

Responsible	Order	Subject	Type	Comment/Concern	Response	Reference from
Josh Kelley	1	Landscape scale	Report	[Action item from November meeting]	Draft a statement explaining that the committee took a landscape scale approach but recognizes the species specific concerns which are not captured at this scale, but will be addressed at the project scale.	November meeting
Josh Kelley	2	Landscape scale	Response	[Action item from November meeting]	Draft a statement explaining that the committee took a landscape scale approach but recognizes the species specific concerns which are not captured at this scale, but will be addressed at the project scale.	November meeting
Katherine Medlock	3	Fire	Report	Fire is not natural.	Where language has been added about biophysical settings and the LANDFIRE model, additional language will be added to mention that this model includes information on fire rates, to address commenter concerns about whether or not fire is a natural disturbance in this system Josh Kelley will add this and explain that LANDFIRE model is not only about fire, but about disturbance generally.	Nov. 10-11 comments
Josh Kelley	4	Fire	Report	Fire is not natural.	Similar to low-elevation pine, the report recommendations on each ecological system where fire is a driving force (montane pine, dry oak) should have a bullet point stating that fact. In cove, northern hardwood and spruce, according to LANDFIRE, there should be a bullet indicating that fire is an infrequent occurrence in these systems. Refer the reader to the appropriate appendix.	Nov. 10-11 comments
Skeo/Medlock	5	Fire	Response	Fire is not natural.	In the response to the comments, it should be made clear that fire is not suggested as a management strategy for cove forest.	Nov. 10-11 comments
Katherine Medlock	6	Model	Report	LANDFIRE only works in the west.	Address comment that LANDFIRE only works in the west.	Nov. 10-11 comments
Katherine Medlock	7	Model	Response	LANDFIRE only works in the west.	A longer explanation will be included in the response to comments about what LANDFIRE is and how it is used. Noting that the model is the best available science and that its use has advanced the committee's knowledge substantially. It was also noted that the model's actual name is unfortunate since it is not simply about fire but includes all disturbances and is based on recent literature on forest types. It was also reviewed and evaluated with expert guidance prior to its application in the Cherokee. The committee suggests using the adaptive management approach as the report recommends will help to ensure that if the model is incorrect in some cases, then management approaches can be changed. A member noted that models are a tool to represent what may happen and predict potential outcomes of various management approaches but all of this needs to and will be groundtruthed during application at the watershed scale. Katherine Medlock will mine statements from previous presentations from Greg Low to help explain these concepts.	Nov. 10-11 comments
Katherine Medlock	8	Extirpated species	Report	Concerns about other species, like the chestnut.	Amend the Threatened & Endangered Species section to Threatened, Endangered and Extirpated Species. Add a bullet with the following language: "encourage ongoing efforts and potential future efforts of the FS to reintroduce native extirpated species, for example American Chestnut, Butternut, spot-fin chub...", then add a picture of a chestnut tree. Joe McGuinness and Josh Kelley will provide historic photos of chestnut trees.	Nov. 10-11 comments
Skeo	9	Water quality	Response	Water quality – need to address.	The Forest Plan addresses this issue, and that can be explained in the response to comments.	Nov. 10-11 comments

Katherine Medlock	10	Nomenclature	Report	All future communications with the public should clearly communicate that this is a northern-districts process.	On the title page, amend the description to “steering committee recommendations to the FS for the North Zone of the Cherokee National Forest (Watagua and Nolichucky/Unaka Districts)”. Add a map of the North Zone to the cover page. Pull the map from the FAQ document.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	11	Landscape scale	Response	Bias of Enhanced Conservation Action Planning (ECAP) and LANDFIRE.	Include explanation in response to comments about that the committee used the best-available tools in order to get to landscape-scale recommendations. This will be flagged for follow up evaluation though an adaptive management approach at a project scale.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	12	Landscape scale	Dialogue	Bias of Enhanced Conservation Action Planning (ECAP) and LANDFIRE.	Point out the areas of the report that address their concerns, including the case statement pointed out by Catherine Murray on page 5.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	13	Monitoring	Report	The commenter wants more photographs, case studies, and examples of good restoration, and for the committee point out where FS has done poor restoration.	Include a suggestion in the monitoring section suggesting that the FS to use reference sites at the project level when they are available. Add a statement that says that the biophysical settings model is an effective reference.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	14	Monitoring	Response	Xeric and mesic pine-oak communities.	Explain monitoring efforts and watershed team efforts at a project scale.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	15	Project implementation	Response	This document should include explicit language that calls for the Forest Service to ground truth any data or models that it uses for projects.	The need for ground truthing is specifically addressed in the document. In response to comments, make a reference to that section.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	16	Monitoring	Response	There needs to be a process for monitoring and evaluation outlined in this document.	Point out the monitoring and evaluation section of the report.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	17	Resources reviewed	Response	Consider the early documents of the FS and include bibliography about that.	Acknowledge that early FS documents were not reviewed by the committee. These records are good for particular areas, but not at the forest-wide scale, so the approach selected was use of 1,000-year simulations. There is not consistently accurate data for landscape scale planning for the entire forest, but at the project level the early records could be a valuable resource when they exist, at the stage where projects are developed.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	18	Monitoring	Response	Include specific examples of successful and unsuccessful restoration projects.	Address the lack of good examples of restoration projects in the monitoring section.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock with review by Stephanie Medlin	19	Initiative role	Response	The initiative paints an unclear and ambiguous relationship between itself and forest planning.	Spell out the committee's role. Mine the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document for language.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	20	Committee role	Dialogue	The initiative paints an unclear and ambiguous relationship between itself and forest planning.	Discuss with Mr. Mounger	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	21	Committee role	Report	Page 23 – The use of the word planning in phrase “at the scale appropriate for this planning process.”	Replace the word “planning” with ECAP.	Heartwood comments

Katherine Medlock	22	Committee role	Response	Page 23 – The use of the word planning in phrase “at the scale appropriate for this planning process.”	Explain that this is the committee’s planning process, not the FS plan process.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	23	Miscellaneous	Response	“What are acceptable restoration practices?”	Refer commenters to Appendix B.	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	24	Miscellaneous	Dialogue	CNF contains only 7% of net volume of live trees on forest land statewide, which should be considered in assessment of community benefits of stewardship contracting.	Discuss with Mr. Mounger	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	25	Miscellaneous	Response	CNF contains only 7% of net volume of live trees on forest land statewide, which should be considered in assessment of community benefits of stewardship contracting.	In the response to comments, point out that regarding stewardship contracting, the committee feels that it is a valuable tool with myriad benefits. The committee is focused only on the 7%. Katherine Medlock	Heartwood comments
Katherine Medlock	26	Outreach	Dialogue	[Outreach efforts discussed during the meeting]	Conference call with Roger McCoy	[Outreach efforts discussed during the meeting]
Katherine Medlock/Josh Kelley	27	Outreach	Dialogue	[Outreach efforts discussed during the meeting]	Discussion with David Mounger	[Outreach efforts discussed during the meeting]
Katherine Medlock	28	Outreach	Dialogue	[Outreach efforts discussed during the meeting]	Discussion with the Southern Environmental Law Center	[Outreach efforts discussed during the meeting]
Katherine Medlock and Steve Simon	29	Outreach	Dialogue	[Outreach efforts discussed during the meeting]	Discussion with Perrin de Jong	[Outreach efforts discussed during the meeting]
Katherine Medlock and Josh Kelley	30	Graphics	Response	Photos of forest conditions are needed.	Indicate that the request to add photos has been addressed in the document and refer commenters to those sections.	Explanation items list (From K. Medlock summary of Mounger’s telephone call)
Katherine Medlock	31	Logging and Timber Management	Response	Three comments regarding logging and timber management.	Steve Simon has drafted a response. This is largely done, but there is some disagreement.	Explanation items list (From Richard Foster and TNHP, pg. 1)
Katherine Medlock	32	Wilderness	Response	Wilderness is not mentioned in the report.	This is beyond the scope of the project.	Explanation items list (from Richard Foster)
Katherine Medlock	33	Wilderness	Response	Wilderness is not mentioned in the report.	Steve Simon suggests a map showing where restoration is being considered, so that it’s clear that the whole forest is not being considered for these management practices. Use a chart to show the same information so that it is not specific. This is included in tabular form, along with a map, in the appendices. This has been addressed. Refer readers to this appendix in the active/passive management discussion in the comments.	Explanation items list (from Richard Foster)

Skeo Solutions	34	Fire	Response	Burning 20,000-30,000 acres/year occurs despite the fact that natural fires occur at a rate of 0-3 per year (based on 10 years of CNF data obtained via FOIA).	Response to concerns about fire will refer to the biophysical settings model.	Explanation items list (From Foster Levy)
Katherine Medlock	35	Active/Passive Management	Report	Five comments were related to this topic.	Address these comments in the document itself and will omit \$30,000,000 from the report.	Explanation items list (From SELC et.al.; pp 2 and 4, Perrin de Jong)
Skeo Solutions	36	Active/Passive Management	Response	Five comments were related to this topic.	A reference to the forest plan guidelines should be made in reference to sedimentation and other impacts. The forest plan has guidelines for reducing those impacts.	Explanation items list (From SELC et.al.; pp 2 and 4, Perrin de Jong)
Katherine Medlock	37	Active/Passive Management	Response	Five comments were related to this topic.	Josh Kelley has drafted language to address items 1 through 3. Take that language, thank commenters, and refer readers to changes to language in report.	Explanation items list (From SELC et.al.; pp 2 and 4, Perrin de Jong)
Steve Simon	38	Old Growth	Response	Four comments were related to this topic.	Josh Kelley will draft response to comments. The points will be addressed in the following way: <u>1. Refer to s-classes and biodiversity document drafted by Josh Kelley. That</u>	Explanation items list (From SELC pp 4 and 10, RGS pg 2)
Katherine Medlock	39	Cost/Economics	Response	No explanation of cost-benefit analysis.	In the active versus passive management section of the comment response, explain changes made to the document and include Josh Kelley's drafted language.	Explanation items list (From SELC, pg 5)
Katherine Medlock	40	Cost/Economics	Response	Cost-benefit analysis is incomplete	In the active versus passive management section of the comment response, explain changes made to the document and include Josh Kelley's drafted language.	Explanation items list (From SELC, pg 5)
Katherine Medlock	41	Cost/Economics	Dialogue	Cost-benefit analysis is incomplete	Discuss with SELC the fact that revenues from harvesting cannot be modeled. Only the cost of implementation was evaluated.	Explanation items list (From SELC, pg 5)
Skeo Solutions	42	Watershed Level	Response	The Draft does not specify the scale at which this watershed planning should occur.	This point is addressed in the document. Refer to the document in the response to public comment.	Explanation items list (From SELC, pg 8)
	43	Monitoring	Response	Three comments regarding this topic.	The response will explain that the committee understands the limitations of working with models. Phrases in the response could include: this was the best-available information, need adaptive management, watershed approach, ground-truthing, reference conditions, etc.	Explanation items list (From SELC, pp 8 and 9; TNHP, page 3)
	44	Model	Response	Point #1	The committee used biophysical settings models and ___ for departure, which is the best available information and the committee reached consensus on using these models. We consulted with various experts on this issue, and they did not reach a consensus, but their recommendations were considered.	Explanation items list (From SELC, pp 8 and 9)
Katherine Medlock and Steve Simon	45	Model	Dialogue	Point #2	This is a very technical Heritage program question that Steve will discuss with them.	Explanation items list (From TNHP, page 2)
Skeo Solutions	46	Model	Response	Point #2	The definition of "ecological systems" used in this document is different than that used by the Heritage program. We have discussed this with them in more depth in personal conversations.	Explanation items list (From TNHP, page 2)
Skeo Solutions	47	Model	Response	Point #3	See document for an explanation of BPS models.	Explanation items list (Perrin de Jong, pg 1,2)

Skeo Solutions	48	Model	Response	Point #4	The committee used the best available information. These data were augmented with additional information where available to address the potential failings in the ____ database. This is explained in the methodology. The data will be revisited at the watershed level as part of the analysis process. The committee asked the FS to update the data before the study began.	Explanation items list
Skeo Solutions	49	Model	Response	Point #5	The committee used the best available information.	Explanation items list (Perrin de Jong, pg. 2, 3).
Skeo Solutions	50	Model	Response	Point #6	See the monitoring section. Regulation is beyond the scope of the committee. The committee recommends monitoring and evaluation.	Explanation items list (Perrin de Jong, pg. 3).
Katherine Medlock	51	Model	Response	Point #7	The committee is using proxies, but that is a factor of working at the landscape scale, not a lack of attention to detail. The committee is not trying to decrease biodiversity. This is already in the report. Thank you for your comment, which has been addressed here: page X.	Explanation items list (Perrin de Jong, pg. 4).
Geoff Call	52	Endangered Species	Report	State the intent of the recommendation with more clarity.	Draft clarified language.	Explanation items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 11).
Skeo Solutions	53	Endangered Species	Response	State the intent of the recommendation with more clarity.	Thank you for your comment. We have clarified this - see page X.	Explanation items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 11).
Steve Simon	54	Gaps/Disturbances	Response	Point #1	This is a very good point in terms of a potential flaw in the model, but the committee still sees the model as a useful tool, despite this shortcoming.	Explanation items list (RGS pg. 2)
Steve Simon	55	Gaps/Disturbances	Response	Point #1	In the language about the LANDFIRE revisions, state that "Revisions were made to those sections of LANDFIRE BPS models that the committee felt were important to the modeling outcomes. The committee considered adjusting the age classes, but decided against it because the committee agreed that what constitutes quality early-successional habitat is different in different ecological systems. Therefore the BPS models were likely more accurate than those differentiated solely by age. This was an un-reviewed model. The committee had the same questions. Diameters have no impact on the model runs."	Explanation items list (RGS pg. 2)
Skeo Solutions	56	Gaps/Disturbances	Response	Point #2	Committee members noted that they have reviewed science on the need for openings used for wildlife [from RGS] but they were not specific for cove forest. That subcommittee had long discussions on the issue of the size of openings and did develop language all could agree upon but it was a compromise. Also report has language on the location and arrangement of openings, slope etc.	Explanation items list (RGS pg. 2)
Katherine Medlock	57	Gaps/Disturbances	Response	Point #3	Refer to language in forest pests & pathogens section, that each one deserves time and attention, but that is beyond the scope of this project. The	Explanation items list (RGS pg. 2)
Katherine Medlock	58	Cove Forest	Response	Point #1	The committee expects specific restoration objectives for each project that take into account the condition of the herbaceous layer. Refer to any changes to the document that result from today's discussion in the response to comments. {Added later in the day: Note that this is a small part of the forest, referring to the Cove Forest language. Specific monitoring programs will be developed at the watershed level.}	Explanation items list (TNHP, pg. 5).

Katherine Medock	59	Cove Forest	Response	Points #2 & 3	The consensus position of the committee is that restoration of cove forests can be accelerated with active management in some cases.	Explanation items list (TNHP, pg. 4).
Skeo Solutions	60	Riparian	Response	Point #1	The committee agrees that beavers are important in riparian habitats.	Explanation items list (Perrin de Jong, pg. 5)
Skeo Solutions	61	Miscellaneous	Response	Points #3 - #5	Because CNF and the committee do not have information on the current condition of private lands, they were not considered.	Explanation items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 10; Perrin de Jong page 3).
Katherine Medlock with Terry Porter's review.	62	Herbaceous/shrub layer	Report change	Point #1	Monitor the herbaceous layer in high value cover, species rich cove systems with high diversity.	Discussion items list (From Richard Foster.)
Skeo Solutions	63	Herbaceous/shrub layer	Response	Point #1	Refer to language in the Cove Forest section, "Protecting and increasing the native diversity of flora and fauna found in Cove Forests should be a primary goal when managing the vegetation of these systems."	Discussion items list (From Richard Foster.)
Skeo Solutions	64	Timber Management/Logging/Marketability	Response	Point #1	Tulip issue is addressed in Steve Simon's uncharacteristic discussion. Refer to that language.	Discussion items list (From Richard Foster.)
Mark Shelley	65	Timber Management/Logging/Marketability	Report change	Point #1	Change the language to: Resulting from farm abandonment and lack of proper forest management, including unsustainable harvesting and uncontrolled fire prior to National Forest ownership. Josh Kelley proposed that this language be polished and agree to via email.	Discussion items list (From Richard Foster.)
Skeo Solutions	66	Timber Management/Logging/Marketability	Report change	Point #2	Change the language from "should" produce marketable products to "could." Note that revenue was calculated, so it was not part of the modeling process.	Discussion items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 2)
Katherine Medlock	67	Timber Management/Logging/Marketability	Report change	Point #3	These efforts are targeting unnatural, uncharacteristic conditions, not natural conditions.	Discussion items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 3)
Josh Kelley	68	Timber Management/Logging/Marketability	Report change	Point #4	Remove "\$30,000,000" from the section.	Discussion items list (From SELC et.al; pg.3).
Katherine Medlock	69	NEPA	Report change	Point #1	: Strike the second recommendation. Mark Shelley will draft a new recommendation about the goal of streamlining the process through early engagement by consensus and collaboration.	Discussion items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 3)
Skeo Solutions	70	NEPA	Response	Point #1	Thank you for your comment, see rewording on page 27.	Discussion items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 3)
Katherine Medlock	71	MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES/PRIORITIZATION	Report change	General discussion regarding whether the committee should prioritize recommendations or not.	Change the numbers to bullets.	Discussion items list

Katherine Medlock	72	MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES/PRIORITIZATION	Response	Points 1 through 7	Point 2 was discussed earlier in the day. Insert some language about using reference conditions at the site-specific scale whenever possible. Use LANDFIRE models to determine that natural range of variability. In response to point 3, add the statement: "because of this, the committee changed numbers to bullets to clarify that there is no prioritization." In response to point number 7, add the response that the Forest Plan will not allow this.	Discussion items list
Katherine Medlock	73	Monitoring/Adaptive Management	Report change	Point #1	Add points 1, 2, and 3 from the comment to the language of the monitoring and adaptive management section in the report. See notes for tracked changes to comment language.	Discussion items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 7).
Katherine Medlock	74	Monitoring/Adaptive Management	Response	Point #1	Thank you for your comment. See page X.	Discussion items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 7).
Katherine Medlock	75	Active/Passive Management	Response	Point #1	Reference the management strategies workbook appendix.	Discussion items list
Katherine Medlock	76	Gap Size/Natural Disturbances	Report change	Point #1	In the monitoring section, add language about small gaps in old growth forest. Recommend tracking it remotely not counting it; label it as openings less than 2 acres in size.	Discussion items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 9, 10).
Katherine Medlock	77	Biomass	Response	Point #1	The committee is not trying to create a demand that the FS will have to supply, but to make restoration efforts more financially feasible and to get projects done that would not otherwise be done. Refer to the language in the report.	Discussion items list (From SELC et.al; pg. 11).
Josh Kelley	78	Data/Mapping Methodology/Model	response	Point #1	Josh Kelley will draft.	Discussion items list (RGS pg 2).