

Nantahala and Pisgah NFs Plan Revision Collaboration and Forest Planning Summit 04/20/2015 NC Arboretum

Objective

The *Collaboration and Forest Planning Summit* is convened to strengthen the collaborative process and frame its impact on planning. The Summit will build valuable relationships between representative members of the Nantahala/Pisgah Forest Partnership, the Restoration Collaborative and the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council. These discussions will lay the groundwork for a broadly supported and inclusive revised forest plan that is reflective of both community interests and best available science, and that is implemented through sustained collaboration and public involvement.

Outcomes

- Build relationships between stakeholders
- Outline how a broadly supported and inclusive plan will impact future implementation and relationships
- Provide context and clarity to suitability debate, understand how to together create positive and productive messages
- Validate the key forest planning issues in need of collaborative problem-solving
- Frame and understand the “roadmap” forward

Agenda

Time	Subject	Content
12:00	Welcome	Meeting Objective and Outcomes Attendee Introductions Icebreaker
12:45	Introduction	A Broadly Supported and Inclusive Plan Stakeholder Voices
1:00	BREAK	
1:15	Context and Clarity	Lessons Learned from Suitability Discussion
2:15	Key Issues	Review Key Issues Synthesis of Public Comments Refine Key Issues and Focus Collaboration
3:00	BREAK	
3:15	Exercise	Building a Shared Vision: Extra, Extra!
4:00	Next Steps	Framework for Moving Forward
4:45	Summary	Close Out
5:00	Adjourn	

Introduction

Kristin Bail, Forest Supervisor, North Carolina National Forests, welcomed everyone to the meeting and provided the purpose for the gathering.

- The Forest Service spent lots of time over the past 2+ years listening to public comments and adapting to partner feedback. Folks want a different approach to collaboration.
- Region 8 recently welcomed a new Regional Forester to help achieve a successful framework for collaboration, among other items. Tony Tooke was integral to forming and finalizing the 2012 Planning Rule, and is invested in high public involvement in forest plan revisions.
- The Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests' goal is for collaboration to bring meaning to all involved. USFS wants to form, foster, and facilitate a process that gives broad support for a forest plan not only for our children, but their children's children. Kristin is committed to providing a healthy forest for future generations.
- Today is about relationships and trust. The Forest Service will continue to listen, adapt and respond to what partners express. This is an iterative process. How what is discussed today will be used is not 100% certain. We have the space to decide that together and move forward.
- There are many affiliations and perspectives represented today, including multiple collaboratives formed around different issues. USFS can work with all of these affiliations to create a space where all groups feel heard and open to create a dialogue. USFS intends for partners to share ideas with each other as well as the agency.
- USFS will do a better job hearing these diverse voices, and providing opportunities for partners to dig into key issues in an appropriate way. The hope is that partners will stay engaged over the long haul, and help the agency identify how to adapt and improve. USFS will focus on partner needs when finding a way to collaborate and move forward into the future.

A Broadly Supported and Inclusive Plan

Participants at each table answered the following questions individually: 1) What does a broadly supported and inclusive plan mean to you? 2) Why is a broadly supported and inclusive plan valuable? Participants discussed their answers as a small group, and reported their shared observations to the room.

- Very few opposing viewpoints arose in answers to the meaning question. To some participants, broad support and inclusivity means a process, to others a result.
- The process of broad support and inclusivity is that everyone has a seat at the table and everyone's needs are addressed. It means listening to and hearing different perspectives, representing a variety of viewpoints, and respecting a large spectrum of answers.
- There appears to be some agreement that inclusivity and broad support results in finding common ground, and a diversity of values coming together. One group highlighted that a tool for broad support and inclusivity is best available science. Another noted that many individuals at their table focused on including natural resource uses in the plan rather than natural resource conservation.
- There is crossover between the meaning and value; many responses to the meaning reflected value and vice versa. There were many comments that the value of a broadly supported and inclusive plan is in the implementation.

- A broadly supported and inclusive plan means people having ownership of the process, and having the ability to deliver value by implementing things on the ground together. The plan results in actual on the ground outcomes that are valuable and beneficial to all.
- Another reason why a broadly supported and inclusive plan is valuable is a reduction of conflict; the outcomes are espoused by all and important resources are not wasted on litigation.
- One group expressed that even if there is gridlock, the process and the product of building broad support and inclusivity is valuable in and of itself. Another suggested a broadly supported and inclusive plan promotes a fully functioning ecological and social system.

Communications after the Fall 2014 meetings

Kristin Bail provided some context and clarity to the discussion around timber suitability, by sharing some of her reflections and lessons learned from the public dialogue initiated last fall.

- Last fall when Forest Service started to talk about timber suitability in the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests, it did not result in the anticipated outcome. The high level of engagement, on the other hand, allowed Forest Service to dialogue with a Federal Advisory Committee Act committee and others. The forest learned from these exchanges that communication is important and words are important.
- This session is about starting a discussion on how Forest Service can better communicate to reach a better outcome for all stakeholders involved. It is also about providing some space for partners to learn and reflect from the timber suitability discussion as well.

Fishbowl Exercise

The fishbowl exercise allows six participants at a time to discuss a topic. Those who are not participating can listen and there is opportunity for reflection as a group later. Once everyone in the fishbowl offers comments, attendees from the audience can replace participants to join the fishbowl conversation.

Discussion Questions

1. What are some personal lessons that you learned after participating and observing the debate around suitable acres for timber?
2. How can we together create more positive approaches and productive messages in future communication?



The fishbowl conversation highlighted first and foremost that people are passionate and connected to the forest in this region. This is a resilient community which is able to come together and evolve beyond past conflict. The conversation also addressed that the Forest Service, like its partners, is capable of miscommunication, despite best intentions. Both are also capable of learning and adapting after missed targets. The fishbowl discussion reinforced that the agency is a long-time stakeholder in this region, managing land in WNC for over 100 years. The agency is held to a high standard, but the public is putting a great deal of faith in its decision-making. One important point from the timber suitability topic is that the collaborative process must address the gap in trust between the public and the Forest Service before the forest plan revision process can move forward with plan components such as standards and guidelines.

The Forest Service identified a key lesson learned in the fishbowl: To build more public trust, the agency needs to be deliberate. When sharing new information, it is critical to also communicate clear intentions for how that information will be used. Agency representatives must present information and intentions

in a way that is comprehensible to the majority of people. The Forest Service should synthesize salient points for easier digestion of materials. It is difficult for partners to identify important messages to relay to user groups when there is such a large quantity of information being shared.



Partners learned how information without context can create space for controversy. It is possible for the same information to be used in many different venues. When messages are misrepresented, it undermines the collaborative process. Interpretation is critical. Fishbowl participants discussed how the Forest Service can facilitate collaboration in a way that prevents public rallying around different interpretation of information, and decreases the need for reactive actions to these messages.

Participants discussed the importance of transparency around management constraints and better context around current and future forest conditions.

Fishbowl participants reflected that conflict is a product of partners not feeling heard. Experts need to see their contributions incorporated into USFS products and partners need to see their interests represented in the forest plan revision outcomes in order to have successful future collaboration. Partners have local expertise which is valuable for plan revision components and maps. Partners recognized that they must not speak past each other. It is equally important to listen to how other representatives feel as it is to listen to how constituents feel.

There were also lessons learned on the nature of a timber suitability analysis. After discussing the issue, participants recognized that suitability is a measure, not a driving force behind USFS land management decisions. However, everyone working to influence the plan revision has different success metrics. The quantity and location of suitable acres for timber production is a measure of success for some stakeholders. The fishbowl conversation addressed that the announcement of suitable acres gave the impression that the process was progressing to the when and the how from the what. Participants noted that it is important to focus on agreement around broad desired conditions before deciding where and how those conditions should be reached. Desired conditions are what drive the agency's management.

The fishbowl participants also provided some context for the Forest Service around the debate. Comments revealed a perception that the forest plan revision process would sacrifice quality for deadlines. There was also a perception that products were developed behind closed doors, and limited by a linear two-way communication pattern with the public. In the future, the agency can make an effort to receive input while designing products in addition to processing public comments on drafts. The fishbowl participants ended the conversation with a major lesson learned: There is plenty of land to accomplish what everyone wants. Past conflicts are understandable but avoidable moving forward. The fishbowl conversation transitioned to discussing how to avoid future conflict by creating more positive approaches to collaboration, and more productive mechanisms to deliver shared messages.

The fishbowl participants discussed how the Forest Service can distribute information most effectively, deliberately, and positively throughout the plan revision process. Suggestions included:

- Use the detailed guidance from the planning rule to more rationally sequence forest plan revision components for the collaborative process to support. It is critical to go step by step.
- Be careful of USFS jargon. It would be great to have a dictionary or a legend.

- Level the communication when presenting Forest Service graphs, maps, and information. Partners should not have to reference three separate documents to understand effects of proposed management to areas of concern.
- Present things at the individual collaboratives as well as public meetings to be inclusive.
- Make sure interests are represented across the broad range of alternatives. Help folks understand how their interests are in every alternative to keep them engaged in the decision space.

Fishbowl participants also considered how the Forest Service can create a productive collaborative process. Suggestions included:

- Help partners acknowledge and respect each other's interest areas.
- Maps are a great tool for less emotive decision making. Get all groups to collaborate over the same map.
- Help all partners own this revision process together and share the messages together. Lead the way, but leverage partners and the breadth expertise present in the collaborative network.
- The passion partners have for the land is valuable – Focus on science but don't completely eliminate passion from the discussion.

The fishbowl discussion also identified ways the partners can promote an effective collaborative process. Suggestions included:

- Consider communicating more proactively with children to engage youth and parents.
- Ask 'why' as a first step to understanding shared information and putting messages in context
- Partners can support USFS with boots on the ground. Ground truthing can provide valuable local expertise to plan components, no matter how comprehensive the analysis.
- Focus on where there is agreement, and expand the discussion from there
- Decide on the 30,000 foot level rather than arguing about each stand in our analysis
- Consider future variation and restoration as a foundation for conversation
- Commit to a process as a group. If there are problems, deal with them internally and directly with each other, rather than in the public eye

Refining and Framing Key Issues

Heather Luczak, Assistant Forest Planner, Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests, provided an overview of public comments received on the forest plan revision to date.

- 82% of comments received were in form letters
- 25 different form letters with varying quantities of submission and topics of focus
- 2,400 individual unique letters
- Most referenced issues: wilderness, timber harvesting, wildlife, recreation
- Some included photos, artwork, videos
- Comments represented the strength of experience with and connection to these two forests
- Comments received from across the US and from as far as Sri Lanka
- 23 meetings with in-person comments

These comments largely validated the relevance of the four key issues that were shared with the public in Oct/Nov 2014.

- 1) Diversity of wildlife habitat
- 2) Special Designations

- 3) Recreation Opportunities
- 4) Access to the forest

The comments also helped USFS identify three key themes which everyone can agree to support:

- 1) Clean and Abundant Water
- 2) Connecting People to Land
- 3) Enhancing and Restoring Resiliency

The issues will be significant in the framing of the forest plan and will be addressed in all of the alternatives but to varying degrees. Heather asked participants address the question: Did the Forest Service frame these issues correctly? After reviewing a description of the themes and issues and conversing around the question, each table provided their answer.

Did the Forest Service frame these issues correctly?

Wildlife Habitat

- Why is diverse habitat important for lots of communities? Better articulate the need.
- This description mentions diversity of structure. What about diversity of structure supports different habitats? Let's be specific there about what is managed and why.
- Talk about canopy openness specifically – where and why it is important for wildlife
- Note that hunting is defined as occurring in specific areas, but that land can be open to multiple uses and many things can happen on the same acre.
- Aquatic and riparian habitat is missing – is there controversy here as much? What is it if so?
- This issue should focus more on disturbance and sensitive species



Special Designations

- Special designations are most connected to restoration and resilience. Express why certain areas are sought after – and how a designation affects the ability to restore.
- Add in some text on 'Maintaining existing...' special designations rather than focusing solely on future recommendations
- Where and why and how much is a big part of the discussion for this and all issues.

Recreation

- Hunters and anglers do not necessarily desire different forest settings. Be careful being too explicit representing desires of forest users.
- The description of this issue gives as a definitive fact that the current recreation system is not sustainable related to financial and staff support for trails. Many things are not sustainable due to financial and staff support, but this is not mentioned in other areas. Perhaps pull out challenges that are relevant to all issues in an introduction to make that more clear.
- Talk about canopy openness specifically – where and why it is important for trails and roads.
- Trails can be a compatible land use, they are not framed very positively here

Access

- Trails and roads should have equal treatment and equal energy into their evaluation
- There is a seasonal component to access that should be included
- Address the backlog of road maintenance and define eliminating closed roads

General

- Folks are eager to move forward in a positive way, rather than be divisive. Let the language in this framing document be 100% positive.
- The themes address the economic impact of the forests, but the issues do not. Each key issue should tie back to the local economy and local communities as well. All themes and issues should be framed in a way that compliments local economies. It is critical to have a multitude of small community connections to the forest that are celebrated and reinforced in the future: historical, cultural, economic connections.
- How does the agency's budget and ability to complete timber sales frame the decision space?
- Invasive species should be included as their own key issue.
- Discuss how the issues and themes are connected somewhere
- Math without numbers doesn't work. Talking about the issues out of the context of the maps, management areas, legal restrictions, etc. is not helpful. USFS should be a part of the discussion, not a referee on these key issues.
- Is restoration captured most effectively under the themes or is it its own issue? Is there agreement or divergence there?



- Many if not all the issues can be placed in a restoration context. Restoration is not well defined in this document. The subject is mentioned in passing as the last theme but it should be elaborated throughout each issue and theme. The language in this theme is also quite complicated.

- These issues do not occur everywhere, and there is not disagreement on them everywhere

councils for implementation?

- How and where is USFS supporting the creation of user

Extra, Extra! Building a Shared Vision...

Matt McCombs, acting Public Affairs Officer, Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests, provided an overview of the afternoon's progress. The group learned about what a broadly supported and inclusive plan means and why it is valuable. Participants talked about the issues and how they will drive our dialogue. Matt asked participants to now imagine reading an article in 2017 about the success of forest planning efforts. What is the headline and what are the key points of the story? Participants at each table worked together to craft a vision for the future. After some time to brainstorm, they shared what they created.

Headline 1: "Your forest, your plan". The Forest Service announces a net gain of sustainable Forest Service trails while increasing wildlife and forest health. Local businesses, schools and economies see boost while your special places are protected. With an increase in budget and staffing, the Forest Service fields a massive new volunteer force. The plan emphasizes reduction in degraded habitat and

restoration on the forest systems using a variety of techniques. The Forest Service and its partners are ready to put YOUR plan in place.

Headline 2: “The Public Supports the Forest Management Plan”. Trust is built with forest users and everybody’s interests are validated. The plan is based in science and represents community values. The plan is not appealed.

Headline 3: “Community collaboration is a national model for forest planning and implementation”. Shovels in hand, ready to implement the new forest plan. Viable timber harvest recognized. Plan not appealed.



Headline 4: “Collaborative effort from 2014 pays off big for the local economy, the wildlife, the people, and the forest”. Unique plan benefits communities and visitors alike. Sustainable recreation will continue to be core value of forest benefiting regional life and the economy. Clean water will continue to be provided for communities downstream

Headline 5: “Forest, wildlife users, all winners”. Diversity of forest users are satisfied with new plan. Forest plan deals with declining species. Diverse interests rally around forest plan. Local economies benefited. Right management, right places, and right species. Plan results in increased timber harvests.

Headline 6: “County commissioners pass resolution for forest plan” or “Diverse groups support Forest Plan”. Balance is achieved between economic and aesthetic values. More partnerships garnered. Support around special designations. Finally all of this results in less litigation and social contention.

Headline 7: “Final Plan will improve forest and economic health”. Forest plan revision leads to more a self-sustained agency. Planned greater timber extraction.

Matt McCombs summarized that between all these headlines, there is an incredibly vibrant, shared vision for the future. The Forest Service loves these lands as well and shares some of the same values and same disagreements. The big question is how we get from today to this vision through next steps.

Next Steps in Collaboration and Forest Plan Revisions

James Melonas, Deputy Forest Supervisor, extended thanks to everyone for participating and to the USFS team for organizing the event. James provided an overview of some of the comments USFS received during sensing about how to narrow down our collaborative work together. Comments from Forest Service partners indicated that focusing collaboration will include three key things: (1) Defining the collaboration space. (2) Defining the timing. How does collaboration fit in to actually writing the plan? (3) Defining the decision space. James spent some time outlining these key next steps, and answering questions with Kristin Bail on the path forward.

(1) Defining the collaboration space.

There is a lot happening on the forest that will not likely change. For example, management areas for existing wilderness, experimental forests, Cradle of Forestry, and others will not change dramatically. Some areas that are ripe for collaboration include:

- *Restoring areas for the resiliency of our forests.* This is about creating aquatic passages, restoring natural fire regimes, restoring the American chestnut, etc. These are areas where we want to increase the pace and scale of the work we are doing to meet desired conditions.
- *Potential wilderness areas.* USFS is working to evaluate potential wilderness areas, and may ask for your help in collaborating on this.
- *Special designated areas and special interest areas*
- *Sustainable recreation program.* USFS has infrastructure, but cannot be all things to all people to deliver the recreation program. How can we collaborate on this?

Lots of background information is already collected; the USFS team can work on this without starting from zero.

(2) Defining the timing.

In regards to timing, it is not necessary for the group to figure out everything before the draft plan is out. Together we can continue to build from the draft plan moving forward.

USFS wants to develop a reasonable range of alternatives and hone in on areas of disagreement. It is important for the collaborative group to help hone in on these areas. The agency will take that information to incorporate into the draft plan and alternatives. That is a task for this summer and fall, so that the draft plan can be completed on schedule.

As USFS approaches releasing the draft plan and alternatives, it will be important to check in with folks to make sure things are communicated with context and clarity. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement is expected to be completed in December or January.

(3) Defining the decision space.

Barring violation of existing policies, the Forest Service will use the collaborative process to develop the final plan. The stronger the collaboration, the more the final plan will reflect all interests. It is the agency's goal to have a well-articulated plan for collaboration embedded in the draft range of alternatives, and to have all stakeholder perspectives embedded in the alternatives as well. USFS wants to provide a structure and process that allows this group to continue to dialogue around the issues so NPNF can have an inclusive proposed plan with broad support for implementation. USFS will continue to ask people to come together in a single setting to work in a collaborative process.

Will future meetings continue to include all the organizations involved?

Kristin Bail: Today was an initiation into the Forest Service's learning and adapting process. What we want is to move forward with a broadly supported process. We want to have effective engagement that introduces terms that are meaningful for people in a respectful and inclusive environment. We will be looking at you to help us include groups that have only been intermittently involved. We are looking to you to help us be inclusive. This will be an open collaborative, which means that anyone who is interested is welcome to join the discussion.

What happens if what the Forest Service develops differs from the collaboratives' points of agreement?

James: If we do differ from those points of agreement, we will be communicating early around that so that there are no surprises. Partners can expect the following from the Forest Service:

- 1- USFS will continue to comply with existing laws and regulations
- 2- USFS will continue to provide opportunities for feedback from stakeholders and individuals and incorporate it into the plan.
- 3- USFS will create a participation and collaborative process that is open to everyone who wants to be around the table. We will work through issues together in an open and transparent way.
- 4- If there are certain issues we can't come to agreement on, the FS will take that and use it in our final decisions.
- 5- USFS will use best available science to make our decisions. When there is conflicting information, we will use it all in decision-making.
- 6- USFS will give more sufficient notice of the collaboration schedule to allow for more planned participation.

How will the Forest help these collaborative groups work together?

James: We have two parallel tracks. We have the collaboratives and we also have the broader public to keep engaged. We don't need to figure it all out through collaboration, but we need to frame the alternatives that we will be analyzing together. We need to design workshops to work through the issues. We want to be continuing the work of the group and not take away from that. We are looking to the collaborative process to help provide the framework we need.

We are going to be using a third party expert to help us design the collaborative process. We will be working with the National Forest Foundation, which is congressionally designated as a resource for the National Forest System. They will develop a rapid assessment of all the work we have done today and help us charter a path forward. They will provide a synthesis of all the work we have done today and share that with everyone. This will be happening in late May early June.

What happened to the science forum? We have a reasonable understanding of the resources we need to collaborate and the issues to focus on. A science-based meeting can help us make progress.

We did discuss a science forum, and that is not off the table. Based on sensing we realized this collaboration and forest planning summit was most immediately necessary. The science forum may happen as we dig into specific issues in the future.

Have you considered having a similar meeting with the political reps here?

It is great to have political reps at these meetings, but I think it would be great for them to see this process as a flip. It would be nice to open it up to have more of that listening happening.

Time commitment is important. Is it possible to do work between the meetings?

Agreement that meeting participant contact information would be shared because that is where the best conversations start.

Group Commitments to Collaboration

Meeting participants suggested some group commitments to the collaboration for further consideration:

1. Each representative is responsible for encouraging good, constructive dialogue within the collaborative, in public meetings, in newspaper articles, in social media.
2. Each representative is responsible for proactive conflict resolution. If a polarizing or destructive message is floating in the public, reach out to involved groups to let them know and have an open conversation about it.
3. The dialogue happens under one tent. Representatives will not act individually to lobby in DC, set up side meetings with USFS, or hold exclusive conversations.
4. Each representative is a bridge builder between their constituents and other stakeholders in the forest plan revision process.
5. Use of the press is encouraged, provided there are considerate ground rules in place. It needs to be obvious when messages are delivered on behalf of an individual, an organization, and the collaborative process. The collaboratives can work together to manage the press, and not allow for future misinterpretation of information.
6. All will continue to engage the general public.

Larry Hayden provided a potential summary statement of the group's commitment:

"We are committed to collaborating with all interests. We will not operate in a black box. We will take this process step by step and deliberately set context and clarity without jargon. We will make sure all interests are represented in the plan and all alternatives. We are not an umpire but a player, helping to look forward in a positive manner. When we disagree, we check in with each other, and there are no surprises. Words are important, listening and checking in is important, but finally it is outcomes on the ground that counts."

Individual Commitments to Collaboration

The participants then each made individual commitments to collaboration to close the meeting. Each attendee made a statement following "I commit to..."

- Communicate with this group.
- Keep the congressman informed of the work here today.
- Clear communication with all user groups and stakeholders.
- Getting to the meat of things.
- Integrity in collaboration.
- Acting professionally and being inclusive.
- Doing my job. All in.
- Developing a successful plan that we can implement.
- Collaborating for the best possible forest plan. For this particular collaborative.
- Being inclusive of all voices.
- Listening with an open mind, learning from others and supporting wildlife.
- Being open-minded and working with folks to do what we can for wildlife.
- Working towards trust.
- Collaborating, educating, working with people on my personal interest and seeing wilderness heard in the process.
- Realizing some of the newspaper headlines.
- Recreational interests and listening with an open mind.
- Seeing the collaboration process move forward. Availability to talk with folks over tea, coffee, etc.

- Wildlife. Committed to all wildlife. Wilderness, wildlife, trails, timber harvests, everything is integrated and fits together.
- Building stronger relationships.
- An open-mind and listening. Being a stronger voice at table.
- Seeing an excellent collaborative plan come to fruition.
- Letting the senator know how this process is going because they work for you. So talk to them and explain. Tell them when something comes up that is not correct.
- Wildlife. Listening to each and every one of you.
- Showing up to meetings and representing paddlers and river interests.
- Honesty, sincerity, and treating everyone with respect so we can have a healthy, natural ecosystem.
- Working for you. Committed to collaborative process. To educating and learning science. Asking tough questions to get through process.
- Committed to making useful maps.
- Creative collaborative solutions and meeting other interests halfway.
- Going to the Macon County Commission. If I make a statement it will be a true statement. Will stay part of the process.
- Being a positive member of the Collaborative group here.
- Finding solutions and integrating wildlife into those solutions and finding ways forward.
- Timber harvest and to teaching people more about logging.
- Working with FS on a good mgmt. plan and working with other groups.
- Health of land and water and those that love these forests. Reciprocity.
- Collaborative process. Open door, always willing to talk. To serving this group and the public in a way that is most beneficial to you.
- Being a better bridge-builder
- Being as engaged in the process. Learning and listening and speaking up when I should. Bringing resources to the table.
- Listening to everyone in the collaborative process. Will go out with anyone who wants to go out and discuss things.
- Getting work done on the ground afterwards.
- Seeing the plan make its way to the end and getting it over with. Represent forest products industry to the best of his ability.
- Economics. Economics are very important. Committed to action.
- Going back to Congressman Meadows about what I have heard today about this process.
- Leaving this forest in better shape than it is right now.
- Listening as best as I can and representing an above ground communication channel to my group.
- Listening and speaking clearly.
- Giving time and energy to creating a quality plan.
- Capturing all of these commitments on paper.
- Being the best district ranger that I can be.
- Designing the process in such a way that you all can be involved as we continue to move forward into implementation.
- Fulfilling what we started and fulfilling some of the great headlines that we envisioned for the future, to learning, adopting, and interacting into the future, and to understanding what we need to engage on more.

Meeting Participants

Name	Organization	Affiliation
Julie White	Southern Off-Road Bicycle Assn	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Tommy Cabe	Eastern Band Cherokee Indians	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Gary Peters	National Wild Turkey Federation	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Steve Henson	NC Forestry Association	Restoration Collaborative
David Stewart	NC Wildlife Res Commission	Restoration Collaborative
Jill Gottesman	The Wilderness Society	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Susan Parker	USFS	
Ben Williams	NC Youth Camp Assn	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Gordon Warburton	NC Wildlife Res Commission	Restoration Collaborative
Hugh Irwin	The Wilderness Society	Restoration Collaborative
Angie Gee	USFS	
Gary Kauffman	USFS	
Jay Kirkland		Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Jim Gray	Ruffed Grouse Society	Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council
Kevin Colburn	American Whitewater	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Bob Gale	Mountain True	Restoration Collaborative
Susan Cameron	US Fish and Wildlife Service	Restoration Collaborative
Mike Wilkins	USFS	
Sheryl Bryan	USFS	
Paige Tester	Wild South	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Marc Bischof		Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council
Josh Kelly	Mountain True	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Andrea Leslie	North Carolina Wildlife	Restoration Collaborative
Derek Ibarguen	USFS	
Linda Randolph	USFS	
Charles Parris		Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council
Ramona Bryson		Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council
James Melonas	USFS	
Jim Winfrey	USFS	
Kristin Bail	USFS	
Matt McCombs	USFS	
Tommie Herbert	USFS	
Ginelle Heller	USFS	
Daniel McNeely	McNeely Companies	Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council
Deirdre Lightsey	NC Horse Council	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
David Whitmire	North Carolina Bowhunters Association	Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council
Kyle Brown	Quality Deer Management Assn.	Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council

Name	Organization	Affiliation
Megan Sutton	The Nature Conservancy	Restoration Collaborative
Heather Luczak	USFS	
Callie Moore	Hiawasee River Watershed Coalition	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Richard Mode	NC Wildlife Federation	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Lee Thornhill	USFS	
Nick Larson	USFS	
David Wood		Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
John Culclasure		Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council
Melissa Patton	Sustainable Foothills	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Phil Elliott	Columbia Forest Products	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Maggie Clancy	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership	Nantahala Pisgah Partnership
Judy Francis	North Carolina DENR	Restoration Collaborative
Jason Rodrigue	USFS	
Jim Phillips	Western Carolina Quality Deer Management	Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council
Leonard Harwood		Fish and Wildlife Conservation Council
Larry Hayden		USFS