

Cherokee National Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative

Q1 How did you hear about this survey?

Answer Options

	Response Percent	Response Count
Colleague sent me an email or told me	64.9%	124
At a public workshop in October	8.4%	16
From a mailing from the Forest Service	18.3%	35
In the newspaper	0.5%	1
Other	7.9%	15
Other (please specify)	17	17
	answered question	191
	skipped question	1

Q2 Please tell us about yourself – what group(s) do you represent?

Answer Options

	Response Percent	Response Count
Resident (not a forest landowner)	34.6%	66
Forest landowner	23.0%	44
Environmental or conservation organization	31.4%	60
Sportsmen organization (hunting, fishing)	16.2%	31
Forest Industry (logger, mill operator etc)	2.1%	4
Academic (professor or researchers)	9.9%	19
State natural resource agency	3.7%	7
Federal natural resource agency	18.3%	35
Local government	0.5%	1
Recreation group (rafting, hunting guide etc.)	16.8%	32
Other (please describe)	9.4%	18
Other (please specify)	24	24
	answered question	191
	skipped question	1

Q3 I agree that the USFS can benefit from the collective wisdom and ideas of a diverse group of stakeholders for establishing restoration goals.

Answer Options

	Response Percent	Response Count
I agree with fully with this statement.	68.1%	111
I agree partially.	27.0%	44
I do not agree.	4.9%	8
If you do not agree, please say why not.	14	14
	answered question	163
	skipped question	29

Q4 Are you aware that the Cherokee Forest is in need of restoration?

Answer Options

	Response Percent	Response Count
No, not aware.	6.7%	11
Yes, somewhat aware.	29.4%	48
Very aware.	58.9%	96
I don't think restoration is needed.	4.9%	8
Optional comments:	18	18
	answered question	163
	skipped question	29

Q5 If you use the forest, please tell us in what ways you use or enjoy the Cherokee (check all that apply).

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Recreation (hiking, biking, camping, horseback)	85.0%	136
Wildlife watching (birding, photography etc)	61.3%	98
Hunting	37.5%	60
Timber supply	13.1%	21
Non-timber forest products (collect mushrooms, ginseng, moss)	12.5%	20
Other (please describe)	18.8%	30
Other (please specify)	32	32
	<i>answered question</i>	160
	<i>skipped question</i>	32

Q6 Whether or not you actually use the forest, please tell us why you think it is an important resource (rank in priority order).

Answer Options	Most important function	Next highest function	Third highest function	Fourth highest function	Least important function	Response Count
Timber supply	13	10	20	18	95	156
Clean water	81	46	12	12	2	153
Wildlife habitat	48	73	29	8	1	159
Recreation	6	16	63	58	11	154
Aesthetics (views, appearance)	12	11	32	55	46	156
Other (please specify)					17	17
					<i>answered question</i>	163
					<i>skipped question</i>	29

Q7 The CNFLRI will be recommending habitat needs for the Forest Service but they will not be recommending changes in designations or uses for areas. Projects to restore the forest will be developed and managed by the US Forest Service. Please rank the following habitats by level of importance for the forest -- which habitats are most urgent to address first for restoration?

Answer Options	Most important	Second most important	Third most important	Fourth most important	Response Count
Streams, wetlands and other aquatic habitats	69	53	31	4	157
Game wildlife species habitat needs	29	25	28	77	159
Forest habitats (general)	35	37	68	20	160
Rare habitats (bogs etc.)	27	42	30	55	154
Other (please specify)					12
				answered question	163
				skipped question	29

Q8 There are several factors that may impact the Cherokee National Forest now and in the future. Following is a list of possible threats. Please rank them in order of importance.

Answer Options	High potential to impact forest	Some potential to impact forest	Low potential to impact forest	Response Count
Incompatible road construction (roads in wrong place, poor construction, road erosion)	83	53	21	157
Incompatible forestry practices (forestry impacting other uses)	75	49	27	151
Invasive species (Hemlock woolly adelgid, gypsy moth, emerald ash borer)	131	18	6	155
Tree diseases such as blight	94	48	5	147
Altered Fire Regime (fire suppression or changes to normal fire intervals)	45	75	25	145
Climate Change	54	52	43	149
Others?	26	5	6	37
Other (please specify)				35
			<i>answered question</i>	163
			<i>skipped question</i>	29

Q9 For those areas that you identified as threats above (in question #8), please describe what you feel may be the greatest obstacles for overcoming those threats. For example, more funding may be needed for restoration work, or an invasive species may be very difficult to control.

Answer Options	Response Count
	118
<i>answered question</i>	118
<i>skipped question</i>	74

Q10 Have you been engaged in past public processes for forest planning in the northern Cherokee National Forest?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	48.5%	79
No	52.1%	85
	<i>answered question</i>	163
	<i>skipped question</i>	29

Q11 If you answered yes to the prior question, was the process worthwhile -- did you feel your input or contribution was useful and valued?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
No	23.5%	19
Yes	43.2%	35
Unsure	33.3%	27
Please add comments to describe what you did or did not like about the public engagement process (please specify)		37
	<i>answered question</i>	81
	<i>skipped question</i>	111

Q12 Would you like to be engaged in this public involvement process for the CNFLRI?

Answer Options

Yes please keep me informed of upcoming meetings and events sponsored by the CNFLRI.

Response Percent

60.7%

Response Count

99

No please do not contact me.

39.3%

64

If you answered yes, please provide you name, street address, city, state and zip code, email and phone number so we can add you to our mailing list.

81

81

answered question

163

skipped question

29

Q13 Please comment on your goals for a restored Cherokee National Forest. What would you like to see happen if the forest were in better shape (restored to a more healthful ecological balance).

Answer Options

Response Count

112

answered question

112

skipped question

80

How did you hear about this survey? Other:
Also from a USFS mailing as we border the NF
Catherine Murray
Catherine Murry
Cherokee Forest Voices email
direct email
direct email
email
e-mail
email from forest service
enewsletter
link
mailing from CNFLR\$
on steering committee
On team
online
Sierra club member sent it out
Son volunteers at US forestry office

Please tell us about yourself -- what group(s) do you represent? Other:
Appalachian Mtns Joint Venture, a regional partnership of fed & state agencies and non-profit orgs
atv enthusiast
Back Country Horsemen
Biological Consulting
Birding, Butterfly and Dragonfly watching/photo groups
Cherokee NF adjacent land owner
conservation organizations
Forest surveyor & assessor
Forester
Have cabin on Lower Paint Creek, Greene County
hiker, camper, horseback rider (trails)
Hiker, carpenter, woodworker, gardener
hunter concerned that future generations can't enjoy the grouse hunting that i did.
I work for US Congressman John Duncan
I'm interested in preserving the forest.
Landowner whose property abuts the forest
local and state bird clubs
Note by Forest Landowner - "Contiguous"; Long term (20 years) activity working to keep CNF contributing highest value to my community.
our 116 acres adjoins cherokee forest
outdoor enthusiast
part time farmer, lover of the outdoors, wildlife, hunting, fishing, etc
public
Student, seasonal employee of federal agency
trail maintainer, avid hiker, backpacker

I agree that the USFS can benefit from the collective wisdom and ideas of a diverse group of stakeholders for establishing restoration goals. If you do not agree, please say why not.
"can" is not "will".
Bankers and timber companies have no right to our public lands. Period.
Collective wisdom is great, but there must be agreement on certain tenets upfront to avoid road blocks later.
depends on who is involved and how much
For example, I do not think timber management or mining interests would have the interests of "recovery" at heart.
I agree with this statement, but would wish to add to it: ". . . establishing restoration goals that are scientifically supported and ecologically appropriate for the CNF."
I am pessimistic that a diverse group of shareholders can agree on goals beyond their specific interest. The process is likely to become one of dividing the forest into segments to segregate conflicting goals.
In my experience, far too often self-proclaimed "conservation" groups dominate public comment opportunities, and have learned long ago how to "game the system" so as to drown out the opinions shared by local sportsmen--hunters and fishermen--and campers.
Meeting accomplish nothing.
Some extremists are associated with certain conservation groups.
Stakeholder input is valuable but shouldn't trump science.
The concept and plan of forest restoration as employed is ecologically false to many cooks in the soup and we do want we want to
You have to be careful about the motives of groups, whether their interest is in the well being of the forest, plants, animals, air, water, and communities, or only in their own pocket book.

Are you aware that the Cherokee Forest is in need of restoration? Optional comments:
depends on what restoration means. can't be a guise to hide the same old timber sale program under another name, ie greenwashing.
I didn't realize what an impact restoration made until we didn't do it for many years. I'm 53 yr old now and can look back in just my lifetime and see the change from 70's and early 80's when lots of grouse were in our forests and now we can hardly find one.
I totally disagree with the efforts of some in the Congress to increase the amount of land designated as Wilderness Areas.
I use national forests in other states because of the state of Cherokee forests and have not used in the last several years.
I work For TDEC and with the Ruffed Grouse and Quail Unltd - We have worked together with a seeding project in the Hickory Tree area.
I'd like to see the elimination of invasive species, though I do not agree with a high level of spraying, burning, or logging.
I've made official recommendations for it.
Maintain a healthy forest cover Improve wildlife habitat Control invasive species
Monocultures resulting from past management -- primarily pine plantations, off-site pine and old clearcuts that came back almost entirely in poplar or just a few other tree species. Fire- recognizing more research is needed on fire and where it might be appropriate. Lack of monitoring Hemlock wooly adelgid (HWA) Pine Bark Beetle Gypsy moth Dogwood anthracnose Emerald ash borer Balsam wooly adelgid Invasive species Roads in the riparian area, Unmanaged recreation in the riparian area Sediment in streams from roads or disturbance Outlaw roads Outlaw trails Blocked culverts Blocked fish passage. Damage to habitat of rare communities Incompatible road construction Incompatible forestry practices Climate Change Fragmentation of the forest Blocked migration paths Habitat loss
My awareness of the USFS pushing this does not mean I think that whatever restroation means to the FS is needed or not needed. It is not much different than Smoky Bear, 1,200 acre clear cuts and other concepts that the FS makes a high priority only to trash when it comes to wanting funding for control burning and certain timber harvest and hunting priorities.
please see submission to Department of Justice Office of Special Counsel, June, 2003
The 2003 plan for the Cherokee says 4-10% should be in early sucesional habitat. This will never be attained by cutting 500 acres/yr. in 650,000 acre forest.
The forest knows better than we do. Humans spoil everything they touch. Leave the forest alone. Greed has destroyed what nature has shared with us.
THis is due to logging and loss of original habitats, right?
To the USFS, restoration always means burn and cut. the forest needs to have simte to mature without current destrucutive practices such as controlled burns, herbiciding, and timbering
We are most concerned about the loss of the Hemlock tree species and the overall impact to the forest, creeks and streams
We need more young forest with wildlife clearings for species that require the early successional forest. Much of the forest is to old and does not provide for the wildlife. We have a mature forest with very little wildlife using this old forest. There needs to be a balance.
Yes I am aware CNF has fallen grossly negligent in its timber management of the forest which has stunted wildlife population growth due to lack of early successional habitat growth and native grasses

If you use the forest, please tell us in what ways you use or enjoy the Cherokee (check all that apply). Other:
atv trail
biological / ecological research opportunities
Blueberries. Huckleberries. Greenbriar....
botany
Conservation of migratory bird populations--help USFS think about their role in regional bird conservation, and how each NF fits into that picture. I would use the area for hunting, recreation, and wildlife watching if I lived there!
Conservation of natural resources and observation/study
Enjoyment of the mountain forest viewscape along roads, streams and from various vantage points
fire wood
fishing
Fishing
fishing
fishing
Fishing
Fishing.
hiking
I value the forest for its own sake, what it does, as opposed to what people do - which is entirely another matter.
inventory of rare plants and animals for the TDEC
Listening
occasional firewood (with permission)
OHV- ATV and off-road motorcycles
OHV use
Partnering in restoration & management of rare communities
privacy, beauty,
Research
research on reptiles, observing climate change/erratic weather effects
trail maintenance
trail maintenance - BentonMackaye
Viewing its wonder
white water rafting and creek boating
whitewater rafting on Pigeon River
Wilderness therapy
Wildlife Habitat

Whether or not you actually use the forest, please tell us why you think it is an important resource (rank in priority order). Comments:
*In this case wildlife includes all native species (plants, animals, fungi, etc) and their habitat
Carbon sequestration
clean air
Cutting trees not necessarily for wood supply, but to improve the health and vigor of the forest area.
don't like the limited choices: #1 the forest ecosystems etc. have intrinsic values of their own that don't depend on human perceptions of importance
I don't like the catagories for this question, makes the last two seem that one considers them meaningless. The question should just be rank 1 thru 5, not 'least important function. All of these are important, very important, but they have to be prioritized as does anything else. In no way am I saying recreation is least important function of the forest, it is just ranked below these other four catagories.
It is after all intended to be a forest, not a tree farm
It is difficult to rank water quality, wildlife habitat (which should be framed more broadly as native fish, wildlife and plants and their habitats) and recreation above or below one another. They are all very important, and scenery is a component of many high-quality recreation experiences.
More well maintained bike and OHV trails
Non-game wildlife should not take a backseat to game
Note: considerable overlap among categories, e.g., esthetics & recreation
Protection of rare natural communities, rare species, and exemplary "common" naturral communities, and natural ecological dynamics
Soil preservation is not mentioned but tied to the clean-water function. Soul lost from the slopes washes into streams, to the benefit of neither. Top-grading has taken the best timber. Most of the current standing timber is low quality, immature trees and poor-grade species. Selective cutting for stand improvement would improve stand quality. Other management practices exacerbate degradation.
The most important resource is watershed functioning; that is, the ability to store water and release it slowly over time.
This is an unfair rating system.
This ranking is absurd.
Used as an example of good management

The CNFLRI will be recommending habitat needs for the Forest Service but they will not be recommending changes in designations or uses for areas. Projects to restore the forest will be developed and managed by the US Forest Service. Please rank the following habitats by level of importance for the forest -- which habitats are most urgent to address first for restoration? Comments:

Again, an unfair rating system.

Again, this ranking system is absurd. The forest ecosystem must be considered for what it does/is, what it wants to grow/be, as opposed to what we want from it, in some absurd rank order. What nonsense "management!"

all are urgent

Are you counting hogs as game? Their decrease should be a priority.

don't like the limited choices: #1 the forest ecosystems etc. have intrinsic values of their own that don't depend on human perceptions of importance

Ecologists' recommendations based on habitat assessments should outweigh a popularity poll.

Game wildlife needs can easily be incorporated into forest habitat and stream/wetland habitat needs, if planned correctly and education to users provided

I believe the habitats of streams, rare habitats and forest habitats to all be most important but survey would not let me rank them that way.

isn't that what we're doing now so your LRI is just a new spin word

Native Brook trout

upland early successional

wildlife should possibly be the most important as it has been overlooked for over a decade

There are several factors that may impact the Cherokee National Forest now and in the future. Following is a list of possible threats. Please rank them in order of importance based on their potential to harm the Cherokee now or in the near future (5-10 years). If you are unsure about a particular threat, please leave blank. You also have the opportunity to identify new issues in the other category. If you select "other" please describe the issue. Other:

abuse & overuse of roads & trails by motor vehicles, especially ATVs, and horses
Again absurd. False conclusion based upon false assumptions (i.e., "When did you stop beating your wife, criminal?" For instance: "Altered Fire Regime (fire suppression or changes to normal fire intervals." What absolutel nonsense. There is NO FIRE REGIME in Eastern North America. What there is is heavily funded Forest Service Fire Program, which program constitutes 48% of the Forest Service budget and 55% of the CNF budget. No other reality than that.
Again, why is a poll of the uneducated useful here? Or is this a test to see how much the public knows?
ATV/4wheeler erosion; Uncontrolled Kudzu growth
Energy production (wind, biomass, fossil fuels, etc.)
Expanding Wilderness Areas will eventually drive users and taxpayers from the forest altogether.
Government
Government oversight.
Illega ORV use on the forest
Illegal ORV usage, poaching, and intensive recreation (even hiking, mtn biking, camping)
illegal use of 4-wheelers and motorcycles and inconsiderate hunters who leave trash around etc.
illegal vehicles and construction near FS boundary
impact from prior ownership mis-management as well as past forest service mis-management.
Incompatible recreational uses
Kudzo
Lack of ability to manage because of difficulty of planning.
Lack of habitat manipulation and stand age
lack of harvest of timber and fire suppression have negatively impacted much needed openings on CNF
Lack of management activities is resulting in a stagnant, dying forest that is not providing quality habitat and is by definition NOT SUSTAINABLE.
lack of management, thinking mostly of thinnings to encourage diverse forest structure (promote understory and midstory) and large-scale use of fire in fire-adapted systems.
Lack of Managment
logging (timber) STOP
Motorized off road recreation vehicles
off-road vehicles
ORV use - illegal trails, damage to water resources, plant & animal life
Over use by visitors/ horse use in hiking areas
Overuse or misuse of sensitive areas by recreational users.
Proposed re-route of Hwy 64 around Ocoee River Gorge
Ridgetop clearing of trees
Soil loss

the FS fire data is remarkably skewed with heavy emphasis placed on and extrapolations made from limited science that is usually done elsewhere (i.e. the western US fire models don't work very well in the east; Coweeta does not represent the north CNF); prescribed burning threatens many natural communities... the "soft science" monitoring of the burn program(s) needs to be strengthened to address the non-woody plants

There has been little if any management allowed on the forest for many years. The biggest factor facing the forest is the lack of diversity in the forest..

Timber extraction

Timber harvesting; Altering habitat to benefit hunters.

USFS beaurocratic entanglements

For those areas that you identified as threats above (in question #8), please describe what you feel may be the greatest obstacles for overcoming those threats. For example, more funding may be needed for restoration work, or an invasive species may be very difficult to control.

#1 - poor planning; #2 - poor planning; #3 - insufficient resources; #4 insufficient resources; #5 -prescribed fires too hot, do unexpected damage; #6 - lack of will to diminish use of fossil fuels

(in question #6) Residential development adjacent to CNF

(Incompat road...) Roads by their nature are incompatible with forest. There is no right place no matter how well constructed - roads create erosion. (Incompat forestry..) The agency is unwilling or unable to monitor logging operations to ensure that the rules we have are followed. (Invasives) The forest is resilient, don't cut it down to save it. (Climate Change) Mature forest mitigates climate change. It does so best when left alone. (Other) Great public pressure to legalie ORV use in teh forest or create laws to make the forest more vulnerable to illegal ORV incursion.

1. bureaucracy, mismanagement (lack of funds) 2. " 3. " 4. " 5. " 6. "

Actually imcompatible road construction lacks only the will of the USFS to build and keep open fewer roads; same for forestry practices; the invasive species issue is more difficult.

As always, it comes down to money. The entire system for acquiring money for restoration needs to be overhauled.

beating the invasives after they have taken hold on the southern landscape.

Both examples apply; commercial interests/lobbyists may compete with USFS goals

Climate change and its accompanying invasive species may be very hard to overcome, but we must try.

Compatible proper road construction is needed as demonstration. Good Forestry should be beneficial to wildlife. Invasive species and diseases (TCD and EAB)are a huge threat. I am on the fence about fire in hardwoods on the forest.

disease and invasives are very hard to control.

education

educattion of public/law makers/activists

enforce grade elevation of roads requires more teeth in the laws to prevent developers from abusing the land

EVERY AMIMAL SPECIES NEEDS SESSIONAL AREAS OF GROWTH.The forest needs a mixture of all stages of growth. A totally mature stand of forest benefits nothing. SELECTIVE CUTTING & opening the canopy is most important

Expanding Wilderness Areas will eventually drive users and taxpayers from the forest altogether. US Forests are NOT National Parks; increasingly, I worry that more and more people are conflating National Forests with National Parks. There is a good reason for the USFS to be managed under the Dept of Agriculture

extractive attitudes

Finding good companies that will do road maintenance correctly. Push for more productive stands. Lack of community support for burning. The ever increasing CO2 emissions. Supported by the Keeling curve.

Finding sustainable answers to invasive species will take a great deal of time and experimentation, all of which will cost money. Contractors harvesting timber need to be carefully monitored to insure that roads are properly permitted, constructed and maintained. Runoff from cut-over areas and new roads need to be fully compliant with erosion and sediment control plans and best practices.

for us to get off our ass actions speak louder than words and this survey

Forest Service Budget Structure

Forestry management influenced by politics and or public opinion.

Forestry operations must be done in such a way that 5 years after cutting it would be difficult to tell logging had occurred. Invasive species must be rigorously quarantined and where possible treated. Research should be supported to understand the causes and cures.

funding

FUNDING

funding

Funding

funding

funding a complete solution to invasive species
Funding and human greed. Logging and hunting interests are overrepresented by the very steering committee putting out this survey! Very disappointed!
Funding and lack staff.
Funding and the inability to react in a timely manner due to planning timelines.
Funding by the Federal Government and concern by the public.
Funding for invasive pest treatment
funding for treatments and labor to apply will limit response to invasive species and diseases
Funding will always be the issue. Most important will be the funding to pay the salaries of FS personnel. Congress only provides funds to manage vegetation so the agency only gets paid to cut trees or burn them. When that is your source of income, every restoration project is likely to include one or the other, whether appropriate or not. We will not do restoration projects. We will do timber projects, road projects, fire projects, etc. in the name of restoration.
Funding, funding, funding:) Capacity of USFS staff, climate change is too broad with difficult measures of how to protect, etc...
Funding, general environmental degradation (air and water pollution). Need to separate eastern forests from western in management decisions-they are so different. Outdated habits of thinking.
funding, outdated agency accomplishment systems, employee training
funding. entrenched forest service mentality biased towards providing timber at any cost. intransigence of forest service staff in looking at different ways of doing things. undue influence of timber industry and single-species focused game groups.
funding/ need a restoration BLI
Funds to overcome problems in forest.
Government contracts with fully-ensconced private lobbyists and contractors, i.e. timber and paper companies, and unwittingly subsidized by the American taxpayer. Highly funded hunting groups that skew the forest toward their personal uses.
Greatest threat is public attitude to cutting trees. Trees must be cut, using BMP's, to maintain diversity in stand age structure, species composition, and especially to keep the forest in a healthy and vibrant condition. That is not now the case on the CNF.
I believe climate change will be the most challenging problem facing mankind because it goes against most ways of making money, and thats what most people rank highest.
If the gypsy moths come to the forest it will be devastatng! I've lived through 3 years of gypsy moth infestation and it almost destroyed the woods. It would destroy my business!
Illegal use of roads and trails by atv's
In general, invasive species are difficult to control except by manual labor; however, some at least can be controlled if not eliminated by minimizing disturbance to the canopy and the forest floor. Tree diseases need long-term research with consistent funding. Large-scale timbering operations are incompatible with southern Appalachian forests. Forests in this region function best through gap dynamics, with no more than 2% of the forest disturbed per year. Adapting to climate change will require the existence of unbroken N-S habitat corridors.
incompatible road construction and forestry practices are hard to overcome... Listen to reason and if compromise is necessary please be open to it. Not everyone will be happy with the results. We have to take care of the forests because it needs our help. We need some funding to help it along.
Invasive species (Hemlock wooly adelgid, gypsy moth, emerald ash borer) These are able to be controled. They all have natural enemies.
invasive species control is not possible Forest does not prescribe burn enough
Invasive species hard to control
invasive species may be very difficult and expensive to control. Smokey Bear is a tough outreach tool to overcome when trying to reintroduce fire to the landscape. more funding is always needed for restoration work.
Invasive species will no over run forest lands quickly if a control plan is not developed and executed.
Invasives are difficult to control and continue to spread from other peoples property
invasives can be controlled on FS but they are all over private lands that act as a seed bank
Invasives, eg the wooly adelgid, are hard to combat. Federal funding and other external issues (safety, economy, etc), influence transportation planning.

knowledge and funding for control of invasive pests and diseases, also a change in understanding of people about these, and about climate change and its impacts.
Lack of basic knowledge of the ecology of forest systems.
Lack of consensus on needs and lack of funding.
Lack of funding and manpower are the greatest obstacles. This includes the need for more funding to address certain issues (such as invasive species and diseases), as well as the more general problem of the Forest having to rely on timber receipts in for a large part of their funding. As long as the forest budget is tied to timber productions, some portion of the high quality forests will be at risk. Lack of public education and awareness of sensitive issues is another problem.
lack of funding, general public apathy
Lack of permanent full-time employees.
lack of sufficient funding is always the biggest threat to the protection of the forest
Lawsuits for cutting timber by preservation organizations...
lobbying by motorized recreational users, horse groups, & timber interests. Note - use restriction is very cost-effective: just close the roads or trails
logging and logging road building
Made up data by biased researchers. Too much eye aesthetics based decisions taken into consideration by uneducated.
Management FOR timber which might include fire management, destructive road building, incompatible forestry practices. Also, lack of, or need for, more funding to combat invasive species and tree blight.
Methods for controlling some invasive species not identified or minimally effective.
Money and politics
More funding
More funding and conservation laws; more designated wilderness; Keep the horses and other transportation limited
More funding needed
More funding needed for restoration, MONITORING and invasive species control.
My farm - 116 acres - has been greatly damaged in last 10 years by major 100 year flood that lasted 10 days - completely changed creek bed - also by supervised forestry burn which got out of control - like to see oaks replanted in cleared land where (illegible)
Need oversight on road construction/funding; limited access or alternate areas for 4wheelers; funding for continued vigilance for kudzu
NO Forest Regeneration
Nonnative forest pests are very difficult to deal with and keep coming in greater variety and number
Not enough funding and personnel to do the work. Time it takes presently for planning (NEPA) and the conflicts associated with this.
Off forest infestation of Kudzu which encroaches on forest lands.
Opposition to harvesting activity or invasive insect treatments
Our greatest need is better public understanding of basic ecology so that we will elect law- and policy-makers who understand impacts of decisions.
Overcome tree huggers and do what is best for the health of the forest which includes controlled timber harvest and fire
People's perception of putting fire on the landscape and understanding the good it can do.
Policy, Funding, Not using the best scientific data
Political pressure to build new roads. Resistance to recognize climate change or do anything about it.
Political will and focus are lacking.
Poorly designed roads and driveways, causing erosion. Invasive species and blights brought in unwittingly difficult to control. Too few staff.
preservation ethic of USFS and "eco-urbanites"
public pressure by industries (timber, mining) and user groups (OHV, hunters, etc).
Re: Climate Change, the obstacles are political. Regarding invasive species, it is a budget issue.
Reduced investment in roads & "decommissioning" of some roads may save funds. Costs of fighting invasive species will be high. Climate change is largely another issue, not within the purview of the NFS.
resources and no good control method
road builders, and funding

Road construction and continued logging in large patches (vs. selective logging from existing road system) and the culture of continuing these actions are probably the greatest ongoing threat to topsoil formation, continued erosion and stream restoration, and biodiversity (even of common species and resources)

Road construction determined by timber sales. Lack of funding for forest uses beyond hunting and timber. Lack of funding for Hemlock wooly adelgid, gypsy moth, emerald ash borer.

Roads tend to go where \$ takes them. Invasive species are hard and expensive to fight. An altered fire regimen may diminish the forest's health.

Salvage diseased trees and cut mature trees to inhibit blight.

sierra club and government are the obstacles in the way of properly managing forest.

spray as they do in other states

stop USFS burns in CNF close un maintained roads protect potential old growth protect old growth with stiff penalties & enforcement

That's Q 6, actually. Shortsightedness and exploitation cause canopy degradation and soil loss. Invasive species and diseases are tricky to eradicate while their hosts live. Hemlock wooly adelgid predators seem to be doing the job now but many hemlocks are already dead or dying and the predator population has not proven itself stable in the long term. Fire regime, road construction, and climate change are consequences of operational choices and vary accordingly, 2 of the 3 being controllable inside the forest.

The cost benefit for invasive species removal may be prohibitively expensive. Combating the effects of climate change may also be difficult or impossible, but we should have the forest in such a state that it has the best possible opportunity to react.

The Forest Service inability to change and remember its purpose and origin is the greatest threat and obstacle to change.

The forests need protection from extensive and destructive logging or 'controlled burns' and the sense that humans have a better management than nature. The obstacles are the people who disagree on management approaches and how much power they wield and to whom they pledge their allegiances. Tragically the invasives are almost impossible to stop and when possible, I trust the best practices will be utilized.

The greatest obstacle is educating the public on the need to do specific work. The second obstacle is getting the funding.

the greatest obstacle is not limited money and/or resources but rather the defined priorities for the limited money and resources = misplaced emphasis

The perception by preservationists that any timber harvesting is an evil thing, these could be overcome to a degree if the land activities could be certified by a 3rd party such as FSC. This is also people who love the forest deeply but are smothering it to death. Restoration work could be paid for from timber sales.

The timber industry's reluctance to stop logging in this forest and the South's drive to burn trees for electricity.

The wrong public perception of restoration practices such as clear cutting has to be overcome with good advertising of the facts.

timber sale as a forest use in Eastern mountains

too much logging for logging's sake.

Tree cutting whole forests - obstacles are money made from lumber.

Understanding of ecological impacts of various management activities

Utilizing the best scientific information with clear objectives in mind.

With a set of scientifically grounded, generally broadly supported ecological restoration goals and priorities, and clear direction to dedicate resources to implementing projects to achieve those goals, many challenges (such as securing funding, or prioritizing work on otherwise enormous tasks like treating NNIS) can be overcome. Regarding climate change, although obviously there are some uncertainties about the precise effects of climate change on forest ecosystems and species, there are "no regrets" strategies we can begin implementing now that will enhance ecosystems' and species' resilience and adaptation to the effects of climate change that we already are seeing and that are predicted.

☐ Incompatible road construction ☐ Incompatible forestry practices ☐ Invasive species ☐ Altered Fire Regime
☐ Lack of needed management actions ☐ Climate Change ☐ Availability of recreation facilities (overlooks, trails, campgrounds, roads, etc.) ☐ Forest Service Budget constraints Lack of a Transportation analysis of every road
Old or wrong CISC data (inventory of what trees are on the forest/ age class and other information) which does not reflect what is on the ground Botanical evaluations not done well Lack of knowledge sharing Lack of monitoring Need to address the more controversial issues on a broader (Southern Appalachian) scale, not being done. Lack of adaptive management Research needs Funding Understanding the science and keeping current

Please add comments to describe what you did or did not like about the public engagement process (public meetings, mailings etc.).
a lot of talk no action
Always seems that the meetings are "for show" and the real decisions have already been made.
Because I did engage in the 1990's, I'm still involved today.
disappointed that little has been done for early succession habitats on CNF
During the last forest planning process, which culminated with the adoption of the revised forest plan in 2004, the "rolling alternative" got stuck quite early in the planning process, and many conservation groups' subsequent comments, concerns and recommendations did not seem to be meaningfully considered and addressed.
Felt the district was responsive to bird species in need of management in proposed riparian control burn. Feel too often USFS discards whatever they don't want in public input. My previous direct engagement was with unit planning in 1970s.
Forest planning process took too long. Project planning needs more local input.
I am concerned that such efforts are primarily a white-wash for predetermined forest service activities. I would love to be proven wrong on this one.
I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this survey.
I find public meetings to be basically street theater. It is not possible to provide reasoned, scientifically based comments about complex issues in a three-minute time slot. It also appears sometimes that public input is evaluated like a popularity contest - the loudest and most numerous comments receive the greatest weight.
I have been involved for years have commented for years but it still seems that no more young forest are being created...
I learned some basics of forest management
In my experience, the agency pays lip service to the people it is supposed to serve, goes through the motions and wastes our time, and then does what it planned to do in the first place. Commodity extraction always takes precedent over the other enumerated uses of the forest.
In the past I have felt the meetings would have zero impact on decision makers. It felt like meetings were a 'dog and pony show' pretending that stakeholders had a voice before the USFS would go ahead with plans to earn money they needed to self fund the agency.
insufficient public notice, terminology too technical, sense that the idea was to let people vent not to really listen
I've been employed by them and am still not sure if they'll do anything with the information they got from me. It's a top-down power structure that does not necessarily pay attention to ground conditions. They are free to ignore anything they pay me to do.
lack of forest service attention to important issues
Liked: consideration of my interests by USFS, followup with mailings. Didn't like: open hostility of competing interest groups
My input was of no value to the Forest Service. They did what they wanted to do regardless of what I said and others also.
No question I have asked has been answered with deeds. No comment I have made has been reflected in the agency's final decision. What little positive feedback I have gotten from the agency has been reverted in the final form of forest planning.
Not sure our input was "valued," but at least it was put out there.
Only a few preservationist types are usually involved and carry too much weight.
People with hidden agendas that just want to block the process because they are extremist. It is their way or no way.
Posted my comments, attended a meeting or two over the years. Sometimes we environmentalists are heard and sometimes ignored!
Public meeting
Re: DOJ Office of Special Counsel, submission 2003

rergrdfgfdg
Seemed to be well managed, diverse groups of people attended and took part
sierra club and government to rigid about old growth, need more early successional habitat
Some of the local people (I am a "local" myself)have slandered and threatened me because I was involved in some effective work on forest issues. Some previous USFS officials have seemed determined to ignore science, the law, USFS regulations, and destroy the forests in the process of poor practices cutting timber. I think it has improved a lot.
Sometime you feel a decision has been made then they ask what you think.
sometimes yes, sometimes no. generally depends on intention of forest service. if it is just to go thru the motions of public participation, then usually no. if they are truly looking for input and collaboration, then yes. latter is much rarer than former.
The antis always got their way.
the meeting I went to was very informative.
The public meeting are somewhat a waste of time. Special interest groups like "The Sierra Club" have members who are paid to attend these meetings. So, you end up having that group setting the agenda. To turn everything possible into a wilderness area.
The public process is good. The hard thing is that if a consensus plan is reached, one group could hold it all up with a lawsuit.
yes, fairly useful, but concerned about lack of expertise of some people to whom the data was given.

Please comment on your goals for a restored Cherokee National Forest. What would you like to see happen if the forest were in better shape (restored to a more healthful ecological balance).

10% of the CNF in early sucessional habitat

A mature forest producing clean water & sweeping CO2 from the air. Early succssion produced by natural processes (windthrows, deadfalls, beetle cycles). Supression of natural fire should be limited to the urban interface. Prescribed fire is not appropriate in the southern Appalachians. A forest providing habitat for all native species and mgration corridors where the species require them. I agree with the former forest (illegible) Michael Dombeck - "The National Forests are the planets' largest water utility."

A more natural shape. Void of all the logging roads that have been cut out through the years. More trails that show the vast ecosystem that is here. Restricting vehicle access on roads in the winter to reduce damage to road and drainage areas.

A restored CNF would represent large areas of accessible but not always available (for usage) protected areas. I would support very selective, highly supervised restoration logging from some existing road systems (within 100 to 300 feet of roads) and by hand within interior areas to jump-start degraded forests back toward natural conditions. This would be based on timing in the season (ie - avoiding key bird & mammal breeding seasons entirely, and primarily in winter), % slopes, monoculture stands in need of tulip poplar / pine (other) removals to release former canopy dominants, and keeping out of rare community types which are intact. Standing & fallen woody debris have been "cashed out" for the most part and thus, these features should be protected and then restored where possible.

A totally balanced forest that encompasses all the various stages of growth-new to mature. Selected areas of small cuts-25 acres using BEST forest management practices will benefit all wildlife & the overall health of the system

again, refer to my Disclosure Notice to the Department of Justice in 2003

Age class and species diversity, more emphasis on NNIS

Allow the Forest Service to spend more time managing for healthy forest that provides for game, nongame, and rare species and rare communities and less time planning.

Balanced timber harvest to create diverse habitats.

Be careful of controlled burning...the last one I know of got out of hand and came over to my side of Iron Mountain. Use of forest for recreation without destroying the forest itself. Supervised forestry projects to thin trees to allow others to reach specamun size.

Chance for the forest to become healthier with young trees growing to replace the old ones that are injured by the insect infestations.

Clean water emanating from a healthy ecosystem supporting biodiversity and healthy human recreation. No public subsidy for harvesting of forest products (reduces market bias against recycled products.)

Clear cutting on public lands should be stopped. Any timber removal should be on a sustained yield and be done using minimally invasive logging techniques such as skidding logs with mules.

Congress pass the Tennessee Wilderness Act of 2010; CNF borders our farm; would like to help in restoration but do not have knowledge or expertise. Would like more information...publications available?

Cut more timber

dsfg

Ecosystem based resource management; not just commodity based management.

Environments conducive to regrowing biological diversity of the forest. Water, wetland, wildlife protections, etc.

Every stream and waterway coming out of the forest would be pristine. The forest would be diverse with no obvious disease and human use impacts.

Every time we set foot in the woods we change it. I think that the CNF is as beautiful as the Smokies. It would bring more visitors to our area.

fewer roads, more protection for rare species and habitat. prescribed burning plans.

forest management decisions governed by sound ecological restoration principles, not a quota of trees that must be cut set by Washington or Atlanta. While single-species game/wildlife organizations have their place at the table, their influence is overwhelming. Nearly every timber project on the CNF is in some way based on providing better "habitat" for one game species or another via early successional habitat creation. This in some circumstances is a valid management goal and approach, but is often used to the exclusion of all other valid needs, especially of non-game species and what is actually in the best interests of the forests and helping create a more natural and resilient forest, not just a glorified tree farm based on short-duration rotational forestry methods that are woefully outdated but still embraced and utilized nearly exclusively by the CNF. I would like to see a more holistic approach to forest management that takes other values other than timber volume into account.

From AMJV's perspective, goal would be to restore forest habitat to sustain, and possibly increase, populations of priority migratory birds. This would likely be accomplished by restoring vertical structure and habitat diversity over a large-scale, and allowing large-scale processes to occur across the landscape (e.g., prescribed fire where appropriate, allow wildfires to 'burn ecologically' instead of suppressing them immediately if they pose no risk to human health or structures)

Harvest to provide diverse age groups over the forest for fiber and wildlife.

Healthy trees and habitat for animals.

Hemlock recovery and more wilderness areas

I am all for a healthy ecological balance. The Multiple Use Act of 1960 states that for National Forest lands, not National Park lands, the forest will be used for wood, wildlife, water, recreation, and range purposes. That means that all five of these uses must be balanced (I don't mean that all 5 have to be equally divided). I mean that all will be practiced in some manner that keeps the forest HEALTHY.

I am not convinced that control burning fully takes into consideration reptile, amphibian and small mammal populations. I'm afraid this exercise is no more than responding to some mass assumption about forest conditions and a shallow, national, broad brush to seize on that to gain funding for the USFS.

I currently use the Cherokee NF for many recreational uses. Hiking, camping, & fishing etc. This land is public land and should be maintained for all people to enjoy. It is a large task to maintain this vast area of land from all invasive species and incorrect use practices. The goal of this project must be to improve the health of the forest lands while not closing it to correct public use. We need these lands protected and managed in a way that will allow future generations to enjoy the mountains of ET & WNC. Reintroduction of species that once called this region home can then take place while still allowing public use to continue. When problem solving, we are faced with a choice. We can start with the small items first or the large ones. In the case of the CNF, the large ones must be addressed first. Invasive species, tree diseases, parasites and road erosion would be a great place to start. Please keep in mind however; this land is public land, set aside from private land for all citizens to enjoy responsibly. Closing these lands for responsible citizens to enjoy would not be beneficial. We want to see and enjoy the improvements this project is designed to address in the CNF.

I hope that restoration goals are ecologically driven rather than economically driven

I would like to see a forest managed to achieve comparable feeling to the time when whites came.

I would like to see a healthy multiple use forest where the majority of species can be enhanced through active management. We need to have forests that provide diversity for all plants and animals; for that we need a range of conditions.

I would like to see a higher level of respect offered to the forest by those who use it, which often comes out of the forest looking better, more healthy and abundant. If you drive a four wheeler into the forest and there is trash everywhere and you can see where folk have been driving in the creeks, what is to stop you doing the same? A well-maintained forest demands greater respect.

I would like to see at least 10 % of the 650,000 acres of Cherokee National Forest managed in early seral/successional age class for those species that require this type of habitat.

I would like to see emphasis--greater funding & staff time allocations--placed on restoring, maintaining & monitoring Southern Appalachian natural heritage resources, especially considering that many of these species & communities reside ONLY within the CNF & neighboring NFs. These resources are entrusted to you for their safekeeping, and this can only be accomplished through Adaptive Management. Adaptive Management can only be accomplished through monitoring.

I would like to see it managed primarily for recreation uses, which is going to be the great need as our population increases over the next decades.
I would like to see more clear cuts which can be used most economically to benefit school funding, and certain wildlife species but done with consideration of riparian ecosystems.
I would like to see more planning to restore watersheds within the forest; more wilderness areas; more effort to support sustainable uses of the forest and less emphasis on timber industry
I would like to see more wildlife habitats opened
I would like to see that the forest regains its vitality so it will be there for future generations. I think we need to maintain our forest for the aesthetic beauty and wildlife habitat it provides.
I would like to see the age classes of the Forest made more diverse.
I would like to see the American Chestnut restored to the forest. I would like to see ongoing work on suppressing or acclimating native trees to invasive insect species.
I would like to see the forest as a model for multiple use. A certification program like FSC could be used to demonstrate how competing interests could be met and provide third party certification to ease a lack of trust that has evolved between groups over the last 2 decades.
I would like to see the forest managed to provide for opportunities not available on private land. I would like the management of the forest to identify parts of the forest that are in good condition and leave those alone, and focus restoration work on parts of the forest that need it the most, not the places with the biggest trees, e.g. the Beaverdam Project.
I would like to see this as an example to other forests and other states.
I would love to see more capacity for managing interns and other young workers to support new programming.
I would love to see the ruffed grouse regain it's numbers in the mountains of East Tennessee. My son has never gotten to enjoy a good day of dog work and grouse flushes. When I was young in the 70's and early 80's we would go to various parts of the Cherokee Forest and flush 10-20 grouse, now, if you flush 2 you have had a better than normal day. Turkey and deer have both flourished in most of the areas, but they too could benefit from more clear cutting practices. There may be other things that have contributed to the decline of grouse, but one major is terrain that is beneficial to their nesting and raising of their broods and clear cut overgrowth is the key to that. I think turkey growth may have also led to their decline with turkey making it hard for their nest to survive, but a heavy undergrowth should help reduce that.
If ecological balance was restored to the forest I'd like to see it stay that way in order to support its highest and best uses: clean water, carbon sequestration, wildlife habitat (with non-game having equal value as game), places for quiet/compatible recreation and tourism. Restoring the forest and then continuing to log, build more roads, mine, drill, and produce energy in them, or maintaining that you have to do these things in order to pay for more restoration, would make this whole process a fantastic, financially-draining, farce.
If not already in place, a ban on any timber removal.
IF the forest were to be "restored to a more healthful ecological balance" outdoor enthusiast users of the forest would be treated to more encounters with a variety of wildlife, enhancing their experience in the CNF. In turn, as more hunters, bikers, hikers, campers etc come to use the forest there will be a positive economical impact on the community in and around the forest.
I'm not sure we need to do much actively. What is needed is to set this area aside to inhibit mining, logging, and development. Let nature take determine the balance.
Improved information/access to Forest for limited impact activities (hiking).
Improvement will never be complete, but a stable canopy (no more than selectively logged) would go a long way toward many of the restoration goals. Restoration could go farther than anyone is likely to take it. I doubt that wolves will be introduced to eat the hogs, though coyotes are likely to evolve to fill the niche in time. I'm pretty sure that grizzlies are out for good, but mountain lions may be coming back on their own..
Improvements in water quality of forest streams and better control of invasive species and disease.
Increased consideration of biodiversity, less emphasis on forest products.

Increased low-impact recreational & educational use; selective timber harvesting, maintenance of wildlife openings, rather than justifying clearcuts as providing successional habitat; trail maintenance by riding groups to allow hiking; clean water; minimal, but well-designed roads, aggressive control of invasives; ban on ATVs; re-establishment of chestnut trees with blight-resistant varieties
It should be managed adaptively, allowing land managers to react to the things listed in #6. Communities should also be kept whole and work should be done to restore as many communities that were there historically. Intelligent tinkering and whatnot.
less emphasis on extraction and consumptive uses; recognize the intrinsic values the natural systems have apart from human-assigned importance values and respect accordingly
Less monoculture. More diversity and natural forest structure.
Let it BE a forest, give it time to again become one, give the soil time to heal, the plants and animals time to develop a balance. Give people the opportunity for learn from the forest/wilderness rather than impose upon it. Life on Earth and the region would be far, far better for all living creatures.
man has a way of doing more damage than good, i encourage the forest service to carefull choose what they do, logging from 40 yrs ago are just now producing decent growth. sometimes its best to let things alone and let nature take its course.
More area opened for horseback riding.
More balance age class distribution. Forest is growing older, not younger. Need more early successional habitat more landscape burning
MORE CLEAR CUTS
more early successional habitat.
more early, young forest to support early successional species...
More emphasis on quiet recreation and less on OHV use and destructive practices such as lumbering. Need excellent well maintained hiking and backpacking trails and clear water for fishing and well managed hunting programs.
more food plots for wildlife as well as more public access to the forest thru the opening of gates during hunting seasons as well the as the rest of the year. The more access you give people to use the forest the more support you can get if its gated and hard to access and enjoy why would anyone want to support making it better if they can get nothing in return.
more Old Growth: end timber extraction
More prescribed fire and more early successional habitat
more school based activities. More wilderness preservation
More tourism - more guided tours - more guided AT hikes.
More wildlife in the public forest
My hope is that the USFS can mitigate damage done by invasive species, to manage and maintain our National Forests strategically. I hope those areas where possible, Brook Trout restoration continues. I hope USFS personnel will continue with their long track record of proscribed burns to ensure the health of the forest long-term. I know how difficult it is, because so many ill-informed people have succumbed to the misinformation about preventive fire maintenance. I also hope the extant trails and roads will be better maintained, to allow people access to the Forest for a long time to come.
Natural habitats maintained by nature with as little human "management" as possible, ie, no logging or prescribed burns. Elimination of invasive species achieved with little or no chemicals. Multiple recreational users sharing the forests with no vehicles on trails. Keep forest roads to a minimum. Allow the forest to heal without excessive "management." The forests are a natural, national treasure and should not be used for loggers to profit while government and taxpayers take a loss!!!
Need to BALANCE nature with public use. If that means limiting the public use then so be it. We don't want to overdo the hunting, fishing and even hiking if it means that too much damage has been done. Then taking care of it is best. Less four wheeling and polluting streams - folks can do that on private property instead!!!!
New growth-Plenty of food sources for wildlife-
No motorized vehicles. Large wilderness areas with no firearms permitted. Heavy fines for litter and flagrant disregard.
open more trails - provide more horseback riding trails - MAINTAIN THE TRAILS YOU DO HAVE!!!
Open-Ended Response

Outreach to local communities to increase use, especially among groups with barriers to access, like inner city kids.
People would be able to use the forest more for camping and recreational enjoyment, such as fishing, photography, bird watching, bicycling, hiking, etc.
Plant/tree diversification - reestablishing more native hardwoods, less pine and poplar. Stop controlled burns all together and especially in the spring when birds are nesting.
Please restore rare and native ecosystems and ensure better water quality.
Positive progress to improve the Forest conditions.
Protect the watershed. A healthy forest will encourage clean water and habitat for wildlife.
Protect water sources. Increase the availability of pristine wilderness for recreation purposes. Although I understand that national forests provide great recreation benefits for some activities that are not conducive to wilderness preservation, perhaps the forest Service could ease conflicts by promoting use of private property for reducing demands of ORVs, equestrian use where it might be detrimental to the wilderness, and bike trails. For example, could NFS buy "conservation easements" that permitted, say ORV use on privately owned lands so that the damage to existing and more pristine National Forest lands could be taken out of such uses.
providing outstanding management of natural resources that are truly unique to the forest
real restoration, not the crap that's gone on in the past.
removal of timber harvest as a goal in eastern national forests and restoration of forests to a healthy state
Replanting some endangered species experimental species crowd out invasive species to further support more wild life with edible trees, bush types
Restoration is too loaded of a word. It means too many different things to different people. Restore might mean you are returning it to some previous state. The Forest is never going to be the same as it was in the past, but we can decide what we want it to be in the future, which will be different than it ever was, whether we do anything or not.
Restoration of native species.
Restoring watershed health should be the number one priority.
Return to a multi-use management practice. Restore a healthy balance of early succession habitat (around 10%) and sustain it.
Returned to the most possible natural condition. Human use strictly monitored and controlled.
Road should not be the major contributor to stream sediment. The equal balance of trail types and multi-use systems.
Sharply reduce logging and eliminate most logging roads. Reduce harmful and noisy recreation such as off-road vehicles and road races on forest roads. Improve and increase safe migration options for wildlife along roadways.
Some roads in the forest which are available all or part of the time for vehicle travel are poorly maintained (erosion). Forest officials have said most of our forests are second and third growth and are just now maturing. But the forest service practiced clear cutting in the late 70s and early 80s and replanted white pines, which didn't do well. Causing erosion & I feel bearing trees should have been planted instead of human revenue trees. This needs to be addressed.
Stop ridgetop development which causes erosion and sends silt into the streams killing fish and taking away valuable wildlife habitat
support Cherokee Forest Voices
Survival of aquatic species would not be questionable.
The entire concept of restoration is another attempt to provide timber products while destroying all other values and uses of the forest
The Forest Service embracing collaboration More public participation in the management of our national forests Projects on the forest that are true ecological restoration and an excellent monitoring program. 1. Restoration of streams, water quality and riparian (stream side) land. 2. Restoring rare communities. 3. Addressing monoculture stands resulting from past management 4. Controlling non-native invasive species

The question is: restored to what? Ideally, to pre-European conditions. But that is impossible, given the impacts of chestnut eradication, and ongoing exotic tree diseases and pests. The best I can hope for is to restore the forest to an optimum level of ecological functioning, including its support of as much native biodiversity as possible.

The rarest community types (balds, bogs, high elevation outcrops, etc) would be restored, protected and managed in a sustainable way. The timber base would be identified and managed sustainably, and all of the various land uses would be located in the most appropriate places so that they would provide the maximum benefit for the USFS and the public, while having the least impact on the natural resources.

The return of the chestnut. Clean waterways.

the wild should remain wild

Turned into national park and logging/party places eliminated

Very broadly, ecological restoration in the CNF would improve water quality where it has been degraded, help maintain and promote the diversity and viability of native fish, wildlife, plants and other species (including rare species and natural communities), improve forest ecosystems' and species' resilience and adaptation to the effects of climate change (which are predicted to involve multiple changes in addition to temperature, such as changes in precipitation patterns), and consequently also would maintain and enhance the quality of outdoor recreation in the forest (including hiking and camping, plant and animal observation, and fishing and hunting).

Watershed protection, excellent recreation potential (hiking, biking, horseriding, hunting, fishing), system roads in good shape, minimal invasives populations, cutting edge silviculture with little or no new road construction, long rotations featuring high quality saw timber, excellent visual quality - largely unbroken canopies.

Watersheds protected would benefit aquatic species, recharge rivers and enhance fishing opportunities, esp native trout. Old growth and protecting potential old growth will increase natural carbon sinks. Stopping USFS burns in eastern forests would help me breath easier and save the Forest Service funds needed for restoring the CNF back before European immigration devastated the forest for timber. I would like the forest harvested by sustainable methods giving significant preference to local community loggers over large corporations. Regional wildlife corridors would be expanded to offset Climate Change stresses of migrating species.