11/28/2014 12:43		<i>I too am concerned about the proximity of trails to private homes. The trail system should avoid conflicts with private residences and consider rerouting the trail systems in order to avoid unnecessary conflicts.</i>	
26533	Reply Received 12/04/2014 10:31		<i>These areas richly deserve Wilderness status. Magnificent waterfalls and hiking oppportunities, plenty of solitude, rich in biological diversity. Protected since 1984, there would seem to be no downside at all, except for politics.</i>	
28919	Reply Received 12/23/2014 15:48		<i>Just say no to a wilderness. If something is working don't try to fix it. Based on the above comments it appears to be working. Let the FS do what they get paid to do " manage our forest" Wilderness areas only restrict or hinder what the FS can do.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29081	Reply Received 12/26/2014 14:24		<i>Hindering the Forest Service!! Exactly!! Just what Wilderness is intended to do - keep human hands off of some parts, not all, of the forest! Wilderness only restricts those who insist on vehicles, or those who want to log to make money, or build roads or make wildlife clearings for more animals to kill.</i>	
29455	Reply Received 12/31/2014 09:00		<i>"Wilderness only restricts those who insist on vehicles, or those who want to log to make money, or build roads or make wildlife clearings for more animals to kill" It also restricts Mountain Biking "Protected since 1984, there would seem to be no downside at all, except for politics." There are plenty of downsides. This designation has not changed for 31 years, and when it comes up again, it will meet the same fate. Those opposed to this have grown in number and voice. Support a different designation for this area...find common ground and support a designation that protects this place, and also meets the needs of the majority.</i>	
29605	Reply Received 01/02/2015 07:45		<i>Find a new way to protect these areas from logging without restricting recreational use! So many trails here need maintenance and wilderness designation only makes it more difficult to keep them in shape. Keep wilderness in Linville Gorge!</i>	
29620	Reply Received 01/02/2015 07:55		<i>This track of land is widely used by mountain bikers. Please keep this area free of Wilderness Area designation so that we may continue to support and protection of this land.</i>	
29702	Reply Received 01/02/2015 08:46		<i>Who is going to maintain the existing trails in these areas should they become Wilderness? How many of the Wilderness supporters are ready to get trained to operate a cross cut saw and other manual techniques for rehab in new Wilderness? Develop partnerships with mountain bikers and equestrians and other groups who have trail expertise and you will have a beautiful area that is maintained. Just read that 15% of Pisgah trails are reported as below standard. Exclude MTBers and the percentage isn't going to get any better. Allow MTB access and develop a partnership for the future, and the product will be something that everyone can be proud of.</i>	
29712	Reply Received 01/02/2015 08:54		<i>^Correction^ after submitting the post above I realize that only 15% of trails are at or ABOVE standard and my previous comment doesn't read that way. The sources for the the sorry state of the Forest Trails: www.fs.usda.gov/goto/nctrailstrategy. With all respect to the Wilderness Stewards group, who do great work but have their hands full... designating an area that bans biking is only going to be worse for trails that are already in sorry shape.</i>	
30302	Reply Received 01/04/2015 10:08		<i>I do not support the proposed Wilderness designation in this area, as it would restrict use of the area to mountain bikers and other trail users and, therefore, hinder tourism and the economy for these areas of the high country. Please consider including these areas in a new National Recreation Area that would give the land the maximum protection while allowing for mountain biking.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30314	Reply Received 01/04/2015 10:42		<i>I believe that a Wilderness Designation is not the appropriate avenue to take in regards to the future stewardship of these lands. This designation would eliminate mountain bike access to this public resource. Mountain bikers are a large user group that want to be a partner in the contiued preservation and stewardship of the trails and this land. Please consider another designation for this area that preserves access for the human powered, low impact activity of mountain biking. Alternate designations could include a new National Recreation Area, National Protection Area, or National Scenic Area.</i>	
30344	Reply Received 01/04/2015 11:56		<i>My family and I agree that a designation of Wilderness is not in the best interest of those who use the area for recreation and also for those private land owners whose lands border those areas. My family is owns land that borders the Sugar Knob area. This land has been a source of income for many families for generations since the late 1800's. A designation of Wilderness would have implications on our farm land that would prevent us from it's use thus placing many families in financial crisis. Futhermore the area has historical value as one of the first settlements in Avery County and contains several old cemetaries.It is enjoyed and used responsibly by hunters, hikers, bikers, etc. Another type of designation needs to be considered or it needs to be left as is.</i>	
30442	Reply Received 01/04/2015 18:33		<i>I would like designation of this area to allow mountain biking. Thanks!</i>	
25867	11/26/2014 8:16	wilderness	I do not support adding anymore Wilderness areas to the study group. There is currently a back log of study areas that are on the books now. I support our exsisting Wilderness areas and would like to see data on the exsisting study areas, wildlife, user and economical impacts . To just keep adding more study areas to the list, with-out first moving on the ones on there now is not what the WA program was designed for. We must have data on what impact these proposed new areas would have on, wildlife,current effected users, local economy's and surrounding forest land. I feel the Mt. Treasures Areas that are proposed for new WSA was a spaghetti on the wall approach ,to see what would stick. None of the data I listed above was ever considered .	no map point
28461	Reply Received 12/17/2014 13:14		<i>I agree with this comment 100%. We already have the Great Smokey Mountain Park which could be considered the largest wilderness area in the south. We do not need any more wilderness. Please think about our children why would you want to leave them land with limited use.</i>	
29098	Reply Received 12/26/2014 16:09		<i>Great Smokey Mountain National Park is not a wilderness area, it is a park. They allow vehicles in the park and bikes on some part of the trails. In wilderness areas, this is not allowed and is a concept that I support. We need these pockets of minimally touched forests to support regional ecology and the overall health of our environment.</i>	
29177	Reply Received 12/28/2014 04:44		<i>The park contains a little over 500,000 acres which includes roads ,campgrounds, trails but the vast majority of the park is equal in scope to a wilderness area on FS land. At least, this will equal hundreds of thousand of acres of minimally touched forest to support regional ecology.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
25965	11/26/2014 19:01	Pisgah	It is my understanding that in the proposed revisions to the USFS land use guidelines, Steele Creek Gorge is being reclassified as a timber harvest area. I strenuously oppose this action. Not only would this affect water quality on a relatively large creek, it would also destroy a very steep and beautiful watershed which is of great value to recreational users. I've been enjoying this creek with family and friends for over 30 years, and I know for a fact that it's a popular local destination. Thank you, David Flood	no map point
28868	<i>Reply Received 12/22/2014 17:18</i>		<i>This 2014 not 1950 if you believe that logging will destroy this watershed then you need to take a look at current FS regulation and at some of their new harvest areas. Your stream will not be harmed.</i>	
26050	11/29/2014 8:09	wilderness	Please dont make this a Wilderness Area. To much multi-use recreation already taking place. Mt. Biking hotspot. May need future trail building and maintenance that needs motorized equipment.	see on map
26514	<i>Reply Received 12/04/2014 07:28</i>		<i>This area should absolutely not be a wilderness area. This is a huge chunk of the forest accessible to the Mills River Community. Making it wilderness annexes out all the people that like to use this area for other activities, as certain maintenance is not allowed then. This area should contain many different designations, with Wilderness not being one of them. The forest should be a multi use forest. This area should contain MA 1 MA 2a and some backcountry designations, but not Wilderness. Not fair to others that use the forest. Many groups have been shunned or discouraged from using this Area over the last 20 years due to poor management practices here.</i>	
28209	<i>Reply Received 12/15/2014 19:36</i>		<i>Laurel Mt and S. Mills R. IRA's clearly qualify for Wilderness, not at all incompatible with hiking, horses, hunting. Very accessible and popular. Needs protection. Might be better to create a Pisgah National Recreation Area for the entire Ranger District, as biking is popular. My "back yard". Water supply watersheds, Parkway watershed, important to local economy. Logging and roading highly inappropriate compared to recreation.</i>	
28458	<i>Reply Received 12/17/2014 13:10</i>		<i>South Mills literally can't become 'wilderness' with rt 280 and houses just a few miles away. A Mountain Biker</i>	
28908	<i>Reply Received 12/23/2014 13:05</i>		<i>There is zero qualifications for wilderness in this tract. There are a tremendous amount of early successional habitats, linear wildlife openings, (that are maintained with mechanical equipment like tractors), bike trails, etc....why are we wasting our time on such tracts as potential wilderness?</i>	
29609	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 07:47</i>		<i>Making wilderness here would hurt the local economy. People come from all over the country to mountain bike here. Trails need maintenance! Keep wilderness in shining rock and middle prong.</i>	
29730	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 09:08</i>		<i>Both S Mills River and Laurel Mnt are already protected - they ARE usfs public lands, and designated IRA's : Inventoried Roadless Areas's. Yes, wilderness designation is INCOMPATIBLE with good wildlife populations (cant use prescribed burning in wilderness) , good hunting opportunities, mountain biking, and many Wildernesses also prohibit stock animals (horses). Don't remove the opportunity to improve land for native Wildlife Diversity here.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30304	Reply Received 01/04/2015 10:10		<i>I do not support the proposed Wilderness designation in this area, as it would restrict use of the area to mountain bikers and other trail users and, therefore, hinder tourism and the economy for these areas of the high country. Please consider including these areas in a new National Recreation Area that would give the land the maximum protection while allowing for mountain biking.</i>	
30316	Reply Received 01/04/2015 10:44		<i>I believe that a Wilderness Designation is not the appropriate avenue to take in regards to the future stewardship of these lands. This designation would eliminate mountain bike access to this public resource. Mountain bikers are a large user group that want to be a partner in the continued preservation and stewardship of the trails and this land. Please consider another designation for this area that preserves access for the human powered, low impact activity of mountain biking. Alternate designations could include a new National Recreation Area, National Protection Area, or National Scenic Area.</i>	
30391	Reply Received 01/04/2015 16:19		<i>Absolutely no Wilderness designation for this area. I recommend that recreational uses be emphasize to a much greater extent, such as ADDING multi-use trails to the area which will favor hiking, trail running, equestrian use, and mountain biking. The NFS could work harder to emphasize recreational use by finding ways to do logging projects without closing down entire watershed areas to all other uses, or perhaps adding trails when existing trails are impacted by timber cutting projects.</i>	
30449	Reply Received 01/04/2015 18:44		<i>I would like to ride my mountain bike and hike in this area.</i>	
30695	Reply Received 01/05/2015 09:51		<i>This area should remain open to multiple use... please do not restrict access to so few people with the wilderness designation. There are more appropriate and more remote areas that could be considered. Thank you.</i>	
30840	Reply Received 01/05/2015 19:01		<i>I do not support designating these areas as wilderness. These areas are heavily used by the mountain bike community. A wilderness designation which would prevent mountain biking in these areas would negatively affect the local economy.</i>	
30922	Reply Received 01/05/2015 20:46		<i>In addition to already being a well-established multi-use recreation area, North Mills River has two well-used through roads (1206 and 5000) as well as numerous already-sanctioned improved campsites. Converting it to a wilderness designation doesn't make sense.</i>	
30927	Reply Received 01/05/2015 20:52		<i>Maintained trails with access to all user groups are not only good for the local economy, but inspire the next generation of forest loving citizens. Nay to wilderness, yea to recreated forest!</i>	
26053	11/29/2014 8:14	Pisgah	Please dont make this a wilderness area. The City of Brevard has spent a great deal of money trying to connect Brevard to the Forest. This could landlock Mt. Bike trails heading west off Burrell Mt.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28214	Reply Received 12/15/2014 19:47		<i>Should, along with Daniel Ridge and the Shining Rock Extensions, be Wilderness based on character of landscape and connectivity for wildlife. May be better to include in a Pisgah ranger district National Recreation Area with logging and roading prohibited except for certain restoration and wildlife needs and only for the purpose of enhancing recreation uses. Watershed water supply, Parkway viewshed, old growth, highly scenic and very popular. My back yard.</i>	
29360	Reply Received 12/30/2014 09:20		<i>Cedar Rock should not be designated Wilderness in any case. Has anyone took notice of the composition of the forest ages at all these various meetings presented by USFS employees? According to their numbers, the Pisgah & Nantahala have the following composition: about 80% = MATURE FOREST (70-130 yrs old trees, this is not old growth), 20% is middle age forest, 6% is Old Growth (131+ years old), and not even 1% is made up of field/shrubby/young forest . There is an entire block of wildlife that REQUIRE young aged openings and such. But people ignorant of the science just keep repeating, no logging, no logging, no logging. Diverse Wildlife, need Diverse Habitat, which mean Diverse plant communities to subsist on, and thus, Diverse tools need to being available to be used. Please study the facts, about the science of Wildlife Management. "Viewshed" is irrelevant to wildlife, but "Watershed" is of primary importance.</i>	
29627	Reply Received 01/02/2015 07:58		<i>This track of land is used by mountain bikers. Please keep this area free of Wilderness Area designation so that we may continue to support and protect this land.</i>	
29719	Reply Received 01/02/2015 08:59		<i>Fellow Mountain bikers: see http://forums.mtbr.com/trail-building-advocacy/life-after-clear-cut-787580.html (watch the helmet cam video too)</i>	
30306	Reply Received 01/04/2015 10:11		<i>I do not support the proposed Wilderness designation in this area, as it would restrict use of the area to mountain bikers and other trail users and, therefore, hinder tourism and the economy for these areas of the high country. Please consider including these areas in a new National Recreation Area that would give the land the maximum protection while allowing for mountain biking.</i>	
30319	Reply Received 01/04/2015 10:54		<i>I believe that a Wilderness Designation is not the appropriate avenue to take in regards to the future stewardship of these lands. This designation would eliminate mountain bike access to this public resource. Mountain bikers are a large user group that want to be a partner in the contiued preservation and stewardship of the trails and this land. Please consider another designation for this area that preserves access for the human powered, low impact activity of mountain biking. Alternate designations could include a new National Recreation Area, National Protection Area, or National Scenic Area.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30393	Reply Received 01/04/2015 16:35		<i>For this area I support continued emphasis on multi-use trail users and emphasis on recreational uses. Logging operations targeting the creation of wildlife openings should remain low impact, and emphasize recreational use of the forest as a primary priority. All logging operations should work around recreational users, especially in areas where recreational use has such an enormous impact on the local economy. Recreational use in this area provides jobs and \$ to the Transylvania county economy that far outweigh gains from timber sales. Just look to the booming Downtown area of Brevard, the high number of summer camp operations, and the restuarant and hospitality sectors of the region to support this assertion.I am fine with allowing the forest to be managed in a healthy way, but it is time to acknowledge that recreational use of the NF should be a major priority for NFS management. Logging operations should be managed so as to avoid impacting recreational users, as opposed to the way things are now...</i>	
30454	Reply Received 01/04/2015 18:46		<i>Please allow mountain biking in this area.</i>	
30706	Reply Received 01/05/2015 10:54		<i>Please keep this under the current designation. I understand that some logging is needed for healthy wildlife, however any logging should be done with consideration for the views and recreation that support this local economy.</i>	
30747	Reply Received 01/05/2015 13:24		<i>I am affiliated with two very respectable Wilderness Therapy Outfitter Guide Programs who have been permitted and operating in these areas for 15 years. Neither of these programs are permitted to operate in designated wilderness areas. Unless the stipulations on their permits change as well, the proposed wilderness area additions in these districts will eliminate their ability to operate in NC. Along with the significant amount of revenue both programs provide to the USFS every year; I believe their stewardship of the land, trail maintenance, and support of other users has been a benefit for the USFS and community.</i>	
30761	Reply Received 01/05/2015 14:13		<i>Cedar Rock area should be managed for recreation purposes as it is vital to the local recreation centric economy of Brevard. The most important resource in the area is WATER not timber.</i>	
30916	Reply Received 01/05/2015 20:43		<i>The Cedar Rock area is already a well-established *recreation* area, including uses not permitted under a Wilderness designation. Along with the other proposed Wilderness areas in the Davidson River area, it doesn't make sense to suddenly prohibit the variety of recreational uses here. User conflict, if it's an issue, can be managed in other ways. Recreation is an important avenue for increasing the public's awareness and appreciation of our natural resources.</i>	
26067	11/29/2014 12:44	General comment	<i>I urge continuing protection for those areas designated as NC's Mountain Treasures.</i>	no map point
28657	Reply Received 12/19/2014 04:38		<i>NC Mountain Treasures, what is this? This sort of sounds like one of those TV preacher's, in that somewhere back in time there was a good idea but that idea has been lost. The TV preacher says send me \$25.00 and your sole will be saved... NC Mountain Treasures has a Donate here box to save our wildness. Let us all get on board with both and we will surely be in paradise....nope I am not going to follow any one.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28883	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/23/2014 05:29		<i>voodoo ecology...these people are well funded, well paid spokesmen and self proclaimed forest experts whose only goal is to grab as much as possible of our public lands as possible. Look around people make your own decisions what is being damaged that needs to be protected.</i>	
29100	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/26/2014 16:26		<i>Where are these comical views coming from people? There is nothing devious or poorly planned about what groups like NC Mountain Treasures try to do when protecting wilderness areas. None of these groups are very well funded or well paid - some are run completely by volunteers. But they do have field experts that know what they are talking about when they make these suggestions. I understand that its hard for some to comprehend the notion of walking/hiking through a forest rather than relying on a motor vehicle, but the majority of people and yes EXPERTS still see the value the wilderness areas have. I for one urge keeping in place these wilderness areas and even expand them.</i>	
29138	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/27/2014 07:07		<i>In which academic journal was NC Mountain treasures published? It is generally accepted that to become a qualified EXPERT their work must be subject to peer review. How do we determine if these field experts know what they are talking about? Has any of their recent work specific to WNC wilderness been published or subjected to peer review?</i>	
29209	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/29/2014 05:14		<i>A quick search of the internet reveals information that TWS the parent of NC Mountain treasures' was started in the 1930's for the purpose of establishing wilderness areas, had recent income of approximately 30 million, paid lobbyists an average of \$300,000-400,000. per year, contributed financially to several politicians reelection and offer employee's an excellent salary with medical and dental insurance. Critics say that most of the employee's time is spend working on the donor list and not on actual research. Definitely a very well organized organization. What is amazing is the number unpaid people with absolutely no financial interest in our National Forests who have at public meetings spoken against more wilderness...do you think that they might have the right idea?</i>	
26068	11/29/2014 12:48	General comment	I'm very impressed with the comprehensiveness of the plan, especially the list of Forest-wide Desired Conditions. I hope that in the plan's implementation regarding areas to be considered for timber harvest, that they be carefully chosen so as to ensure that the planned reconstruction does not give way to (possibly unauthorized) use by those whose activities tend to produce erosion or further destabilization of the area.	no map point
26069	11/29/2014 12:50	wilderness	I encourage expanding the list of Potential Wilderness Inventory areas.	no map point
28857	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/22/2014 16:18		<i>Why? Wilderness areas restrict access and limit the public land use.</i>	
29104	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/26/2014 16:34		<i>Wilderness Areas also help to improve air quality, water quality, and biodiversity. Just because wilderness areas have restrictions on bikes and motor vehicles, does not suddenly make it a forbidden zone for humans. Try hiking through one of the already established areas and you'll see the value.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30857	<i>Reply Received 01/05/2015 19:25</i>		<i>I have tried hiking through one of the established wilderness areas, unfortunately I didn't like it all that much. I believe that our FS land like all of our Natural Resources should be protected, improved by good management and used by all the people of the USA. The current FS plan without the proposed new wilderness additions seems to meet these objectives. No more new wilderness.</i>	
26383	12/2/2014 13:15	wilderness	Expanding Wilderness Areas around Linville Gorge would make sense in terms of spreading visitors to a larger area as well as conserving larger blocks of significant forest in one of the USFS's flagship areas.	see on map
28190	<i>Reply Received 12/15/2014 18:59</i>		<i>Dobson Knob is worth protecting as Wilderness. Table Mtn Pine stands, remarkable falls on Paddy Creek, a truly wild and remote place. Overmtn Victory Trail connector. I have been there.</i>	
28698	<i>Reply Received 12/19/2014 13:13</i>		<i>The Linville Gorge area where the existing wilderness area is now is probaly the most practical area. There is a railroad on the east side and a road down the middle of the proposed expansion area...neither of which really meet the criteria for Wilderness. Expanding the wilderness area just to spread out visitors over a larger area just doesn't make good sense, Visitors come to this area for the gorge not the surrounding areas...they can if they wish visit the surrounding area now. How could making it a wilderness help lessen the impact on the gorge.</i>	
30733	<i>Reply Received 01/05/2015 13:21</i>		<i>I am affiliated with two very respectable Wilderness Therapy Outfitter Guide Programs who have been permitted and operating in these areas for 15 years. Neither of these programs are permitted to operate in designated wilderness areas. Unless the stipulations on their permits change as well, the proposed wilderness area additions in these districts will eliminate their ability to operate in NC. Along with the significant amount of revenue both programs provide to the USFS every year; I believe their stewardship of the land, trail maintenance, and support of other users has been a benefit for the USFS and community.</i>	
30925	<i>Reply Received 01/05/2015 20:51</i>		<i>I would love to see Linville Gorge designated as wilderness. The area has a very rugged and wild feeling to it which would be completely consistent with that designation. It also possesses the splendor and beauty which should be preserved by such a designation.</i>	
30957	<i>Reply Received 01/05/2015 21:57</i>		<i>I respectfully request that you recommend both Russell Creek/Irish Creek and Dobson Knob areas for the proposed wilderness designation in the Pisgah/Nantahala forest plan revision process that is currently underway. 1. Present uses are compatible with Wilderness values.2. Steep, rugged terrain and variety of vegetation provide high degree of challenge and risk.3. Wilderness designation would favor habitat for species preferring older forests.4. The current 11,700 acre designated Wilderness area for the Linville Gorge is a relatively small area that may be walked across within hours. Increasing the designated area will significantly increase the opportunities for wilderness solitude and absence of human development. 5. As population growth continues in the region so will the level of human impact, and the potential for the loss of the experience of solitude.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
26559	12/4/2014 13:09	wilderness	I support the addition of all the lands in the USFS inventory designated as Potential Wilderness Area (PWA) as Wilderness designation. I don't support additional logging on public lands included as PWAs in WNC. I believe that economic and ecologic value to residents and visitors/tourists of intact forest is greater than the ecological costs of logging roads, avenues for invasive exotics/pathogens, erosion, impacts to wildlife and biodiversity, decreased water quality, loss of carbon sequestration, etc.	no map point
28658	<i>Reply Received 12/19/2014 05:05</i>		<i>I couldn't agree more.. this is exactly what we should do. The economic of intact forests on residents could be a road side stand where the poor mountain folk could sell boiled peanuts , apples and little handmade trinkets. Those bad invasive exotics/pathogens you know we have bee seeing a lot of out of state tags I'll bet that is where they are coming from. I heard one the boys that works down at the Forest Service say they didn't have enough money to keep up the roads they already must be all those ecological costs. Since we got that new BI-LO store down to town we really don't eat that much wildlife so we could care less about the little critters.</i>	
28829	<i>Reply Received 12/22/2014 11:39</i>		<i>Our forest are for everyone and they should be used by every one not just special interest groups. Unfortunately wilderness areas restrict access and future uses. No more wilderness.</i>	
26576	12/4/2014 15:44	wilderness	Please designate more areas in Pisgah and around Grandfather Mountain as wilderness areas. They should not be logged and not have roads developed either. Biological diversity, clean water and must be at the top of your list. Don't let politics and greed sway your designations. Thank you.	no map point
28660	<i>Reply Received 12/19/2014 05:35</i>		<i>I agree no more roads, biological diversity, clean water must be at the top of our list...politics and greed should not sway your designations. We don't nee any more people coming in and enjoying our mountains so lets make it to where they can't get here. There is no need to pay any attention to local politics then they only represent what the local people want. We certainly don't want to consider what the majority of the people want. Biological Diversity will certainly be maintained by large tracts of even age timber. After all the definition of diversity means all of the same age/type.</i>	
26746	12/6/2014 9:32	wilderness	The Linville Gorge Widerness Area is a national treasure, one of the few remaining areas of virgin forest on the east coast, with significant historical, geological and biological interest. It is a major tourist attraction for WNC, and contributes to the beauty and economy of the region. But is is small and under constant threat of encroachment by civilization. Whatever can be done to protect its borders by addition of even several thousand acres represents an investment for present and future generatiосn in preserving our widerness legacy. There are few places on the east where one can go to experience the beauty and solace of the wilderness; we must preserve and protect this vanishing national resource. I strongly support the designation of additional wilderness land, in particular in the Linville Gorge area, including Lost Cove and Harper's Creek. These are areas of special scenic and historicla interest tht must be preserved.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28589	<i>Reply Received 12/18/2014 08:19</i>		<i>Given the history of Lost Cove and Harper's Creek in convincing elected officials that North Carolina has wild areas worth preserving, these areas need to be protected -- at least not included in areas suitable for timbering.</i>	
28855	<i>Reply Received 12/22/2014 16:00</i>		<i>Unless you plan to buy a few thousand acres of private land around the gorge and donate it to the FS for wilderness you aren't going to reduce the threat of encroachment by civilization. Changing the designation of the surrounding land will do nothing to stop the spread of civilization or protect the Gorge. Wilderness areas restrict access and future land use. Please say no to wilderness.</i>	
29075	<i>Reply Received 12/26/2014 14:15</i>		<i>Wilderness designation keeps the Forest Service from logging and roading. It only restricts access to vehicles and those who must use them. The concept is that there should be places on Earth where humans do not dominate and manipulate, places our grandchildren can visit and see and experience what our ancestors saw. It is an expression of humility in the face of something we could never create ourselves. Some would call it a religious experience.</i>	
29105	<i>Reply Received 12/26/2014 16:41</i>		<i>A very well put explanation @ Reply 29075. Why is there a need to put roads through every forest we have. These areas need to be preserved in an original state for future generations to enjoy! As you mentioned there are mutli faceted benefits to designating wilderness areas. I think some posting comments on here need to strap on some boots and take a hike through some of the pisgah or nantahala region. You'll see the benefit.</i>	
29121	<i>Reply Received 12/26/2014 18:49</i>		<i>I agree completely there is no need to put roads through every forest we have. Road construction is just too expensive the FS isn't likely to build any more roads. I did strap on some boots today and took about a 5 hour hike in the forest. I typically spend 400 to 500 hours per year on NF. I did like what I saw unfortunately this is why I don't want to change anything. I would like for my children and grandchildren to be able to see exactly what I saw today that being a mixed age forest not a wilderness.</i>	
26781	12/6/2014 19:26	wilderness	The wildlife field at the gap is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment.	see on map
26785	12/6/2014 19:31	wilderness	Roberts Cove timber harvest site and attendant roads are substantially noticeable.	see on map
26789	12/6/2014 19:35	wilderness	Timber harvest site and prior road construction in Roberts Cove is a substantially noticeable.	see on map
26792	12/6/2014 19:43	wilderness	Substantially noticeable vegetation treatment.	see on map
26795	12/6/2014 19:49	wilderness	Wildlife opening is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment and wilderness character cannot be maintained or restored through appropriate management actions. This area should therefore be disqualified from the inventory for areas considered for inclusion in the NWPS.	see on map
26800	12/6/2014 19:59	wilderness	Old road to access past timber site is substantially noticeable on-the-ground and thus this area should be precluded from consideration for addition to the NWPS.	see on map
26804	12/6/2014 20:05	wilderness	Old timber harvest area and accompanying roads on Pretty Pine Branch are substantially noticeable and wilderness character cannot be maintained or restored. This area is therefore not appropriate for inclusion in the NWPS.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
26808	12/6/2014 20:13	wilderness	Regeneration harvest site, road on west side of Bear Branch and road along ridgeline on east side of harvest site are substantially noticeable vegetation treatments. Wilderness character can be maintained or restored through appropriate management actions here and thus this area should be precluded from NWPS consideration.	see on map
26821	<i>Reply Received 12/06/2014 20:30</i>		<i>Edit above comment: "Wilderness character canNOT be maintained or restored through appropriate management actions here..."</i>	
26811	12/6/2014 20:18	wilderness	Old timber harvest road is substantially noticeable on-the-ground and thus the imprints of humans is very apparent. This area should be excluded from NWPS consideration.	see on map
26814	12/6/2014 20:24	wilderness	This area was a past timber harvest site with road construction that is to this day substantially noticeable. Wilderness character can be maintained or restored through appropriate management actions here. Therefore this area should not be considered for inclusion in the NWPS.	see on map
26820	<i>Reply Received 12/06/2014 20:29</i>		<i>Edit above comment to read: "Wilderness character canNOT be maintained or restored through appropriate management actions here..."</i>	
26817	12/6/2014 20:28	wilderness	Old timber harvest site is substantially noticeable. Roads are also substantially noticeable, and wilderness character cannot be maintained or restored through appropriate management actions. This is not an appropriate area for NWPS consideration.	see on map
26822	12/6/2014 20:38	wilderness	This old regeneration harvest site and its permeating roads are substantially noticeable, and no management actions can restore or maintain wilderness character here. This area should be not be recommended for inclusion in the NWPS.	see on map
26826	12/6/2014 21:06	NFsNC	Hope this will continue to be protected.What areas does it actually impact? My family on all sides has been here since the 1700's and I want to see as much protected as possible.	no map point
26827	12/6/2014 21:10	Pisgah	What area does this actually cover? This appears to be close to my home. Could you let me know, please.We are bordered on two sides by What I believe is national forest but it has never been surveyed to my knowledge. I would be very interested in What area this actually entails.	no map point
26828	12/6/2014 21:20	wilderness	This old timber harvest site with its attendant roads is substantially noticeable. Management activities would not restore or maintain wilderness character here. This area should thus be excluded from the NWPS inventory.	see on map
26832	12/6/2014 21:43	wilderness	Evidence of past timber harvesting here is substantially noticeable. The network of roads along the southwest side of Long Ridge preclude any reasonable finding of no imprints of humans. The extensiveness of the road system renders this area impossible for restoration or maintenance worthy of wilderness character. Ergo this area must be excluded from the NWPS inventory.	see on map
26835	12/6/2014 21:56	wilderness	Old landing deck at Bryson Gap with road running through it is substantially noticeable on the ground. This area is thus not primarily affected by the forces of nature and warrants this area's exclusion from NWPS consideration.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
26838	12/6/2014 22:06	wilderness	Unmistakably substantially noticeable is the old road that crosses Bryson Gap and follows the tributary down to North Shoal Creek where it turns northeast and follows the creek until it bears northwest to cross Three Fork Gap into the Potter Branch watershed. The long-time human use of this route has left its imprint on the land and therefore this warrants this area's exclusion from the NWPS inventory.	see on map
26841	12/6/2014 22:12	wilderness	This old timber harvest site and constructed roads and skid trails on the west side of Turner Top is substantially noticeable and is not appropriate for NWPS inventory as no maintenance or restoration management activities would engender characteristics of wilderness.	see on map
26844	12/6/2014 22:17	wilderness	This old timber harvest site with its patchwork of skid trails is substantially noticeable.	see on map
26847	12/6/2014 22:20	wilderness	Large patch harvest site is substantially noticeable.	see on map
26850	12/6/2014 22:23	wilderness	This area should not be included in the NWPS inventory because of its substantially noticeable timber harvest and road building history.	see on map
26853	12/6/2014 22:29	wilderness	The species composition in this stand is substantially noticeable evidence of past even-aged forest management and therefore this area is not void of the imprints of human and needs to be removed from the NWPS inventory.	see on map
26856	12/6/2014 22:40	wilderness	The past timber harvest in Joe Cove is substantially noticeable on the ground. Management cannot restore or maintain wilderness character because of the numerous criss-crossing roads and skid trails. Exclusion of this area from NWPS inventory is warranted.	see on map
26861	12/6/2014 23:06	wilderness	Recent timber harvest and skid roads are substantially noticeable. This is not an appropriate area for inclusion in the NWPS.	see on map
26864	12/6/2014 23:08	wilderness	This road has been used to haul timber recently and substantially noticeable. Exclusion of this areas from NWPS inventory is warranted.	see on map
26868	12/6/2014 23:14	wilderness	This is an old road that is used presently by ORVs. I do not support illegal ORV use, but the imprints of humans is undeniable and this area is therefore not appropriate for NWPS inventory inclusion as it not characteristic of wilderness.	see on map
26871	12/6/2014 23:17	wilderness	Road is substantially noticeable and management would not restore or maintain wilderness character here. Exclusion from NWPS inventory is recommended for this ridge spur.	see on map
26874	12/6/2014 23:23	wilderness	The old road from the timber harvest that runs along the spine of Pine Stand Ridge is substantially noticeable on the ground. The imprint of humans is undeniable and management will fail to restore or maintain any character of wilderness. This area should be ruled out from the NWPS inventory.	see on map
26877	12/6/2014 23:28	wilderness	The past timber harvesting activity on the west side of Pine Stand Ridge is substantially noticeable on the ground with its myriad roads, skid trails and decks. It is highly unlikely that this area could be restored or maintained to the characteristics worthy for wilderness NWPS inclusion.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
26939	12/8/2014 5:31	Pisgah	I would like to see a more protective status for the Bluff Mountain area, than the proposed 2A. It is an area of great local cultural and physical prominence, and in consideration of this, the Forest Service should allow a status for the area which reflects that.	see on map
28910	<i>Reply Received 12/23/2014 13:07</i>		<i>This tract does not qualify for wilderness consideration due to it's small geographical area.</i>	
29708	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 08:50</i>		<i>Correct, this area does not qualify for wilderness status due to small size, among other things.</i>	
26942	12/8/2014 5:36	Pisgah	I hope in veiw of the dominance of tourism in the hot springs area, consideration will be given to the viewshed the hot spring town.	see on map
28912	<i>Reply Received 12/23/2014 13:12</i>		<i>Hot springs lies dead in the path of the Elk expansion from the Great Smoky National Park. If we want to provide required habitat for these animals, and thus, have TOURISM dollars from wildlife watchers, and Elk HUNTERS, we need to create habitat (grass/forbs) on Bluff Mountain. Thus, Wilderness cannot be considered for this area because it will prevent active for early successional habitat.</i>	
29710	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 08:53</i>		<i>I believe the foodshed, both for native wildlife and local people is much more important, than a anthropogenic perspective of what is attractive, in viewshed nonsense. A foodshed is enhanced, when you allow sunlight to reach the forest floor by utilizing timber harvest and prescribed fire. Don't ruin hot springs usfs lands by further restricting management.</i>	
26965	12/8/2014 9:33	General comment	We are watching as magnificent populations of native creaturesâmonarchs, honey bees, and numerous other species , struggle to stay strong. If we, as humans are to have such an important impact on our planet, shouldnâthat impact be about preserving and conserving the wilderness habitats around us? If foresighted people who came before us had not seen into the future and put in place the protections that have given us the national treasures we now enjoyâthink about what the Grand Canyon or the Appalachian Trail or the Blue Ridge Parkway, or the Smokey Mountains would look like if someone had not fought the hard fight to preserve them for our benefit? We must continue this tradition of honoring our landscape and our wilderness treasures. Itâthe main reason most of us have chosen to live here. I am in full support of the Wilderness Society proposal as the best strategy. I implore you to adopt their proposal.	no map point
27064	<i>Reply Received 12/08/2014 12:53</i>		<i>I agree with your thoughts especially those regarding the idea of preserving nature and Wilderness areas. We should support this Wilderness proposal for our children and the future generations of all life. Currently in western North Carolina we are enjoying the benefits of old growth forests, clean air, water and wildlife habitat because selfless people before us had the foresight to conserve our natural resources.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28097	Reply Received 12/14/2014 13:04		<i>I not agreed with your thoughts. There are enough existing regulations today to protect the plants and animals on our public lands. A Wilderness area only limits the public's access and adds more restrictions. I have heard that our forests here are the most visited in the USA...things seem to be working well so why add additional restrictions. Why would we want to leave our children with limited or restricted use public lands?</i>	
28942	Reply Received 12/24/2014 06:05		<i>Just a few points:Monarch butterfly's feed on Milkweed an early successional habitat plant...this plant doesn't grow in big timber wilderness areas .Honey Bees are not native to our mountains they are an Italian import...they are dying from a mite not the loss of old growth timber. We don't have wilderness area all around us. If we are enjoying the benefits of our forest, clean air water and wildlife now...why would you want to change things. Wilderness areas restrict access and public use. NO wilderness! I think that wilderness is a catchy term... but unfortunately some people don't understand it's meaning.</i>	
28945	Reply Received 12/24/2014 06:41		<i>A few more points: The Appalachian Trail is simply a trail that people walk on through the forest... sure it has views... most of it runs through non wilderness areas. It does provide a good profile of our forests. A brier patch is just as beautiful to some as old growth timber. The Blue Ridge Parkway is just a road with a good accessible to everyone view. The Parkway could not have been built under current environmental regulations neither could it have been built through a wilderness area. So the things that most people value in this in this post are not what is found in a wilderness area, say NO to wilderness.</i>	
27038	12/8/2014 11:23	Nantahala	US Forest Service land is for everyone not just timber companies. Wilderness areas should be expanded not reduced. Logging does not promote wildlife growth it reduces it. I have been a hunter for over 30 years and have hunted logged areas as well as none logged areas. Logged areas are devoid of large game animals only small game animals benefit from logging. Selective burning is the only way to improve large game animal habitat. Old growth forests hold more diversity than cut forests. When the white man arrived in America the Forests were better than anywhere in the world. Now through " Forest Management" our forests are in poor shape and deteriorating due to logging. With less than 1000 acres being logged each year out of 1.1 million available, why does more acreage need to be opened up for destruction? Protect as much as possible for the future! Protect it for our grandchildren and theirs.	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28101	Reply Received 12/14/2014 13:54		<i>I agree generally with these comments however I have come to an entirely different conclusion. Wilderness areas should not be increased. Forest Service land is for everyone, wilderness areas restrict access and use so they really aren't for everyone. I think also that logging does initially reduce wildlife but in future years will greatly increase both large and small game populations. Selective burning is a good tool if used wisely that can improve habitat. I agree that through current "Forest Management" our forests are in poor shape however if only 1000 acres are being cut each year out of 1.1 million how could logging be a significant factor in our forest's decline. I also agree we should protect as much as possible for our grandchildren and theirs, but protection without the restrictions incurred by the wilderness designation. Let us leave them land they can use.</i>	
27090	12/8/2014 14:24	North Carolina	In general I support increasing the acreage of wilderness designated areas. We live in Montreat, which adjoins part of Pisgah NF. Most (if not all) of the undeveloped land owned by the Mountain REtreat Association has been set aside as a conservation area to protect it in perpetuity. I believe that large tracts of land that remain undisturbed (or less disturbed) will pay off in the short and long run.	no map point
28881	Reply Received 12/23/2014 05:14		<i>This is a common tax loophole for rich private property owners ...the value of the property is reduced thus the tax bill is also reduced...The same principle also applies to public land restrict use =decrease value. Please keep our public land available to be use by everyone not just a fewno wilderness</i>	
27112	12/8/2014 15:43	wilderness	This is an active railroad, the sound of which should be taken into consideration for any additions to Wilderness in this general vicinity. I would imagine that its sound could easily be heard on northern arm of the Dobson Knob Extension.	see on map
27120	12/8/2014 17:01	wilderness	This powerline should be considered when evaluating the Dobson Knob Extension proposal. I do not believe a powerline to be compatible with a Wilderness experience.	see on map
27173	12/9/2014 8:06	wilderness	I fully support this being a wilderness area. I think it is an amazing, nearly religious experience to walk the crest trail in silence and embrace the feeling of solitude this area can provide. The blacks are a beautiful place and should be managed as the treasure they are.	see on map
28374	Reply Received 12/17/2014 04:45		<i>When I was a kid I picked huckleberries on what was then the Burnsville watershead. At that time the land was privately owned, I think itwas owned by thr Briggs family. This area is now listed on The Forest Service as roadless...years ago there were Jeep Roads that I drove on.... I wonder what happened to the old roads. I supect that now they are gated and unable to be traveled...paradise lost, Wilderness area or no wilderness it makes no difference most of this area is too steep to be logged under current requalations... it is now inacessable to most of the public. Might as well sell the land and put up condo's for all the good this land will do for most people,</i>	
28824	Reply Received 12/22/2014 11:19		<i>I think most people know that the forest service isn't going to sell any land. The point being that this land is for everyone to use not just special interest groups. please just say no to wilderness</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29073	Reply Received 12/26/2014 14:08		<i>The Blacks are the premier Wilderness candidate in the national forests. Wild and rugged, providing the beauty, the awe and the solitude that some of us treasure. Does this desire make this 87 yr old a special interest? The only people kept out of Wilderness are those that must use a vehicle. I am unable to understand why the creation is useless, why one would not want to experience nature as God made it, without human manipulation. Middle Creek is even virgin forest, a true rarity in our human dominated world. Logging and roading would be like tearing down cathedrals. I want my grandchildren to have access to places like this, to know what the Earth was like once.</i>	
29131	Reply Received 12/27/2014 05:19		<i>87 or 18 it makes no difference if your views differ from what the majority of the people want then yes you are a special interest. I don't think that the forest service has any plans to log Middle Fork ...nor any other part of this areas. Additional government regulation are not necessary... there may be some time in the future that it may be in the best interests of the forest to log this area...we need to keep all of our options open. Frankly I would rather leave my children the right to do what ever they want with the forest than a Wilderness area in which that decision has already been made.</i>	
27196	12/9/2014 9:44	wilderness	I support extending the Shining Rock Wilderness/Middleprong to include this area. This would protect the waters and viewsheds and there are few actual trails in the area so recreation is not really a consideration. Only managing for a healthy forest please.	see on map
27775	Reply Received 12/12/2014 12:10		<i>Please don't make this a wilderness area. Trees and Forest have life cycles just like people do, they don't live forever, regeration is part of the cycle. If we have any hope of living in harmony with nature, humans have to be in the equation. It is an appealing notion to think that "letting nature take its course" is the best solution. But, with more than 7 billion of us on the planet, that's just not realistic. With active management we can promote biodiversity and sustainability... a healthy forest.</i>	
28902	Reply Received 12/23/2014 12:41		<i>Please NO MORE Wilderness in Haywood county. We already have two, a National Park, and the Blue Ridge Parkway. These equals hundreds of thousands of acres excluded from an active management response to enhance diversity or battle disease.</i>	
29352	Reply Received 12/30/2014 07:49		<i>I completely disagree with the suggestion to extend the Wilderness of Middle Prong. The current wilderness of Middle Prong (and even Shining Rock) has become a wildlife food desert for the DIVERSITY of species that are native here, because there is the inability to utilize the best (most practical, with small work force) management tools to enhance herbaceous forage throughout these vast acreages. Sunlight needs to reach the forest floor in order to grow those sunlight loving plants that exist in the seedbank. When you cannot use motorized tools (ie chainsaws for creating fields, and equipment often needed on a prescribed fire (dozer for fire-lines creation & pumper units for water), enhancement of lands is near to impossible. Please, do not add any further limitations to perpetuate all varieties our native plant and animal species, not simply those that thrive in unbroken mature forests.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
27215	12/9/2014 11:09	Pisgah	This area is very very heavily used by cyclists, permitted events, and recreational users and should be considered for a National Recreational Area Designation. Wilderness would limit groups with access already and logging would be disastrous considering the massive number of users. This area is also prized for its solitude and natural beauty.	see on map
27218	12/9/2014 11:14	Pisgah	This area is very very heavily used by cyclists, permitted events, and recreational users and should be considered for a National Recreational Area Designation. Wilderness would limit groups with access already and logging would be disastrous considering the massive number of users. This area is also prized for its solitude and natural beauty.	see on map
30324	<i>Reply Received 01/04/2015 11:05</i>		<i>I do not feel that this area represents and had wilderness value.</i>	
27221	12/9/2014 11:18	wilderness	I think extending the boundary of the Shining Rock Wilderness to include this area makes sense and fully support it.	see on map
28381	<i>Reply Received 12/17/2014 05:14</i>		<i>I do not think extending the boundary makes sense, we have enough government regulations and restrictions on our forest service lands now....we don't need any more.</i>	
28904	<i>Reply Received 12/23/2014 12:46</i>		<i>We are tired of Wilderness creep and we will not stand for any more in Haywood county. This area is a historical management area for wildlife, and contains high elevation grass forbs (Sams Knob) and needs maintenance and prescribed fire, which designating as Wilderness would prohibit.</i>	
29260	<i>Reply Received 12/29/2014 12:20</i>		<i>Regarding extending Shining Rock, I discourage doing such. The area is already an IRA, and needs NO further restrictions to maintaining diverse wildlife and plant populations. IRA's fortunately still permit mountain biking, tree removal (not production, though this is unfortunate), and prescribed fire, and we need all these tools to maintain DIVERSITY here. Leave it alone, in it's IRA status, so that we can best maintain areas like Sams Knob.</i>	
27224	12/9/2014 11:20	Pisgah	This area is very very heavily used by cyclists, permitted events, and recreational users and should be considered for a National Recreational Area Designation. Wilderness would limit groups with access already and logging would be disastrous considering the massive number of users. This area is also prized for its solitude and natural beauty.	see on map
29067	<i>Reply Received 12/26/2014 13:40</i>		<i>Daniel Ridge not big enough for Wilderness, but does deserve high protection from extractive use. Old growth forest in its highest elevations, Parkway viewshed, water supply watershed. Its location next to Shining Rock and south to Cedar Rock and west to Tanasee Ridge make it a good wildlife corridor. Art Loeb Trail runs through.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29356	Reply Received 12/30/2014 08:04		<i>There is no need to designate this either a Wilderness, nor NRA (national recreation area) at Daniel Ridge. It is already in the USFS public lands and is in no danger of "development". Timber harvest or production would NOT be disastrous for any recreation. In fact, I have been looking for a different experience of single trek bike rides like they have in Canada...ie see http://forums.mtbr.com/trail-building-advocacy/life-after-clear-cut-787580.html (and watch the awesome vimeo video!) They have got some great! ideas on making different kinds of mnt biking trails.</i>	
30459	Reply Received 01/04/2015 18:48		<i>Please allow mountain biking in this area.</i>	
30759	Reply Received 01/05/2015 14:09		<i>I do not support any designation which restricts recreational uses which are currently allowed such as mountain biking. High elevations along the Parkway are suitable for wilderness designation.</i>	
30843	Reply Received 01/05/2015 19:05		<i>This area is extremely popular with the mountain bike community. Please do not designate this as a wilderness area.</i>	
30914	Reply Received 01/05/2015 20:41		<i>The Daniel Ridge area is already a well-established *recreation* area, including uses not permitted under a Wilderness designation. Along with the other proposed Wilderness areas in the Davidson River area, it doesn't make sense to suddenly prohibit the variety of recreational uses here. User conflict, if it's an issue, can be managed in other ways. Recreation is an important avenue for increasing the public's awareness and appreciation of our natural resources.</i>	
27306	12/9/2014 18:23		I enjoy fishing and hiking in and around the Fires Creek Management Area. I fully support extending wilderness designation to the proposed areas.	see on map
27664	Reply Received 12/12/2014 05:24		<i>Please do not make this a wilderness area, current regulations are sufficient to protect this area.</i>	
29042	Reply Received 12/26/2014 12:51		<i>Fantastic for wilderness! Rim trail, slick rock, views. Bear sanctuary near. Trail connections to Boteler, Chunky Gal, even to Cheoah. Have backpacked here. Even a spring up on the ridge. A premier place. Entire Mtn Treas Area should be included.</i>	
29196	Reply Received 12/28/2014 16:55		<i>No way this should be a wilderness area. This area is currently classified 4 & 5 roadless area. Which means that it already has the highest protection possible while still allowing the FS to manage the property to meet the plan objectives.</i>	
27509	12/11/2014 8:13	wilderness	I do not support any additional wilderness areas, I do support our existing areas. However, I think we have enough wilderness areas already. What I don't understand is who or what we are supposed to be saving these areas from. Under current regulation the Forest Service cannot or will not be able to damage any environmentally sensitive area. I see no need for additional restrictions. Wilderness areas restrict access and potential future use of our public lands. Should we leave future generations public lands with limited future uses... no I don't think so.	no map point
27667	12/12/2014 5:32	wilderness	We do not need any more wilderness here, we have enough already. Wilderness areas restrict access and use, please do not leave our children with public lands with restricted use.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29773	<i>Reply Received</i> 01/02/2015 10:10		<i>The main reasons users choose to access these forested areas is because they prefer the qualities found there (scenic beauty, wildlife, clean streams, solitude, etc). Take away the protection that Wilderness Areas provide for these qualities, and you welcome not only the loss of these qualities but the appeal to users. Please leave our children public lands that protect their interests and include the Wilderness addition.</i>	
30297	<i>Reply Received</i> 01/04/2015 09:38		<i>I think that a conservationist approach is much better for our children than the traditional preservationist approach. Yes, protect our forest assets for the future generations, improve those assets by better management and use those assets in the future. Please leave our children land they can use... no more new wilderness areas.</i>	
27672	12/12/2014 5:43	wilderness	No wilderness. current restrictions are good enough. Please don't leave our children with restricted use lands.	see on map
27675	12/12/2014 5:48	wilderness	No wilderness. current restrictions protect this area. There is no reason for more restrictions	see on map
27709	12/12/2014 8:42	General comment	Wet Weather Closures - Any TMR-based wet weather closure strategy should allow for native surfaced trails and roads to be open when soil conditions/lack-of-rainfall permits. If a wet weather closure is needed, the implementing Forest Order should be for the shortest period of time rather than a longer time period. In NEPA, it is always easier to extend a short closure versus repealing a longer closure. Mitigate Trail Impacts from Non-Recreation Projects - The impacts from non-recreation projects such as vegetative treatments and wildlife protection efforts often include obliteration of the trail or removal of water control structures such as rolling dips and catch basins. Those trail mitigations can often cost \$15,000 to \$20,000/mile to install (or replace). I would suggest that "trail mitigation" guidelines be added to relevant non-recreation projects.	no map point
27778	12/12/2014 12:25		No Wilderness. Our public land is owned by all of us wilderness areas only benefit a small section of our population. Current Forest Service regulation provide all of the protection that is needed. There is no need to restrict future land use by making this a wilderness.	see on map
28109	12/14/2014 15:26	North Carolina	These are national treasures and should always be preserved for us and our future generations. Please protect our forest.	no map point
28684	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/19/2014 09:23		<i>I agree completely provided we use a sensible balanced approach to forest management. Our future generations need public lands that have multiple uses.</i>	
28201	12/15/2014 19:24	wilderness	Black Mtn and Bearwallow to its south should be Wilderness, ignoring the powerlline separating them. Highest peak in the East, high, rugged, virgin forest on Middle Creek, the premier Wilderness candidate on the Pisgah Forest. Once proposed for a national park. Adjacent to wild lands to east and west and south. Parkway viewshed. If you don't recommend this you are not going to recommend anything and your process is a farce. Have been here too, of course. Who wouldn't love the Blacks?	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28384	Reply Received 12/17/2014 05:45		<i>I agree this is a very nice area one that we should protect... I was born near here and spend a large portion on my life here. Why don't we just plow up all of the roads put up more gates let it revert back to the way to was a 100 years ago. This might hinter a few people like our elderly or disabled but we can handle them. We could post pictures on the internet. These people could enjoy this area from the comforts of their living rooms. Wilderness areas can only be enjoyed by a few people so who cares about the rest....Right?</i>	
28923	Reply Received 12/23/2014 16:33		<i>Our FS lands are for everyone not just a few, this area could use better access so that more people could visit them. Wilderness designation limit access and use and is not needed here.</i>	
30980	Reply Received 01/05/2015 22:41		<i>The test for Wilderness must consider signs of human civilization, i.e. powerlines. Viewscape powerlines are incongruous with the spirit and statutory requirements of the Wilderness Act.</i>	
28211	12/15/2014 19:41	wilderness	<i>Craggy Mtn WSA with proposed NC Mtn Treas boundaries should be Wilderness. Walker Cove old growth, Douglas Falls, rhododendron gardens, Parkway viewshed, a treasure!</i>	see on map
28471	Reply Received 12/17/2014 13:36		<i>This area seems to be rather small, and seperated from larger tracts of public land. You might refer to this as a backyard wilderness...it would seem to be unreason to select this area</i>	
28588	Reply Received 12/18/2014 08:17		<i>My husband and I had a great hike into Craggy Mountain. We are getting a little old to shoulder packs for any distance, so having wilderness this accessible is very important to us.</i>	
28669	Reply Received 12/19/2014 06:56		<i>If accessibility is important and you enjoy the area as it is now why would you want to change the designation?</i>	
29070	Reply Received 12/26/2014 13:57		<i>Craggy is not really protected now. The Forest Service can change its status to full bore logging if the Wilderness Study Area designation is abandoned by the congress. Only congressional designations, like Wilderness have a really good chance of avoiding extractive logging management pushed by Forest Service, commercial interests - or by hunters wanting more deer to shoot. Wilderness is our way of saying some portions of the natural forests should be left free of human interference, for the sake of the future, for our great grandkids, for science, for us to see what our ancestors saw. Where is one's soui if one doesn't want full protection for Craggy?</i>	
29113	Reply Received 12/26/2014 17:54		<i>The forest service has not gone full bore logging for many years they only cut small tracts 5 to 20 acres, and yes it does improve wildlife numbers. Yes, we need to leave something for our grandkids but my grandkids might want to shoot a deer. Our FS lands are for all not just a few.</i>	
29204	Reply Received 12/29/2014 04:42		<i>Just because there has not been full bore logging doesn't mean a venal future Congress wouldn't drive the Forest Service to sell off as much as possible (cheaply) to buddies of Congress, all in the name of balancing the budget. Seeing a deer is not really a thrill when they are in my garden all the time, and there's lots of wildlife that needs wilder areas.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30978	<i>Reply Received</i> 01/05/2015 22:36		<i>Deer would not be in your garden if they had food in the forest. Mature forests don't support healthy deer herds.</i>	
28216	12/15/2014 19:51	wilderness	Entire proposed area should be Wilderness. A wild, scenic area, adjacent to wild area in TN. AT. Blackstack cliffs and views fantastic, plenty of rugged wild land and creeks on southeast slopes as well.	see on map
28709	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/19/2014 13:46		<i>This tract has multiple uses based on the map with the most land area being in roadless. If the Forest Service has no plans to built roads or cut timber in most of this tract how is it in danger. It is not adjacent to a wilderness tract in TN. I see no reason for wilderness here.</i>	
28916	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/23/2014 13:25		<i>Leave it alone. Allow the USFS to apply professional land management methods, thus not Wilderness.</i>	
28401	12/17/2014 7:55	wilderness	The area south of Dobson Road that includes the Black and Yellow Forks of Paddy Creek and associated drainage areas are very appropriate to be designated as Wilderness Areas. The Yellow Fork holds one uniquely gorgeous waterfall, as well as smaller cascades. The Black Fork is as yet unexplored by me, but holds the promise of an equally beautiful waterway, rich with boulders, rapids, and swimming holes. The rocky cliffs that lie just north of the Black Fork and south of Dobson Road are yet another gorgeous feature of this area. At one point, I came to the base of a vertical rock wall, where there was a narrow, but fairly tall crevice in the rock wall, very dark, cool, and damp. From a crack along the rock came a steady stream of water spurting out, gently and steadily dripping down into the pool of water that was created at the base, which then ran back underground. Unique and special discoveries like these really beg for protection under the Wilderness designation.	see on map
28704	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/19/2014 13:26		<i>Very nice story this sounds like a wonderful place. However it doesn't make such sense to stick a small block of wilderness area all by it's self just to protect your special place. I think your special place is already classified as a roadless area prodtection should be adaquate.</i>	
29079	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/26/2014 14:19		<i>Forest Service designations like "roadless" are usually only good for the life of a management plan, about 15 years, after which all bets are off. Wilderness is a congressional designation, much, much harder to undo, so therefore far better protection. This area is only across the road from the Linville Gorge Wilderness, so not so separated, and 5000 acres or more is not really "small".</i>	
30075	<i>Reply Received</i> 01/03/2015 17:54		<i>Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) are Congressionally mandated and are not decided on from plan to plan. Also, Wilderness is not necessarily protection. Sometimes active management by our forestry and wildlife professionals is what is needed to best conserve our resources. This active management is largely not possible in Wilderness.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28583	12/18/2014 8:02	General comment	Unfortunately our families values don't fall neatly into the any of the NFS designations, but our priorities are pretty simple and clear. Although we do enjoy mountain biking, group camping and would strongly prefer to be allowed to build a fire anywhere we camp, we consider the value of preserving undisturbed(less disturbed) wild forest for future generations, more important than our small recreational preferences. Our number one goal would be for our future generations to know the majesty of a truly old-growth Southern Appalachian Forest, be it cove or ridge. With that in mind we support an increase in designated Wilderness Areas, and would love for a future goal of the NFS to be in the management of these areas toward the creation and preservation of eastern old-growth forests. - Yes, a 600 year plan... why not start it now. Thanks so much for surveying our interests. ~ LTL	no map point
28665	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/19/2014 06:30		<i>The great smoky mountain NP contains about a 1/2 million acres of truly old-growth forest to be preserved forever. It is the most visited NP in the system, the surrounding NF lands are also the most visited due mainly to their location. I agree that the needs of one family's recreation preferences are small but what about the needs of a 1,000 families or 100,000 families. By increasing the amount of wilderness areas we are also decreasing the number of acres that can be used for other recreational purposes. Yes, a 600 year plan might be a good idea however we cannot afford to discount the future recreational needs of this area in that plan. Failure to consider future recreational needs will result in over use of the remaining areas.</i>	
28723	12/19/2014 16:05	General comment	I've feel incredibly lucky to have such an amazing resource in my back yard. I want to write in though to say that I am extremely apposed to the Wilderness designation in the Pisgah and Grandfather Districts for Daniel Ridge, Laurel Mountain, Cedar Rock Mountain, South Mills River, Woods Mountain, and Jarrett Creek areas. All of these areas include high densities of trails that are much loved destinations for recreation, including mountain biking. I feel that, given the usage of these areas, designating them as Wilderness is inappropriate and would have major adverse impacts on tourism and the local economy. I would support these areas being labeled as a National Recreation Area to provide maximum environmental protections while allowing for continued recreational use, including mountain biking.	no map point
28725	12/19/2014 16:11	General comment	It is encouraging to read that the Forest Plan revision considers updates to working partnerships between the NF and volunteer groups relating to unmet upkeep of recreational trails. I do oppose the consideration to designate Daniel Ridge, Woods Mountain, Laurel Mountain, Cedar Rock Mountain, South Mills River, Jarrett Creek Wilderness Areas. These areas include most of the mountain biking trails in use. Mountain biking attracts many people annually to western North Carolina and was a significant factor I considered when moving to the area.	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28848	12/22/2014 15:15	wilderness	I object to changing Daniel Ridge, Cedar Rock, Laurel Mtn. and S Mills River to Wilderness. DuPont Forrest and Bent Creek are crowded. DuPont has recently added to two parking lots and they continue to overflow. Many in this area depend on cycling for their well-being and sites like DuPont & BC, would be overrun if these areas are closed to MTB. There are plenty of more remote areas in Pisgah and Nantahalla that would be more appropriate choices. Industry in this area has changed dramatically; WNC is nationally recognized as a mountain biking destination. Trails pivotal to that recognition are included in this proposal. There are many businesses already profiting the community thanks to these trails. Losing the ability to bike these trails would drastically change that complexion. Squirrel Gap Trail, South Mills River Trail, Laurel Mtn. Trail are among the most dearly loved trails in my mountain biking repertoire. Losing these trails for biking would be a very great loss to me and many others.	no map point
28996	<i>Reply Received 12/24/2014 11:36</i>		<i>You do not want a wilderness in your areas which is fine by me. I don't want any more in my backyard either. Please don't send the wilderness folks to Pisgah or Nantahala because we don't want any more wilderness over here either. We need to let the forest service do their job and manage the forest with out any more wilderness because there isn't anything to manage in a wilderness.</i>	
28860	12/22/2014 16:29	wilderness	No wilderness needed here very small tract	see on map
28906	<i>Reply Received 12/23/2014 12:54</i>		<i>This is getting a little ridiculous, everytime someone discovers something outside of Asheville, they want to "designate" it a Wilderness. This land is already in National Forest, and thus not in any danger of development, so, let the professionals manage it.</i>	
29705	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 08:48</i>		<i>There is no need for a wilderness designation here with the Pigeon River Gorge area. Agree with prior commentors, both too small, and already protected as usfs public land.</i>	
28935	12/24/2014 5:25	wilderness	Please do not make this a wilderness area. Although maked roadless there are old roads all over it not really wilderness material... existing regs have and will protect this area.	see on map
28938	12/24/2014 5:32	wilderness	There is already a large tract of WL nearby... we don't need any more. No wilderness.	see on map
28963	12/24/2014 7:01	North Carolina	Hello, The purposed Wilderness areas along the 276 corridor in the Brevard/PisgahForest area would be devastation to much of the local economy and Mountain Bike Community. This area between Hwy215 and Bent Creek has become a world renown Mountain Bike Destination. By instituting wilderness upon these localized areas would close many family owned busineses who have served the cycling and hiking communities for 20+ years. There are great areas to the East and West of this core area that Wilderness would be a great fit, but not among some of the most classic Mountain Bike trails in the USA. Again, adding Wilderness to the Brevard-Mills River area would be an astronomical economic blow to much of the area. Please reconsider the repercussions it would have on many.	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
28976	Reply Received 12/24/2014 07:45		<i>I fully support your proposal, it would appear that a wilderness is not needed in this area. However, I would also ask that consideration be given to the people in the areas East and West of your area. Many people do not support more wilderness areas in these locations as well. You do not want a Wilderness in your backyard neither do they. Wilderness areas restrict access and future uses for every acre placed in wilderness we loose an acre that could be used for other recreational activities not allowed in a wilderness. No more wilderness!</i>	
29035	12/26/2014 10:16	Pisgah	As the leader & organizer of a hiking group of over 350 members in WNC, I strongly oppose the planned expansion of logging activities in the Nantahala & Pisgah National Forests. These two forests are a national treasure that should be protected & preserved in their natural state & all hiking areas in these forests should be designated as not suitable for timber production, timber harvest, & road building so as to maintain their natural character. Also, designate old growth forests from the last Forest Plan in management areas that are unsuitable for timber production, timber harvest, and road building. It takes hundreds of years for old growth forests to develop & these types of forests have already been diminished almost to the point of extinction due to private land development, pollution, erosion and past logging initiatives. PLEASE STOP THE MADNESS, LEAVE OUR FORESTS ALONE. MOTHER NATURE HAS BEEN DOING A GREAT JOB OF TAKING CARE OF HERSELF. www.meetup.com/wnc-easy-hikers/	no map point
29099	Reply Received 12/26/2014 16:18		<i>As a concerned citizen and the leader of a group of one I am strongly in favor of the current proposed FS plan. PLEASE STOP THE WILDERNESS MADDNESS LEAVE THE FOREST SERVICE ALONE PLEASE ALLOW THEM TO DO THE JOB THEY ARE PAID TO.</i>	
29388	Reply Received 12/30/2014 12:28		<i>I moved here several years ago because of what the forests have to offer - clean water, hiking, great vistas, and natural beauty. I strongly oppose the planned expansion of logging activities in the Nantahala & Pisgah National Forests. These two forests are a national treasure that should be protected & preserved in their natural state & all hiking areas in these forests should be designated as not suitable for timber production, timber harvest, & road building so as to maintain their natural character. Also, designate old growth forests from the last Forest Plan in management areas that are unsuitable for timber production, timber harvest, and road building. It takes hundreds of years for old growth forests to develop & these types of forests have already been diminished almost to the point of extinction due to private land development, pollution, erosion and past logging initiatives. LEAVE THE FORESTS ALONE. MOTHER NATURE HAS BEEN DOING A GREAT JOB ON HER OWN.</i>	
29044	12/26/2014 13:01		S. Nant. Wilderness is extremely popular, justifiably, so the extensions proposed are very well advised, and useful to spread out use. AT runs through. I have backpacked through here. Whiteoak Stamp a fine bog. Views are fantastic from up high. Chunky Gal has a special white oak area and connects to Boteler. The Wilderness boundary set at the 3000ft contour line for political reasons makes management difficult. Shoud be extended to make sense.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29101	Reply Received 12/26/2014 16:28		<i>You have backpacked through this area... this is good... I am glad that you enjoyed your time here. This is truly a wonderful place! When I first moved here 18 years ago I was amazed with all of the easy assessable FS land. I am retired and spend from 60 to 70 days a year on FS land. I like it so well that I do not want anything changed so I cannot agree that more wilderness would be a good thing. I think it makes no sense to change anything.</i>	
29779	Reply Received 01/02/2015 10:23		<i>As a Georgia resident and frequent visitor to this area, I am gravely concerned that this area be added as Wilderness. Being congruent with the Chattahoochee National Forest, it provides a green corridor at the southern region of the Appalachian Mountains, a necessity for ecological health. This area holds biodiveristy that rivals few others in the temperate world. Protecting these areas and adding them as Wilderness speaks greatly to our stewardship of the land and how we appreciate our heritage as Americans.</i>	
30870	Reply Received 01/05/2015 19:53		<i>I would prefer a conservationist approach rather than a preservationist approach be indicators of our stewardship of the land and the heritage we leave to our children. Protect our FS lands, improve them through good management and leave them alone for our future generations use. I think the current FS proposed plan without any new wilderness areas does just that. No more wilderness. Besides Highway 64 and the cell tower with newly renovated road acess on the north side of 64 aren't really what one would expect to see in a wilderness.</i>	
29047	12/26/2014 13:07		Already a Wilderness Study Area, and richly deserving Wilderness status. Only reason it has not made it so far is irrational objection from locals, but this is a NATIONAL forest and it belongs to me too. I have walked in here and it is beautiful, with its fine falls. Even the old rail grades are of interest. It's location makes it even more important as a wildlife connector. Absolutely no question it qualifies.	see on map
29106	Reply Received 12/26/2014 16:54		<i>Irrational locals are sometimes difficult to deal with but you might try to see their position. This land is in a National Forest thus the land is protected from development, it has been logged many times but yet the area is very beautiful today. They see this land their heritage passed down from generation to generation. They do not want to loose it or see part it taken away. Wilderness areas restrict acess and use thus some of their hertiage is lost. This is why they fight so hard. Please no more wilderness!</i>	
29050	12/26/2014 13:13	wilderness	Cheoah has been a premier Wilderness potential since RARE II, but you people have butchered it from its original 21,000 acres down to its current 7000 or so. Shellstand Rd was a disaster. And roads have been cleared for wildlife openings. For shame! It still qualifies however. Just go up on the bald and take in the wide views, including the double blossomed flame azalea. AT corridor as well.	see on map
29110	Reply Received 12/26/2014 17:41		<i>Interesting post; your double blossomed flame azalea does well in indirect light of open woods or a mixed age forest but declines as forest mature and canopies close. Fire may temporarily open up the mature canopy and temporarily rejunavate declineing populations. So by making this a wilderness area the trees will grow , the canopy will eventually close and your azaleas will cease to exist. If you truely value this plant then you would not want this to be a wilderness area.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29057	12/26/2014 13:22		This whole ridgeline from the S. Nant. Wild. and Wayah Bald on the south to Wesser Bald deserves more protection than it is getting, includes the AT corridor, another route I have walked. The whole area is wonderful and should really all be Wilderness. Old forest in places, a wildlife connector, wildflowers, a wonderful long route.	see on map
29118	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/26/2014 18:29		<i>Today, I spend the entire day on Wayah Bald spent some time on the AT, some time on the Bartram Trail and some time on FS roads. Do you know what I saw, I saw a few bear hunters, several cars on the road up to the tower...but no hikers... there weren't many tracks in the snow on the AT. My point being, today at least, hikers were not the main users of the forest. Why then would be want to limit access to other groups by making these areas wilderness.</i>	
29060	12/26/2014 13:26	wilderness	Joyce Kilmer and Citco are together one of the finest Wilderness Areas in the East. It makes sense to add on to them as shown. They aren't making this stuff anymore. Have seen a 3 ft dia. silverbell in here. Amazing!	see on map
29127	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/27/2014 04:42		<i>Joyce Kilmer and Citco are big enough, we do not need any more wilderness</i>	
29063	12/26/2014 13:33	wilderness	The Dark Prong extension is worth adding to Shining Rock. Have hiked up Dark Prong several times, incredible waterfalls and wild area, belongs in Wilderness, especially one getting way too much use	see on map
29128	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/27/2014 04:50		<i>You hike there now, you enjoy the area now but by making it a wilderness this will some how improve or preserve the area. Interesting; always trying to improve...I would leave things alone if it were my choice... wilderness not needed here.</i>	
29350	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/30/2014 07:32		<i>The Graveyard Fields extension to Shining rock is not needed. This areas needs to have tools (like prescribed fire) available to be utilized to best maintain blueberries fields/young growth stage of succession. By designating an area as a wilderness, you prohibit the use of fire, creating even more red tape for land managers to be able to use on our public lands. There is NO existing danger to this area in that it is both designated an IRA - (inventoried roadless area), and already in USFS public land holding.</i>	
29083	12/26/2014 14:25	Pisgah	I am appalled and outraged that anyone would even THINK of expanding logging in these areas. I have first-hand experience as to the devastation of logging. My husband and I just moved here from Bozeman, Montana, where we previously owned 32 acres of forested property. We were duped into allowing a "thinning" program on our property, having been deceived into thinking that it would be a good thing for the property to thin out the trees. It forever changed the property and makes me sick to my stomach to this day about what was lost in the process. I moved here to enjoy the beauty of the area and do not want to see it destroyed.	no map point
29129	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/27/2014 04:57		<i>Increased logging is needed because the FS has not followed their own plan...they have not cut enough in years past. Wildlife will greatly benefit from the increase in timber harvesting.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29169	12/28/2014 0:47		This section of the Unicoi Mountains is very remote and borders the Upper Bald River Wilderness Study Area in Cherokee National Forest, which is nearly 13,000 acres. The Benton MacKay Trail borders this area on the north, and Wilderness is consistent with the values of that trail. Because of its continuity with upper Bald River, this area should be considered in several different iterations. The whole of the area should not be disqualified by a handful of old roads and decades-old clearcuts on its perimeter. It would be appropriate to exclude white pine plantations from the potential wilderness. This is a deserving Wilderness Area, though any recommendation on Wilderness should include a recommendation for prescribed fire to be included in the congressional designation language.	see on map
29180	<i>Reply Received 12/28/2014 05:13</i>		<i>No way should this be wilderness! This is a FS degsinated mulituse area and we need to leave it that way.</i>	
30395	<i>Reply Received 01/04/2015 16:37</i>		<i>I favor having this area remain multi-use. I don't believe Wilderness designation would be an asset for the forest or the county.</i>	
29208	12/29/2014 5:05	General comment	I am an avid outdoor Forest traveler and camper. Management of all Forest's in this area should be without logging. This practice extracts and destroys what is the sanctuary of nature. Management of lands should mimic nature. Science knows how. We have logged this wonderland {US} to almost a mono culture.	no map point
30080	<i>Reply Received 01/03/2015 18:09</i>		<i>That is an interesting point about a monoculture. If you think we have a monoculture, why would we then place that undesirable monoculture into a designation that doesn't allow us to use forestry practices to rectify it? In other words, why do we want to try to preserve that which we realize needs to be changed? Before designating any lands as Wilderness, or for more restrictive designations in general, I urge the Forest Service to consider how that more restrictive designation would impact our ability to carry out restoration activities on that land. For instance, how will designating an area as Wilderness negatively impact our ability to reintroduce chestnuts there? We will need to have timber harvests in order to clear areas for chestnut plantings, but that is not possible in Wilderness areas. Will designating an area as Wilderness mean that we'll probably never see chestnuts reestablished in that area?</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29221	12/29/2014 7:34	wilderness	The North Carolina High Peaks Trail Association supports Wilderness designation for the Black Mountains. Our primary mission is to maintain, improve and enjoy trails of the Black Mountains. The Black Mountains are rugged and pristine with the highest trails in the East. Nearly half of the 40 named peaks over 6000-ft are in the Black Mountains. Seven of these peaks would be protected if this area became Wilderness! The Black Mountains are a true mountain treasure and deserve congressional protection. NCHTA works closely with the Appalachian Ranger District to maintain nearly 70-miles of trails and we realize that about 20 miles would become Wilderness trails. We are prepared to maintain these trails under Wilderness standards. NCHPTA fully supports the US Forest Service mission to manage this nation's public forests. We support the diverse uses of these public lands, and believe there are some exceptional lands that should be preserved as Wilderness. The Black Mountains are one of these exceptional lands!	see on map
29275	<i>Reply Received 12/29/2014 14:14</i>		<i>This section proposed to be preserved as wilderness is a great step towards preserving the national treasures that are the Black Mountains. As a private citizen, I echo what the NCHPTA has stated, and wholeheartedly support designating this area as wilderness. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</i>	
29333	<i>Reply Received 12/30/2014 06:34</i>		<i>We support the consideration of this area as Wilderness.</i>	
29365	<i>Reply Received 12/30/2014 10:22</i>		<i>I also support this area to be designated as Wilderness.</i>	
29542	<i>Reply Received 01/01/2015 20:50</i>		<i>I agree with the wilderness designation. Protecting this Black mountain ridge would also protect precious headwaters for many watersheds that flow down the valleys.</i>	
29753	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 09:31</i>		<i>I disagree with this wilderness designation. When you designate wilderness, you simply restrict being able to utilize forest management tools to benefit both plant and animal diversity that might not benefit from strictly Mature Forest Status, across this large area.</i>	
30376	<i>Reply Received 01/04/2015 15:32</i>		<i>The Black Mountains, highest mountains in the east coast, should be designated as Wilderness to protect the rare and endangered spruce fir forests. The Blacks also serve as a watershed for the Toe River, classified as an Outstanding Resource. Protecting our mountains is the most important priority for our local economy and for the health and well being of all.</i>	
29239	12/29/2014 9:22	wilderness	I support the comments of the NC High Peaks Trail Association regarding adding a portion of the Blacks as a protected wilderness area.	no map point
29268	12/29/2014 13:16	wilderness	I strongly agree with the opinion of the NC High Peaks Trail Association re. designating part of the the Black Mtns as wilderness area. We have enough development in other areas of our state.	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29297	12/29/2014 16:31	General comment	Wilderness Designation for Craggy Mountain was endorsed by the Buncombe County Commissioners in 2010. According to surveys by Alan Smith and USFS acquisition documents from 1914, there is at least 1,500 acres of primary forest centered on Waterfall Creek. The qualities of this area are compatible with Wilderness. The potential wilderness boundary should end at Staire Branch to preserve existing mountain bike trails.	see on map
29301	12/29/2014 16:34		The addition to Ellicot Rock should be strongly considered. The rugged terrain of the addition and its adjacency to Ellicot Rock Wilderness are factors that make sense for Wilderness.	see on map
29405	12/30/2014 13:37	wilderness	Existing old-growth forest and old-growth forest designation from the last Forest Plan should be managed as wilderness areas. This forest type is rare, typically occurs in terrain unsuitable for road building and has special value. Similarly, existing roadless areas should be managed as wilderness. These areas are also rare and have special recreational and ecological value.	no map point
29410	12/30/2014 13:47		The east slope of the Black Mountain range should be managed as wilderness with no additional road building or logging. This is steep, highly visible terrain with high elevation spruce-fir forest, extensive hiking trail system, and some old growth forest. It forms a large cohesive wilderness area with the adjacent Mt. Mitchell State Park.	see on map
29413	12/30/2014 13:56	wilderness	The Upper Wilson Creek/Harper Creek areas have unique wilderness quality and should be managed as such. This area contains an extensive system of hiking trails, spectacular streams and waterfalls and is close to the cities of Lenoir, Morganton and Boone and so provides an excellent resource for wilderness recreation and associated sustainable economic benefits to the region.	see on map
29717	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 08:59</i>		<i>The existing hiking trails are poorly maintained and some are spilling sediment into the excellent water quality you mentioned. Some spots need EQUIPMENT to fix the damage. The earth will never take back some of the spots that the erosion is happening. Making this Wilderness will deny the opportunity to revegetate and rehab these areas properly.</i>	
29723	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 09:01</i>		<i>Wilderness bans biking. Mountain bikers were not around 30 years ago when this designation was started. They are here now, and can HELP.</i>	
29948	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 20:27</i>		<i>I agree that a level of protection is needed for the grandfather ranger district areas, but is a wilderness classification necessary? With that classification a lot of negative impacts will occur to the forest in the ways us users interact with it. Please reconsider another classification that can protect the forest but allows its recreational usage to stay the same. Mountain biking is HUGE in western NC and especially within the Pisgah forest system. Cutting out that recreational usage would have a very negative effect on the forest and the community. So please, look at other possible resolutions.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30300	Reply Received 01/04/2015 10:07		<i>I do not support the proposed Wilderness designation in this area, as it would restrict use of the area to mountain bikers and other trail users and, therefore, hinder tourism and the economy for these areas of the high country. Please consider including these areas in a new National Recreation Area that would give the land the maximum protection while allowing for mountain biking.</i>	
30312	Reply Received 01/04/2015 10:39		<i>I believe that a Wilderness Designation is not the appropriate avenue to take in regards to the future stewardship of these lands. This designation would eliminate mountain bike access to this public resource. Mountain bikers are a large user group that wants to be a partner in the continued preservation and stewardship of the trails and this land. Please consider another designation for this area that preserves access for the human powered, low impact activity of mountain biking. Alternate designations could include a new National Recreation Area, National Protection Area, or National Scenic Area.</i>	
30387	Reply Received 01/04/2015 16:09		<i>I support no Wilderness here, rather continued development for hiking and mountain bike access. Areas that have been managed for recreation are bring significant benefit to the surrounding areas, with no negative impact to the forest.</i>	
30444	Reply Received 01/04/2015 18:35		<i>I would like a designation that allows mountain biking in this area and ability to repair and maintain trails as needed.</i>	
30735	Reply Received 01/05/2015 13:22		<i>I am affiliated with two very respectable Wilderness Therapy Outfitter Guide Programs who have been permitted and operating in these areas for 15 years. Neither of these programs are permitted to operate in designated wilderness areas. Unless the stipulations on their permits change as well, the proposed wilderness area additions in these districts will eliminate their ability to operate in NC. Along with the significant amount of revenue both programs provide to the USFS every year; I believe their stewardship of the land, trail maintenance, and support of other users has been a benefit for the USFS and community.</i>	
29420	12/30/2014 14:40	wilderness	Roadless areas adjacent to the existing Southern Nantahala Wilderness contain areas of ecological significance and make logical extensions to protect the integrity of the wilderness experience of hikers on the Appalachian trails and other trails in the area.	see on map
29424	12/30/2014 14:49	wilderness	The Bald Mountain roadless areas should be managed as wilderness. These lands form a substantial intact wilderness area bordering the Appalachian Trail. The highly visible ridge should not be scarred by logging or road building.	see on map
29689	Reply Received 01/02/2015 08:37		<i>No, the Bald Mountain should not be designated to wilderness. Timber harvest and prescribed fire are two necessary tools to promote and enhance habitat for a DIVERSITY of wildlife, which are prohibited from being used in wilderness areas. IRA's already prohibit timber production, though not tree removal/timber at a very limited scale, at the least to keep a field a field, or wildlife opening OPEN. Keep this area open for prescribed fire use when needed. No more restrictions needed here in current IRA.</i>	

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29427	12/30/2014 14:57	wilderness	The proposed wilderness area extensions to the Middle Prong and Shining Rock make a lot of sense. This is one of the most heavily used recreational areas in the forest because of its wilderness qualities, particularly the Sam Knob and Graveyard Fields areas. These lands contain unique and special wilderness qualities and should not be subject to further logging or road building. Wilderness is a rare quality and it make a lot of sense to expand the few existng areas into more logical units by including the relatively small adjacent roadless areas.	see on map
29481	<i>Reply Received</i> 12/31/2014 12:48		<i>Agree that given its current state and popularity with hikers, this area and its immediate environs deserves the special protection of wilderness status</i>	
29635	<i>Reply Received</i> 01/02/2015 08:01		<i>This is a smart use of wilderness. Expand and connect the current areas rather than try to create new ones, creating new rules and headaches.</i>	
29748	<i>Reply Received</i> 01/02/2015 09:25		<i>Regarding extending Shining Rock, I discourage doing such. The area is already an IRA, and needs NO further restrictions to maintaining diverse wildlife and plant populations. IRA's fortunately still permit mountain biking, tree removal (not production, though this is unfortunate), and prescribed fire, and we need all these tools to maintain DIVERSITY here. Leave it alone, in it's IRA status, so that we can best manintain areas like Sams Knob.</i>	
29750	<i>Reply Received</i> 01/02/2015 09:27		<i>The Graveyard Fields extension to Shining rock is not needed either. This area also needs to have tools (like prescribed fire) available to be utilized to best maintain blueberries fields/young growth stage of succession. By designating an area as a wilderness, you prohibit the use of fire, creating even more red tape for land managers to be able to use on our public lands. There is NO existing danger to this area, in that is both an IRA, inventoried roadless area, and in the USFS public lands system.</i>	
29476	12/31/2014 11:02	Pisgah	Pisgah National Forest is place enjoyed by everyone. If anyone has ever visited Pisgah during the summer or the fall, you will see many people enjoying the forest. Sometimes I have experienced large amounts of traffic in Pisgah Forest because so many people are enjoying the natural beauty. To add logging trucks and logging equipment to the people crowd in Pisgah would be a mistake. In fact, it would be downright dangerous. Family vehicles traveling the roads with logging trucks is a tragic accident waiting to happen. In addition, if our pleas to NOT log Pisgah Forest are ignored, then DO NOT log any of the old virgin forest. There is plenty of research to support that the animal and plant life is forever altered once the forest is cut. It will never come back to exactly the way it once was and rare species, for example specific species of salamanders will never come back. Virgin forests are rare and should be treated as a real treasure, not something too exploit for any reason.	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29529	1/1/2015 17:19	Pisgah	I support the creation of a Black Mts Wilderness Area. The Blacks represent a significant percentage (perhaps 5-10%) of what is left of precious So. Appalachian Spruce-Fir forest. This is one of the rarest and most endangered ecosystems in America. These mountains and trails have seen a dramatic increase in visitation over the past decade. Outdoors-related tourism is a substantial and growing force in the local economy. A wilderness designation could help ensure that the ongoing increase in use would not have a detrimental effect on the land. I work for a school with 13 full time employees. We conduct many trips in and through the Black Mts and would be happy to abide by any new rules that would accompany a wilderness designation. Designating the Black Mts and Craggy as Wilderness would provide an impressive wildlands corridor of 60,000+ acres including the C.R. Hunt Club, Mt. Mitchell St. Park and the Asheville Watershed.	see on map
29544	<i>Reply Received 01/01/2015 20:58</i>		<i>Designating the Black Mountains as a Wilderness area would also protect some of the most pristine headwaters from soil erosion due to logging.</i>	
29747	<i>Reply Received 01/02/2015 09:24</i>		<i>I reject the the black mountain area as being designated as wilderness. We need to keep the forest open to professional resource managers to use prescribed fire and timber harvest to improve habitat forage and plant diversity to the resultant wildlife diversity. Fear not, the USFS will not irresponsibly carry out timber production in sensitive non-suitable areas. Today's timber harvest on public lands, when guided by wildlife professionals, is one with an ecological goal in mind.</i>	
30784	<i>Reply Received 01/05/2015 17:10</i>		<i>The spruce-fir forest is a left over from the last ice age it is present here because of the cool temps nothing else... because of the poor quality it's timber value is zero so it is very unlikely that logging will ever be a problem. They reproduce by wind born seed blown into openings in the forest. Fire is one tool that can be used to create the openings a chainsaw is another...neither is permitted in a wilderness. The wildlife corridor mentioned exists now... the animals can't read so they could care less about a wilderness designation. Current designations adequately protect this area ...there is no need for wilderness here.</i>	
29562	1/2/2015 6:58	Pisgah	Please NO Wilderness areas. I want the forest open to all user groups and not just the worthless non trail repair working hikers. Please open all the trails to a variety of uses. BIKERS ESPECIALLY. We are the ones that keep all the trails cleared.	no map point
29578	1/2/2015 7:26	Pisgah	I am all for protecting our wilderness, however I feel that there needs to be a plan in place that allows ALL user groups to use the forest. Placing wilderness designations on land turns the areas into a hiker's only destination. There needs to be plans put in place to allow all user groups to work together in planning phases as well as maintaining the trails. Hikers, Mountain Bikers, equestrians, hunters, etc can all work together to help protect the wilderness. I know for a fact that Mountain Bikers are a user group with the know how and determination to get people together to maintain trail systems like no other group. Please don't lock us out with wilderness designations! People travel to Pisgah from all over the country to ride these world class trails!	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29624	1/2/2015 7:56	Pisgah	If I'm not mistaken, Heartbreak Ridge runs right through this area, and is an incredibly popular mountain bike ride. It would be a shame to designate this as wilderness, and enjoy it on two wheels.	see on map
29653	1/2/2015 8:15	General comment	It's hard to tell what trail this is, but if it's Heartbreak Ridge, I absolutely oppose wilderness designation for this area. Heartbreak Ridge is one of the finest backcountry bike accessible trails in the country and should remain open to bikes. I've never had a single user conflict in 20 years of riding. The trail is sustainable and in great shape. It dries quickly and is a treasure that should not be taken away. I fully support land protection, but there are alternatives to wilderness designation.	see on map
29661	1/2/2015 8:21		Wow. It almost seems that the USFS has cherry picked the most iconic and historic areas from which to exclude mountain bikes. If your goal was to unify the MTB community in opposition to the management plan, you're well on your way. Laurel Mountain trail is a classic Pisgah ride that is generally sustainable, heavily used and loved, and should not be slated for wilderness designation. Again, there are alternatives that protect the land while not locking out traditional use.	see on map
29691	1/2/2015 8:38	Pisgah	Wilderness designation is not the answer. There are too many user groups that enjoy using the forests and there is no reason to lock out certain groups. We need to move forward and focus on maintaining the trails for everyone to use. There is a huge user group available to tap into for trail maintenance. Lets maintain what we have and not close it down to certain groups.	no map point
29698	1/2/2015 8:42	wilderness	A review of the proposed wilderness areas would clearly be a devastating blow to the WNC economy. It is also troubling that one organization, TWS, was used to determine the wilderness area. This is according to comment reference ID 25018. I am sure many recreational commenters will find it disturbing that specific special interest non-recreational advocacy groups were named in the comment by the UFS. A clear indication this proposal is biased. There are benefits to logging targeted areas to bolster the forest growth, but removing access to areas for everyone with the exception of one recreation group is a targeted attack against all other recreational sports. Using the wilderness designation to protect the forest against logging is also tool to limit the access, unfairly. With regards to logging, the loss of income from recreational tourist would never be replaced from logging revenues. I propose an alternate designation of the land to permit use by all groups while protecting specific areas from logging.	no map point
29704	1/2/2015 8:47	NFsNC	Continued balance of Multiple Purpose is the goal of the Forest Service. I support the study of additional micro wilderness areas to improve and protect what little wilderness we have left. Thank You	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
29767	1/2/2015 9:51	Pisgah	I am a fully grown man with a family and consider myself an intermediate mountain biker. "Shredder" is a term that gets associated with MTBers incorrectly. I have recently discovered a few Pisgah trails that are common to the Gorge area and was amazed. This is truly World Class. All three times I have visited these trails our group has stopped to buy fuel and food in the Linville or Pineola area. Also, it would seem as though some bikers had come between some of my trips and cleaned up the trails of some natural debris that was in the way last time. MTBers self-police and gladly maintain trails that are legal to ride. The MTB volunteer force is strong, a resource that can be of great assistance. I have never seen a MTB trail in all of my travels that destroys the natural beauty of the surrounding forest, it makes it more accessible to people who want to explore nature. Everyone needs to respect each other and their preferred forms of outdoor recreation though, it gets tricky.	no map point
29775	1/2/2015 10:11	General comment	In regards to Wilderness designation, Federal land agencies in the 1980's interpreted the Wilderness Act to prohibit bicycles, though previously they had been allowed. Wilderness is often seen as the gold standard in land protection, but Congress can use similar prescriptions like National Protection Area, National Scenic Area and other designations that preserve the land, allow bicycles and may be more relevant to local cultures and needs. With this regard, I believe that mountain biking, a low-impact, muscle powered recreation, is an appropriate trail use on public lands and is consistent with the values of Wilderness land protection, which includes recreation in natural landscapes. When proposed Wilderness Areas include significant mountain biking opportunities, I think it is important to pursue boundary adjustments and alternative land designations that protect natural areas while preserving bicycle access.	no map point
29814	1/2/2015 12:02	Pisgah	The Wilson Creek area of Pisgah National Forest hosts a wonderful community of conservation-minded people. Mountain bikers are stewards of these mountains and streams and are a huge help to maintaining trails. Mountain bikers would be excluded by a Wilderness designation. Our hope is to keep Wilson Creek and Pisgah National forest as it is now, or even expand laterally to include more trails for hikers, bikers, and others.	no map point
29826	1/2/2015 12:46	Pisgah	Growing up and living in WNC helped me garner a love for the great outdoors. I have spent a greater part of my life enjoying Pisgah on the back of a bicycle. I understand that by growing the number of acres designated wilderness areas, it may feel that you are better protecting the land. However, if you do so you are not only polarizing the end users even more, (hikers, bikers, equestrians), but you are taking away viable methods that many use currently to enjoy the beautiful part of the WNC mountains that we know as Pisgah. I urge you to reconsider either what are permitted uses of wilderness area, let Pisgah be exceptions to current regulations, or just simply not reclassify all of these parts of the region.	no map point
29836	1/2/2015 13:01	North Carolina	Please do not create any further wilderness. The tourism tied to mountain biking in WNC is vital for the region.	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30256	<i>Reply Received 01/04/2015 05:29</i>		<i>Their are several areas that are not appropriate for MTB. IMBA-SORBA supports some of the Wilderness proposals in areas where there is no mountain biking. It seems to me that the Black Mountains and Craggy are two such areas. Please avoid making blanket statements about new wilderness areas in Pisgah. Nearly all of the remaining spruce-fir forest on public lands deserves to be designated as Wilderness.</i>	
29909	1/2/2015 18:52	wilderness	I'd like to join the chorus of voices against further wilderness designation in the proposed area. MTB is a huge source of tourism revenue in western NC and cyclists are major users of these areas in particular. I routinely travel to western NC with family and friends specifically to ride in the areas in question. I'm all for responsible use of the NF and resource management, but I think wilderness designation would ruin what has become a nationally recognized riding destination.	no map point
29989	<i>Reply Received 01/03/2015 07:09</i>		<i>I'd also like to join the effort to prevent further wilderness designation in PNF. I have personally enjoyed the trail systems here for over a decade and would join any alliance to keep MTB trails open for future use. MTB is a huge tourism asset to the area and 2nd to none on the east coast. I am all for the responsible use of these trails and could see how making further wilderness designation here would be stunting the growth of what has become a MTB destination for tourist. I love to hike and bike but I would not be considered a hiker by my peers. I am a Mountain Biker and that is why I chose Western NC as my home. Thank You for giving me a way to voice my opinion about this.</i>	
30255	<i>Reply Received 01/04/2015 05:27</i>		<i>Their are several areas that are not appropriate for MTB. IMBA-SORBA supports some of the Wilderness proposals in areas where there is no mountain biking. It seems to me that the Black Mountains and Craggy are two such areas. Please avoid making blanket statements about new wilderness areas in Pisgah. Nearly all of the remaining spruce-fir forest on public lands deserves to be designated as Wilderness.</i>	
30786	<i>Reply Received 01/05/2015 17:29</i>		<i>Why should 29909 stop making blanket statements? I also think that the current regulations are adequate to protect our forests. Craggy is adequately protected. The spruce-fir forest on public lands is here because of the cool temps at higher elevations. Unless a wilderness designation will prevent global warming it will have no effect on the spruce-fir forest.</i>	
30088	1/3/2015 18:28		I do not agree with wilderness designatoin for Daniel's Ridge, Laurel Mtn, Cedar Rock area including Butter Gap and Cat Gap trails, South Mills River and the Jarrett Creek area. These areas contain miles of MTB trails that provide solitude away from the crowds that are present at Bent Creek or Dupont State Forest. I do think the plan should include the highest protection from logging but still allow mountain biking. A designation such as Backcountry or even a National Recreation area should be considered for these areas.	no map point
30109	1/3/2015 20:36	wilderness	This is the site of a timber harvest which is a substantially noticeable vegetation. This area should be excluded from the Wilderness inventory.	see on map
30113	1/3/2015 20:47	wilderness	The timber harvest here is a substantially noticeable vegetation history and therefore this area does not meet the requirements for NWPS inclusion.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30116	1/3/2015 20:51	wilderness	This does not meet the NWPS inventory requirements because the timber harvest here is a substantially noticeable vegetation history.	see on map
30120	1/3/2015 20:56	wilderness	This old road to timber harvest sites is substantially noticeable on the ground. This area does not meet NWPS inventory requirements.	see on map
30123	1/3/2015 20:58	wilderness	Timber harvest site here is readily apparent - substantially noticeable on the ground - and should be excluded from the Wilderness inventory because it does not meet the requirements for NWPS inventory inclusion.	see on map
30126	1/3/2015 21:01	wilderness	Timber was harvested here not long ago and the history is obvious, multiple roads and skids trails still substantially noticeable on the ground. This area should be excluded from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30130	1/3/2015 21:10	wilderness	The old logging road here is substantially noticeable on the ground. This area should thus not be considered for Wilderness.	see on map
30134	1/3/2015 21:17	wilderness	It is substantially noticeable that timber was harvested here. Roads are obvious. This area is not appropriate for Wilderness.	see on map
30138	1/3/2015 21:24	wilderness	This is the location of a very large timber harvest that has substantially noticeable roads and skids trails crisscrossing the entire ridge. The forest species composition today tells the story of timbering history. This area should not be considered for Wilderness.	see on map
30141	1/3/2015 21:28	wilderness	The old logging road here is substantially noticeable. This area is not appropriate for Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30144	1/3/2015 21:31	wilderness	The timber harvest here is substantially noticeable on the ground today. Exclude this area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30147	1/3/2015 21:34	wilderness	This road has been used very recently. The proposed Wilderness boundary should not include this road.	see on map
30150	1/3/2015 21:37	wilderness	Old road is substantially noticeable. This ridge should be excluded from the Wilderness inventory.	see on map
30153	1/3/2015 22:06	wilderness	The old road on the west side of Middle Prong is a road. Roads are on-the-ground evidence of imprints of humans and are not characteristic of Wilderness. Therefore this area should not be considered for Wilderness.	see on map
30156	1/3/2015 22:16	wilderness	This timber harvest is very recent and is easily visible from the proposed 495-acre Middle Prong extension. It's visible from Fork Ridge even in the summer time with full vegetation. Because of the obviousness of human influences in the immediate area, the 495-acre extension is not appropriate for Wilderness inclusion.	see on map
30159	1/3/2015 22:21	wilderness	This is the site of a very recent timber harvest. The immediate adjacency to the proposed 888-acre Middle Prong extension should disqualify the 888-acre area from Wilderness consideration because it is readily visible to forest users and is thus evidence of civilization does not characteristic of Wilderness. Also, this is a very important area for ruffed grouse, and if the extension is designated Wilderness, management will be opposed in the future by virtue of its proximity to the Wilderness.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30163	1/3/2015 22:31	wilderness	These two proposed extensions to Middle Prong Wilderness are not needed. Because these areas border 7,500 acres of Middle Prong Wilderness, keeping management options on the table here for the benefit of wildlife and the forest (protect against invasive species and forests pests and pathogens) is vitally important. Moreover, the Blue Ridge Parkway can be heard from Lickstone Ridge and is not characteristic of Wilderness to hear motor vehicles. This area should be dropped from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30166	1/3/2015 22:33	wilderness	Timber harvest here is substantially noticeable vegetation treatment. This does not meet the test for Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30169	1/3/2015 22:36	wilderness	Recent timber harvest is substantially noticeable vegetation treatment. This area should be excluded from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30172	1/3/2015 22:38	wilderness	This is the site of a recent timber harvest. This area should thus be excluded from the proposed Wilderness boundary, and the boundary should be widened. Not appropriate for NWPS inclusion.	see on map
30176	1/3/2015 22:42	wilderness	This road system is obvious on the ground is not characteristic of Wilderness. It's evidence of human imprints and timber operations. This area should therefore not be considered for Wilderness.	see on map
30179	1/3/2015 22:46	wilderness	This road is still readily apparent on the ground. It's an imprint of recent human use. Hunters and other forest users still travel it and thus it's obvious that it is a road and not characteristic of Wilderness. This area is not appropriate for Wilderness inclusion.	see on map
30182	1/3/2015 22:50	wilderness	The Big Creek Watershed is littered with recent timbering activity and it's adjacency to the proposed 4,044-acre Middle Prong Extension should disqualify the proposed Middle Prong Extension from Wilderness consideration because it's not characteristic of Wilderness to have a big area with recent timber harvests (i.e. imprints of humans) readily visible.	see on map
30185	1/3/2015 22:56	wilderness	This is the Wayne E. Smith Shooting Range on the Cold Mountain Game Lands. It is important to note the trajectory of shooters - to the northwest, directly into the proposed Middle Prong Extension. Sound from this gun range carries clear to the top of Deep Gap and shooting can be loudly heard throughout Big Creek Watershed and surrounding area. This is a very popular gun range, and shooters use it year round, 6 days a week. Hearing gun shots regularly year round is in no way characteristic of Wilderness. There is no opportunity for solitude. It is entirely inappropriate to consider the Middle Prong Extension for Wilderness given the shooting range's impact on the area.	see on map
30188	1/3/2015 23:04	wilderness	There are roads all over this ridge. Very obvious on the ground. In no way characteristic of Wilderness. This area should not be considered for Wilderness.	see on map
30191	1/3/2015 23:13	wilderness	The road system through this area of the proposed Middle Prong Wilderness extension is very extensive. Roads permeate the entire area. The are visible on the ground. The roads are used by hunters and other forests users and do not impart Wilderness characteristics. The presence of these roads and numerous skid trails should exclude this area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30201	1/3/2015 23:23	wilderness	This is a road used to access the inholding. Motor vehicles are prohibited in Wilderness areas. This area is absolutely wrong for Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30204	1/3/2015 23:25	wilderness	There are residential homes here. Exclude from Wilderness inventory.	see on map
30207	1/3/2015 23:29	wilderness	This is a 49-acre private inholding. It's inclusion in the inventory must be an oversight. The entire USFS area surrounding it should be excluded as adjacency to this area of human sights and sounds is not characteristic of Wilderness.	see on map
30210	1/3/2015 23:34	wilderness	This road to the private inholding is substantially noticeable. Exclude from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30213	1/3/2015 23:40	wilderness	Recent timber harvest here is a substantially noticeable vegetation history. This does not meet the test for Wilderness consideration. This area should be excluded.	see on map
30216	1/3/2015 23:42	wilderness	Timber harvest location/landing deck. Exclude from wilderness.	see on map
30219	1/3/2015 23:45	wilderness	Imprints of humans very obvious here. Metal cables and other evidence of timbering activity are found throughout the area. The woody species composition tells the story of timber history. This area is thus not appropriate for NWPS consideration.	see on map
30222	1/3/2015 23:48	wilderness	Recent timber harvests are easily visible from the proposed Wilderness extension. Seeing active forest management activities does impart an experience of solitude. This area should be excluded from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30225	1/3/2015 23:52	wilderness	This is an approximately 11-acre private inholding with a residential structure. Must be an oversight. Exclude this area from Wilderness inventory and the area surrounding it.	see on map
30234	1/4/2015 3:03	Pisgah	My family and friends would like the Bluff Mountain Area designated a Management Area 3 – Backcountry. I would like to see this area preserved from timber harvest because it is steep and is very much within the Appalachian Trail View Shed. Usage for this area is for backcountry camping, hiking and non-motorized vehicle use by the public.	see on map
30241	1/4/2015 3:20	Pisgah	My family and I would like to see the Forest Service lands surround Hot Springs designated backcountry use because it is within the Hot Springs View Shed. Tourism is pretty much the only industry in Hot Springs, and people visit Hot Springs for the beauty, so we need to protect this industry.	see on map
30245	1/4/2015 3:32	Pisgah	I would like to see the Big Ivey area designated as backcountry so that it may still be used for people but restricted from logging to protect rare plant and animal habitat as identified by the North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, old-growth forests identified in field surveys by the Western North Carolina Alliance and SAFC, and unprotected backcountry areas identified by The Wilderness Society and The Nature Conservancy.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30248	1/4/2015 3:39	Nantahala	I would like to see the following areas protected for the revised Forestry Plan that consist of rare plant and animal habitat identified by the North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, old-growth forests identified in field surveys by the Western North Carolina Alliance and SAFC, and unprotected backcountry areas identified by The Wilderness Society and The Nature Conservancy. Large Areas: Tellico Bald ~12,000 acres, Terrapin Mountain ~6,651 acres, Fishhawk Mountain ~5,600 acres Natural Areas: Thompson River, Scaly Mountain, Whiteside Cove, Doubletop Mountain, Fire Gap, Corbin Knob, Rough Butt Bald, Charley Bald, Rich Mtn/Sugar Creek, Brown Mtn/Hench Knob, Shelton-Pisgah Mtn (north side, Panthertown Area)	see on map
30260	1/4/2015 5:35	Pisgah	Their are several areas that are not appropriate for MTB. IMBA-SORBA supports some of the Wilderness proposals in areas where there is no mountain biking. It seems to me that the Black Mountains and Craggy are two such areas. Please avoid making blanket statements about new wilderness areas in Pisgah. Nearly all of the remaining spruce-fir forest on public lands deserves to be designated as Wilderness.	no map point
30323	1/4/2015 11:03	wilderness	I do not feel that the areas of South Mills River, Cedar Rock, and Shining Rock represent and have Wilderness value. Due to these area's proximity to Brevard, access by roads and trails that are used by multiple user groups in responsible ways, adding a wilderness designation would be inappropriate. A wilderness designation would not improve how these areas are used or preserved for future generations.	no map point
30359	1/4/2015 13:10	North Carolina	Designating the Black Mountains as a Wilderness area will be an investment in the future economic and social health of this region. Economic, social, health, and biological values of the Black Mountains make it a uniquely valuable resource that distinguishes this region from others in North Carolina and the eastern US. Long-term economic and social vitality of this region are tied to the vitality of these exceptional lands. The appeal of this area derives not only from its rugged beauty but also its clean air and water, diverse wildlife, and opportunities for hiking, camping, hunting, and fishing. The local economy is not now strong, but this is a desirable location for certain businesses as enabled by internet and other technologies that reduce need for physical proximity of employees and manufacturing. That is a basis for my full-time residence in Yancey Co. The economic and social prospects of this area are tied to the continued vitality of the Black Mountains.	no map point
30361	1/4/2015 13:40	Pisgah	It is important that mountain biking (human powered bicycles) be included as approved uses, and not designate "wilderness" Perhaps "scenic area." This is a large community of tax paying beneficiaries for the region.	no map point
30362	1/4/2015 13:57	Pisgah	It will be important for those in the region to be able to bicycle (mountain bike) in the usage of this land. "Wilderness" would be inappropriate designation.	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30374	1/4/2015 15:27	wilderness	I support the creation of a Black Mts Wilderness Area. The Blacks represent a significant percentage (perhaps 5-10%) of what is left of precious So. Appalachian Spruce-Fir forest. This is one of the rarest and most endangered ecosystems in America. These mountains and trails have seen a dramatic increase in visitation over the past decade. Outdoors-related tourism is a substantial and growing force in the local economy. A wilderness designation could help ensure that the ongoing increase in use would not have a detrimental effect on the land. I work for a school with 13 full time employees. We conduct many trips in and through the Black Mts and would be happy to abide by any new rules that would accompany a wilderness designation. Designating the Black Mts and Craggy as Wilderness would provide an impressive wildlands corridor of 60,000+ acres including the C.R. Hunt Club, Mt. Mitchell St. Park and the Asheville Watershed.	no map point
30412	1/4/2015 17:30	wilderness	These are wildlife openings. Not appropriate for Wilderness.	see on map
30415	1/4/2015 17:38	wilderness	The road system in the Owlcamp Branch drainage is evidence of imprints of humans and therefore this area should be excluded from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30419	1/4/2015 17:42	wilderness	Extensive road system present in this area. Not characteristic of Wilderness. This area should be excluded from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30424	1/4/2015 17:47	wilderness	This is a road that's used by motor vehicles. Not all characteristic of Wilderness. Exclude this area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30427	1/4/2015 17:49	wilderness	This is a parking lot and car camping spot. This not appropriate for Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30431	1/4/2015 17:52	wilderness	Wildlife opening is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment history. Given the extremely low amount of early successional habitat in Snowbird, this area is vital to maintain for the numerous species of wildlife that utilize ESH. This area should be excluded from the Wilderness inventory.	see on map
30434	1/4/2015 17:57	wilderness	This is a man made bridge. It's large and is evidence of the imprints of humans and should thus be excluded from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30437	1/4/2015 18:05	Pisgah	I support the NC High Peaks Trail Association's suggestion for the Black Mountains area to be considered for Wilderness designation. I live at the foot of Woody Ridge, across the road from Browns Creek, and have already seen the problems of run-off, erosion, and stream damage arising from some of the road-building and heavy cutting that have occurred on private land along Woody Ridge in the last 5-7 years. Timber cutting higher up in the National Forest would just compound the damage from equipment and road incursion on steep slopes, affecting sensitive streams such as Roaring Spout. To quote from the the NCHPTA: "The Black Mountain Potential Wilderness Area is already predominantly in an inventoried road-less area". The Black Mountain Range is a true mountain treasure and deserves to be protected as such."	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30798	Reply Received 01/05/2015 18:10		<i>Interesting post, I don't agree I think that the Blacks are adequately protected now but it's still interesting. The problem I have with the post is that you cannot compare logging practices on private land with logging practices on FS land. They aren't even close to being the same. On private land the most important consideration is the money...some but not all private land owners haven't a clue how the logger should leave the land after the job is done. On FS land the most important consideration isn't the money but the overall health of the forest. They do care very much and take steps to insure that all those bad things mentioned above do not happen.</i>	
30446	1/4/2015 18:36	wilderness	The railroad line that was here is still very much obvious on the ground. Railroads are not natural. The railroad was built by humans and used to haul logs. It's undeniable evidence of human imprints. Ignoring the railroad line undermines the spirit of the Wilderness Act.	see on map
30451	1/4/2015 18:44	wilderness	This old logging road is substantially noticeable on the ground. This does not pass NWPS test muster and this area should therefore not be included in the Wilderness inventory.	see on map
30456	1/4/2015 18:47	wilderness	Road is evidence of humans. Area not appropriate for Wilderness inclusion.	see on map
30461	1/4/2015 18:55	wilderness	Significant road system here. Noticeable on the ground. This area is thus not appropriate for Wilderness.	see on map
30464	1/4/2015 19:01	wilderness	The logging roads here are substantially noticeable on the ground. Not appropriate for Wilderness.	see on map
30468	1/4/2015 19:09	Nantahala	This proposed new section "Ellicott Rock W Extension" contains the old "Glades Rd" which was closed several years ago. Prior to being closed, it was popular for off road vehicles - the road was deeply entrenched and a source of sediment to nearby creeks. The road has healed, but the area has too many still-fresh scars for Wilderness. Although I'm happy that the road is now closed to traffic, the old road does make a nice hiking/hunting/mountain biking trail. Probably best suited for backcountry designation. The area does have a nice boulder field/cliff complex where Green Salamanders have been found and I have also seen a big-eared bat (whether Virginia or Rafinesque's, I'm not sure - just saw the silhouette of the big ears before the bat flew off - this was back in 2000 or 2001) in a natural grotto in this same boulderfield/cliff complex. That said the road likely has some populations of Fraser's loosestrife that would benefit for mngt. Another reason to perhaps hold back on Wilderness designation.	see on map
30471	1/4/2015 19:10	wilderness	This is the site of a very large even aged timber harvest. The immediate adjacency to the proposed area should at a minimum increase the buffer of the proposed boundary.	see on map
30475	1/4/2015 19:27	wilderness	Calderwood Reservoir, unnatural and manmade, is visible from the proposed Wilderness extension, and sounds from boats further degrade the no-civilization experience. This area is not appropriate for Wilderness or at a minimum the boundary should be adjusted to reflect to view and sound scape from the reservoir.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30478	1/4/2015 19:31	wilderness	Major power line corridor. Visible from proposed Wilderness extension. I do not support creating a Wilderness area that has major signs of human civilization in the immediate viewscape.	see on map
30481	1/4/2015 19:37	wilderness	Powerline is not characteristic of Wilderness. Create buffer around this area or exclude the whole area.	see on map
30485	1/4/2015 19:41	wilderness	There are roads in this drainage. People still walk them to hunt. Roads are not characteristic of Wilderness and thus this area should be excluded from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30491	1/4/2015 19:45	wilderness	This is a major powerline that runs over Tellico Gap. Because it's visible from portions of both the Wesser Bald and Tellico Bald proposed Wilderness areas, the portions of the proposed Wilderness areas in the viewscape of the powerline should be excluded from Wilderness consideration because viewing powerlines does not impart an experience of solitude that is characteristic of Wilderness.	see on map
30496	1/4/2015 19:48	wilderness	Even aged timber harvest here is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment and this area should therefore be excluded from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30499	1/4/2015 19:52	wilderness	The road is very much noticeable on the ground. Still passable to hunt. The road's presence should exclude this area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30502	1/4/2015 19:56	wilderness	Substantially noticeable vegetation treatment history, even aged forest management, should exclude this area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30505	1/4/2015 20:05	wilderness	This area has a very high density of white pines and, at the minimum, should be excluded from Wilderness consideration because it's substantially noticeable evidence of vegetation treatments. This is a suitable area for restoration. Restoration is not compatible with Wilderness restrictions and thus this not a good area for Wilderness.	see on map
30509	1/4/2015 20:16	wilderness	Private property with residential structure. Exclude from Wilderness consideration and expand boundary.	see on map
30514	1/4/2015 20:22	wilderness	I am an Asheville resident that regularly (at least twice a month) travels with friends to the Grandfather District to ride mountain bikes. Changing these areas to wilderness will prevent us from riding bikes. I do not want to see these areas closed to bikes or other recreational users. I would love to continue to ride in the Grandfather District and to support the surrounding local economies.	no map point
30515	1/4/2015 20:23	wilderness	Proposed Wilderness area borders private property. Not conducive to Wilderness experience. Boundary should be expanded here.	see on map
30518	1/4/2015 20:25	wilderness	Proposed Wilderness covers portion of private property. Exclude and expand boundary.	see on map
30521	1/4/2015 20:29	wilderness	There's a road here and parking lot. Exclude from Wilderness inventory.	see on map
30525	1/4/2015 20:32	wilderness	Adjacency to subdivisions does not impart a Wilderness experience. Civilization readily palpable. This area should be excluded from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30528	1/4/2015 20:37	wilderness	The 4,000+ acre Wesser Bald Inventoried Roadless Area sufficiently protects this area. Further restrictions are unnecessary. I do not support recommending this area for inclusion in the NWPS.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30531	1/4/2015 20:41	wilderness	Substantially noticeable vegetation treatment history, even aged forest management, evident here. Exclude this area from Wilderness inventory.	see on map
30534	1/4/2015 20:45	wilderness	Substantially noticeable vegetation treatment, timber harvest, obvious on the ground here. Exclude this area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30537	1/4/2015 20:53	wilderness	These white pines are substantially noticeable evidence of human imprints on the landscape. This is not appropriate for Wilderness. Much more suitable would be to keep this area open to management options where restoration could occur.	see on map
30540	1/4/2015 21:00	wilderness	White pines are substantially noticeable vegetation treatments. Visible from points throughout the watershed. Not appropriate for Wilderness. Restoration, not restrictions, needed to improve forest health and habitat for wildlife.	see on map
30543	1/4/2015 21:04	wilderness	The old road here is substantially noticeable on the ground. People travel it to hunt and it's not characteristic of Wilderness. This is not appropriate for Wilderness.	see on map
30546	1/4/2015 21:07	wilderness	Forest Service road that is maintained as a linear wildlife opening, white pine plantations and recent timber harvests are visible from surrounding areas proposed for Wilderness. This evidence of civilization should disqualify the proposed Wilderness area from consideration.	see on map
30549	1/4/2015 21:09	Pisgah	I do not support USFS timber production in areas of the forest with heavy recreational use, including the Pisgah District, especially in the Davidson River and South Mills River areas. Timber production in such areas will negatively impact the experience for all users including hikers, mountain bikers, horseback riders, hunters, and fishermen. I do not support the proposed Wilderness designation in the Pisgah and Grandfather Districts for Daniel Ridge, Laurel Mountain, Cedar Rock Mountain, South Mills River, Woods Mountain, and Jarrett Creek areas. These areas are heavily used by the same groups as above. Any impact or loss of recreational use in the above locations will not only impact the user groups but will also have negative economic impact on the towns surrounding said areas. Mountain bikers are already restricted to small areas that are heavily used for recreation. Further restriction will damage the positive growth and accolades western NC has received over the past several years.	no map point
30550	1/4/2015 21:11	wilderness	Logging road here is substantially noticeable on the ground. Exclude this area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30553	1/4/2015 21:18	wilderness	Timber harvests, FS Road 714 and even a road slide are easily visible from many vantage points above Sugar Cove. This obvious evidence of civilization is not consistent with a Wilderness experience. Exclude the portions in this viewshed from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30556	1/4/2015 21:21	wilderness	This recent timber harvest is substantially noticeable vegetation treatment that should exclude the surrounding areas from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30559	1/4/2015 21:23	wilderness	Timber harvest site is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment. Exclude area from Wilderness inventory.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30562	1/4/2015 21:27	wilderness	Very recent timber harvests, linear wildlife road, white pine plantation, and maintained wild opening all readily apparent in Rhinehart Creek watershed. Surrounding areas proposed for Wilderness should be excluded because visibility of this human activity is not consistent with a Wilderness experience.	see on map
30565	1/4/2015 21:30	wilderness	Significant forest management activities occur in Younce Creek drainage. Readily visible from adjacent area proposed for Wilderness. Exclude adjacent area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30568	1/4/2015 21:33	wilderness	FS Road maintained and forest management activities occur in Wildes Cove. This evidence of human civilization would impact the proposed Wilderness area adjacent to it and thus the proposed area should be excluded.	see on map
30571	1/4/2015 21:38	wilderness	Timber harvest location is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment that should disqualify this area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30574	1/4/2015 21:43	wilderness	Timber harvest here is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment that requires this area's exclusion from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30579	1/4/2015 21:46	wilderness	Old road here is readily visible on the ground. Exclude area from NWPS inventory.	see on map
30582	1/4/2015 21:50	wilderness	Timber harvest site is a substantially noticeable vegetation history that should exclude this area from Wilderness consideration. Skid roads run throughout. Not suitable with for Wilderness.	see on map
30585	1/4/2015 21:54	wilderness	Very large site of timber management activities. Roads and skids roads are found throughout the area. The vegetation treatment history is substantially noticeable. Exclude area from Wilderness inventory.	see on map
30589	1/4/2015 21:59	wilderness	Timber harvest site and roads are substantially noticeable. Exclude area from Wilderness inventory.	see on map
30594	1/4/2015 22:13	wilderness	Timber harvest site and is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment that is a disqualifying factor for Wilderness consideration. Roads further support excluding this area from the Wilderness inventory.	see on map
30597	1/4/2015 22:15	wilderness	This was the location of an even aged timber harvest. It is substantially noticeable today when hiking the area. Therefore this area is not satisfy the test for NWPS inclusion.	see on map
30600	1/4/2015 22:18	wilderness	Add this acreage to the previous timber harvest site comment. Exclude from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30603	1/4/2015 22:21	wilderness	This logging road is evidence of humans. It's super obvious on the ground. This area is not suitable for Wilderness given the recent imprints of humans.	see on map
30606	1/4/2015 22:26	wilderness	This timber harvest site is very large and substantially noticeable on the ground and from surrounding areas. Exclude this area and adjacent areas from the Wilderness inventory because substantially noticeable vegetation treatments are disqualify factors for NWPS inclusion.	see on map
30609	1/4/2015 22:29	wilderness	Private property. Active quarry. Exclude area and expand proposed Wilderness boundary a significant distance. This is major human civilization activity inconsistent with Wilderness.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30613	<i>Reply Received</i> 01/04/2015 22:35		<i>Disregard above private property comment. Notwithstanding, this area is still not compatible with Wilderness.</i>	
30621	1/4/2015 23:48		This area should be designated a wildness area. The Harper Creek area is a beautiful untouched forest and should remain that way. I have hiked all of the trail system in the area and would love to continue to do so without any issues. I've seen all kinds of wildlife during my hikes from deer, beavers, bobcats, hawks, bears. Like I said it's a beautiful piece of untouched forest and should remain that way just like the Linville Gorge. Thank you	see on map
30737	<i>Reply Received</i> 01/05/2015 13:22		<i>This area is beautiful. I'd like to access more of it by mountain bike, but I cannot do that if it is Wilderness or Wilderness Study. I've noticed that there are many old roads that criss cross the land, and even some of the trails are huge scars. These may not be inventoried by the USFS, a roadless inventory or even considered in the evaluation for Wilderness suitability, but don't seem to be "untrammelled by man" in character.</i>	
30686	1/5/2015 9:19		I do not support wilderness designation in the Grandfather Ranger District. Wilderness Designations would prohibit mountain biking. Mountain bikers not only preform trail work and maintenance but also fuel the local economy. Mountain Biking is a great way to explore and experience this incredible area with minimal impact.	see on map
30689	1/5/2015 9:23	wilderness	The Wilderness Areas in the Southern Appalachain Mountains are an integral part of our natural heritage. With so many people coming to our area, these last wild places become more valuable every day, not only for what they already are but for what they can be for future generations. Please work to expand and protect these Wilderness areas from designated uses that would impair the natural beauty and solitude that can be found here. The opportunity to access these remote locations and test one's self reliance can build character, confidence and leadership traits unparalleled in the conveniences a more urban setting. Once these wilderness places are lost they are lost forever. Please continue to expand and protect these national treasures so that we may create future leaders that have a respect for the land.	no map point
30716	1/5/2015 12:38	wilderness	Regarding wilderness status - this area is very popular among hikers, campers, day-trippers, and mountain bikers. This makes this area not a good candidate for wilderness designation. Perhaps identifying the best wildlife corridor through this area up to the parkway, which does not cross the most populous areas of trail, would be the best compromise in this area.	see on map
30754	1/5/2015 14:04	wilderness	Part 1 I do not support the designation of so many significant multi-use areas as wilderness. Yes, we need more wild spaces in the forest. But much of the proposed area is not well suited for wilderness designation. There are many reasons why these areas are not suitable - foremost is that all of these areas have been logged and as a result a vast network of old roads and trails exist on the land, although they are not mapped. Second, the logging of these lands has been done with very little concern about the future forest health and there are many places where the young forest is far too dense and there are too many low value species of timber.	no map point

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30755	1/5/2015 14:05	wilderness	Part 2 I support the improvement of the health and diversity of the forest, however I do not think that improving the health should be for the purpose/benefit of future logging/timber interests. We should improve the health and vitality of the forest to continue to attract the hundreds of thousands of recreational users who contribute the the local economies in the region. And we should support forest health to ensure that the priceless water resources remain high-quality and abundant.	no map point
30756	1/5/2015 14:06	wilderness	Part 3 Rather than talk about the forest age now, and how we need to manage for certain ages to ensure wildlife diversity we should look back in history to BEFORE these lands were ever logged. What was the age then? It was all old-growth and there was tremendous wildlife diversity and greater abundance. But more wildlife just brings in more hunters which would in turn increase conflict between user communities. It will never be 'easy' to hunt in Pisgah National Forest - because it's rugged terrain and it isn't an ideal habitat for popular game species such a deer.	no map point
30757	1/5/2015 14:06	wilderness	Part 4 I find it ironic that at a time when the FS plans significant logging in an area which is most wilderness-like (Devil's Courthouse) they are considering designating so much other land as wilderness. Although I do not support the wilderness designation in so many areas there are a few areas where it makes sense. For instance, it would make sense to designate higher elevations (e.g. >4,400ft) along the Parkway as wilderness as these areas are far too steep for timber operations and there is a low concentration of high value timber there due to the rugged terrain and harsh conditions. But even such a designation could be problematic for people/businesses that rely on the high-country to make a living.	no map point
30758	1/5/2015 14:06	wilderness	Part 5 I believe that Pisgah National Forest should be managed FIRST as a vital water and recreational resource for the region and that those uses should have the highest priority. Finally, I sincerely hope that the comment received are taken seriously and fully considered in the final decision. I participated in the Courthouse Scoping and Decision process from the very beginning, and in the end I felt that very little of the public comment was considered - the final plan looked just like the original plan, meaning the USFS did exactly what they wanted to do and the process of public comment was only for show.	no map point
30770	1/5/2015 15:45	Nantahala	Given the challenges the Forest Service faces in maintaining a road network of over 380,000 miles, we do not need to build new roads in areas that do not currently have them. Today it's estimated that deferred maintenance is over \$8.4 billion nationwide and increases annually as allocated funds fall far short of annual maintenance needs. Agency reports confirm that the Forest Service has less than 13 percent of the funds needed to maintain its existing roads. Take the millions of dollars it will take to build and maintain these roads in perpetuity and invest it in our community. We just lost Stanley and 430 jobs, now is not the time to waste money on something that will only offer short term benefits to a few people. Once the trees are harvested they are gone and so will any economic impact.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30790	1/5/2015 17:47	NFsNC	Re: Logging in the Pisgah & Nantahala Forest & the Big Ivy Wilderness. The specific biosphere & biodiversity of the southern Appalachia Mts. exist nowhere else on earth. Each plant is essential to the health of other plants & animals. Many are rare, used for centuries as medicinals. The degradation to forest waters, plant & animal symbiosis, habitat & rare plants is inevitable with logging. The Big Ivy Wilderness, the Pisgah & Nantahala forests, are considered unparalleled by hunting, fishing, mtn biking, hiking, camping, birding, kayaking & other Nat'l and Int'l outdoor organizations. How much time & money will they spend here if the waters, the views, the biosphere is damaged by logging? I moved here years ago for these mountains. A huge majority of the endless stream of transplants, retirees & tourists come here for these mountains. They are sacred, for all kinds of reasons, to locals & visitors. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW LOGGING IN THESE AREAS. It's short-sighted insanity.	no map point
30802	1/5/2015 18:20	wilderness	Interstate 40 can be seen and heard from the proposed Pigeon River Wilderness. Sights and sounds of a major interstate are not conducive to a Wilderness experience. The proposed area should be ruled out from NWPS consideration.	see on map
30805	1/5/2015 18:28	wilderness	The even aged forest management history on the east side of Harmon Den Mountain is substantially noticeable. Portions of the harvest within the the proposed Wilderness boundary should be removed and the boundary should be expanded.	see on map
30808	1/5/2015 18:31	wilderness	Timber harvest is substantially noticeable vegetation treatment. Remove from proposed Wilderness and increase boundary from harvest site.	see on map
30813	1/5/2015 18:34	wilderness	Substantially noticeable vegetation treatment history, timber harvest, does not pass test for Wilderness. Exclude area and expand boundary.	see on map
30819	1/5/2015 18:37	wilderness	This timber harvest site should be removed from the Wilderness proposal and the boundary should be expanded.	see on map
30823	1/5/2015 18:40	wilderness	Timber harvest site is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment. Remove area from proposed Wilderness and adjust boundary to distance that protects a Wilderness experience.	see on map
30827	1/5/2015 18:42	wilderness	my wife and I believe that the wilderness area of sugar ridge area near harpers creek should not be in wilderness for the simple reason that wilderness area has enough area without taking the sugar ridge area	no map point
30830	1/5/2015 18:45	wilderness	The road here is obvious on the ground. Substantially noticeable imprint of humans. Not appropriate for Wilderness. Exclude this area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30833	1/5/2015 18:47	wilderness	This timber harvest site is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment that requires the area's removal from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30836	1/5/2015 18:50	wilderness	This area should be rejected from Wilderness consideration because of the substantially noticeable timber harvest.	see on map
30845	1/5/2015 19:10	wilderness	Please remove this area from Wilderness consideration because the timber harvest is a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment. The proposed boundary must also be adjusted.	see on map
30849	1/5/2015 19:12	wilderness	Substantially noticeable timber harvest must rule out this area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30852	1/5/2015 19:15	wilderness	Old road here. Proposed boundary should be set back from the road.	see on map
30859	1/5/2015 19:29		Appear to be roaded areas here. Please consider when evaluating the potential of that area for designation.	see on map
30863	1/5/2015 19:42	wilderness	The road here is obvious on the ground. This area ought not be included in the proposed Wilderness boundary.	see on map
30866	1/5/2015 19:44	wilderness	Old roads zig zag up and down the ridge. Not appropriate for Wilderness.	see on map
30874	1/5/2015 20:00	wilderness	Extensive roads and skid roads cover the entire area and signs of timber harvesting are substantially noticeable on the ground. Please remove this area from the proposed Wilderness area.	see on map
30881	1/5/2015 20:06	wilderness	This Chunky Gal Inventoried Roadless Area provides more than sufficient protection for this area. Wilderness designation is unnecessary. Please retain some management tools here for the benefit of forest health and wildlife.	see on map
30884	1/5/2015 20:10	wilderness	64/Murphy Road is right next to the proposed area. Sights and sounds from this highly traveled road would be experienced in the Wilderness area and at a minimum viewscape and sound analyses should be conducted to set the proposed Wilderness area back from obvious impacts from human civilization.	see on map
30888	1/5/2015 20:14	wilderness	There are roads everywhere you go in this area. It is not all compatible with Wilderness. It's also a good area for grouse and deer hunting and could be even better with a little management. Please do not include this area in the proposed Chunky Gal Wilderness.	see on map
30891	1/5/2015 20:18	wilderness	Large timber harvest site is substantially noticeable. Proposed boundaries and viewscales within proposed boundaries should be adjusted.	see on map
30894	1/5/2015 20:20	wilderness	This regeneration harvest site ought to be removed from the proposed Wilderness area and the boundary should also be set farther back.	see on map
30897	1/5/2015 20:22		Please consider the close proximity of US Hwy 221 when evaluating areas of the Dobson Knob Extension for Wilderness designation. A large percentage of the proposed extension is within a mile or so of this highway, especially in the upper portion of the proposed extension. As someone who frequents land on the west side of 221 in this area, I can tell you that noise from traffic is highly audible, even at more considerable distances (I have hiked from 221 to areas just below the Parkway on the western side, with traffic from 221 still being audible). I do not consider the noise of automobile traffic to be compatible with a Wilderness designation.	see on map
30900	1/5/2015 20:24	wilderness	The heavy road system and substantially noticeable vegetation treatment history here does not meet the standards for Wilderness inclusion.	see on map
30905	1/5/2015 20:29	wilderness	The Sharptop Ridge proposed Wilderness addition is too small to practicably preserve and use in an unimpaired condition, especially given the significant boundary footage with private lands.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30908	1/5/2015 20:35	wilderness	The Cherry Cove proposed Wilderness extension is not suitable for Wilderness because it lacks the acreage and its preservation and use in an inimpaired condition is not practicable given that its entire eastern boundary and most of its northern and western boundaries abut private lands - subdivisions for the most part with numerous landowners.	see on map
30911	1/5/2015 20:40	wilderness	Roads and the woody species composition is substantially noticeable evidence of timber harvesting. I recommend removal from proposed Wilderness boundary.	see on map
30918	1/5/2015 20:44	wilderness	Roads present. Obvious on the ground. Not characteristic of Wilderness to experience man made roads. Timber harvesting history. Exclude from proposed Wilderness boundary.	see on map
30929	1/5/2015 21:21	wilderness	Shooting Creek already has more than enough protection. One, it's National Forest. Two, most of it is an Inventoried Roadless Area. Additional restrictions that accompany Wilderness are unneeded. This would be better suited for restoration, which is hard to accomplish in Wilderness areas because of regulations and red tape. Target the high density of ericaceous species through prescribed fire. These south-facing slopes need fire returned to the landscape It's hard to meet the Natural Range of Variation goals if restrictions hamper management options.	see on map
30932	1/5/2015 21:29	wilderness	Very large timber harvest sites are substantially noticeable. Roads are present throughout the area. Better for the ecological health of the area would be restoration efforts, not restrictive Wilderness designation.	see on map
30943	1/5/2015 21:43	wilderness	Wildlife opening. South Mills River has very little early successional habitat. Please do not designate this area Wilderness because no ESH will be able to be maintained for the benefit of wildlife.	see on map
30948	1/5/2015 21:48	wilderness	Please do not designate the South Mills as Wilderness. These wildlife fields need to be maintained for deer, turkey, bear, etc and it would be better for wildlife to cull the white pines which wouldn't be possilbe in Wilderness.	see on map
30951	1/5/2015 21:50	wilderness	Extensive road network and substantially noticeable vegetation treatments should remove this drainage from the proposed Wilderness boundary.	see on map
30954	1/5/2015 21:57	wilderness	Wildlife opening needs to be maintained to provide a much needed habitat component. If this becomes Wilderness, wildlife suffers.	see on map
30960	1/5/2015 22:02	wilderness	South Mills has more than enough protections. Much of it is an Inventoried Roadless Area already. Wilderness designation unnecessary. This used to be a great area for deer and turkey. It's going downhill for wildlife. South Mills would benefit from a little more active management. Multiple use. Not designations for special interests.	see on map
30963	1/5/2015 22:04	wilderness	Timber harvest site. Removal of this area from the proposed Wilderness area is warranted because it's a substantially noticeable vegetation treatment.	see on map

Reference ID	Date Created	Keyword	Comment and Replies	Map Point
30966	1/5/2015 22:18	wilderness	Laurel Mountain, Big Ridge and the Big Creek Watershed need restoration, not further restrictions. Large stands of mountain laurel and rhododendron need targeting. Prescribed fire would benefit much of this area. This used to be a terrific area for deer, turkey and grouse. Populations now declining. Wildlife needs help and imposing restrictions only exacerbates the problem. Moreover, the management tools in this area are already limited because of Laurel Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area. Mountain biking is very popular here. No reason to recommend for NWPS.	see on map
30969	1/5/2015 22:20	wilderness	Substantially noticeable timber harvest. Remove from Wilderness proposal.	see on map
30972	1/5/2015 22:22	wilderness	Substantially noticeable timber harvest. Exclude from proposed Wilderness area and buffer the area.	see on map
30975	1/5/2015 22:28	wilderness	The timber harvest here is substantially noticeable throughout the upper Horse Cove drainage. I recommend removing the entire area from Wilderness consideration.	see on map
30982	1/5/2015 22:47	wilderness	The proposed Wilderness area boundary should be adjusted to for a set back from the Mount Mitchell Golf Course and highly parcelized subdivisions.	see on map
30987	1/5/2015 23:00	wilderness	I do not support recommending this area for NWPS inclusion. Spruce-fir forests face a host of threats, and it would be very-shorted to limit management options. I love this area and it's under no threat from timber management and is further protected by its IRA designation. Wilderness designation completely unnecessary.	see on map
30990	1/5/2015 23:10	General comment	Where are these talks of National Recreation Areas coming from? The Forest Service did not discuss NRAs at its public workshop in Asheville on April 17, 2014 when it covered Wilderness and other special designations. Before any designation is seriously contemplated, the public deserves information, adequate notice and an opportunity to comment.	see on map
30994	1/5/2015 23:30	wilderness	The Ellicott Rock proposed Wilderness extension shares a boundary with 14 different private landowners. Adjacency to subdivisions does not provide outstanding opportunities for solitude, and the multiple unprotected neighboring lands do not make preservation of the area practicable.	see on map
30997	1/5/2015 23:35	wilderness	Subdivision is not an appropriate neighbor for Wilderness. I recommend the boundary beso that the area is buffered from the sights and sounds of the homes and roads.	see on map
31000	1/5/2015 23:41	wilderness	The Southern Nantahala Wilderness extensions are unneeded. Much of this acreage is already an IRA. Southern Macon County has a ton of Wilderness already, and the deer herd here has declined since the Wilderness designation.	see on map