

**NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT  
WORKING GROUP BREAKOUT SESSION  
NCSCP Summit  
June 8, 2006**

**A. Clarification questions:**

- 1) What are the acronyms in Strategy 1.2?
- 2) Wording on Strategy 1.1: create **THE** NC Sandhills Fire Management Council; and, replace “Fire Management” with “Prescribed Fire Management”.
- 3) Objective 1: What is a “landscape management concept” and what are “conservation lands”?
- 4) Objective 2: Define “compatible”.
- 5) What are the specific responsibilities of NC Sandhills Fire Management Council (management and/or administrative and/or implementation)?
- 6) Is there more detail as far as specific steps, timelines, etc.?
- 7) Why have separate landowners and land managers working groups?
- 8) Strategy 1.5: Are research studies/findings implemented?
- 9) Strategy 1.4: Define “landscape level”.
- 10) Strategy 1.1: Why use the word “impacting” versus ‘facilitate better’, ‘promote’ or another more positive word?

**B. Initial reaction or feelings for the plan:**

- 1) Doesn't seem as comprehensive as it should be/could be.
- 2) Too general, lacks “how to implement” strategies.
- 3) Hard sell for private landowners and most will think you are meddling.
- 4) Like the plan, surprised that some things like MOU haven't gotten very far, very impressed by land managers coming together to talk, not moving as fast as might like.
- 5) Need more information.

- 6) Great beginning.
- 7) Like it, this is what partnerships are all about, opens doors for working collaboratively.
- 8) Objective 1 and 2 very general and almost incomprehensible wording.
- 9) Good start, some questions would be answered if we had looked at the whole plan.
- 10) Tired of looking at it.

**C. Potential problems, obstacles or difficulties with the plan:**

- 1) So many different working groups and meetings, it is hard to participate and still do work on the ground.
- 2) Inability to reach consensus on compatibility is a big stumbling block between private and public land managers.
- 3) Need to improve on outreach to private landowners.
- 4) Perceived conflict between Partnership and public's perception of the Partnership.
- 5) Working with private landowners to communicate conservation goals is a challenge, though it can be done.
- 6) Be cautious about not being too vague when developing objectives and goals; need more specifics and be as clear as possible.
- 7) Whole process of having people with sufficient time to deal with partnership duties and will continue to take a lot of time, recognize that people we are asking to get involved are very busy, particularly hard on land managers who are expected to be out of the office doing job.
- 8) Need to truly let goals, objectives and strategies specifically link together; this could be more explicit.
- 9) This group must address invasive species issues; this is a huge hole in the strategy.
- 10) Fire management on private lands and the inability to burn on so many days is a problem.
- 11) Conflict between tree stocking levels (basal areas) for different objectives (RCW, pine straw and timber), relates to compatibility and other issues.

12) Funding is a stumbling block.

**D. What like about the plan and vision:**

- 1) Like that it addresses research needs and hopefully can be applied to management.
- 2) **Vision:** Private landowners will have an environmental conscience that is in balance with commodity production.
- 3) Great beginning and it has opened the door for dialogue, and USFWS has done a great job of mending fences and getting info out there.
- 4) Have gotten a lot of different people together and talking and helped to build new relationships which have been very helpful.
- 5) Responsible for getting the first regional prescribed fire council started.
- 6) Impressed that the partnership made up of many different entities.
- 7) **Vision:** That conservation becomes an integral part of people living in the Sandhills and the public takes pride in natural resources found here.
- 8) **Vision:** Over time significantly increase acreage of fire-managed longleaf pine (reverse the trend)
- 9) Doing conservation on a bigger scale than normally happens, not just a few acres but truly at the landscape level.
- 10) Like the emphasis on education and communication; this is best way to get people to take care of longleaf pine ecosystem.
- 11) Strives toward ecosystem level management and protection for all partners to protect ecosystem while striving for sustainability.
- 12) We're moving forward and the partnership is building success and momentum.
- 13) **Vision:** When conversations began in the late 1980s they brought positive results, hope that this plan creates the same kind of sustained momentum.
- 14) Having an established partnership and a group committed to putting this strategy together and getting it down on paper is the result of a lot of hard work.
- 15) **Vision:** We'll continue to meet and refine management strategies to reach the goal.

- 16) Building relationships and the amount of progress that has been made towards people sharing knowledge, techniques and equipment.
- 17) Simply that the plan exists is great, and represents a lot of “firsts” but the partnership needs to take credit for what it has accomplished so it can be example for other regions that should be doing this.
- 18) **Vision:** Don’t have to re-do the hard work so we can now build off of and improve the strategies to address new issues and threats.

**E. New strategies to consider:**

- 1) Use land managers, forestry consultants and land owners who manage for other values to communicate with others who have similar interests; seeing someone like themselves having success.
- 2) Make sure to engage communications working group to get the word out about everything we do in terms of management, especially in terms of fire council. The benefit will be an educated regionally-diverse public who understands the basic ecology of the Sandhills. (Note: Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, etc. are always looking for speakers).
- 3) Keep an eye out for new issues (like development encroachment, new demands on recreation from growing populations, future fire restrictions) and problems associated with population growth (e.g. introduction of invasive species).
- 4) Start to reference poster, handout and presentation on weed management.
- 5) Promote establishment of “smoke-acceptable” districts.
- 6) Conduct site visits focused on invasive species issues.
- 7) Continue to keep eye on implementation of research and apply it toward management; revisit idea of Research Working Group (lots happening at Fort Bragg that could be implemented).
- 8) Need to develop strategies to address loblolly invasions into longleaf pine stands and provide landowners with strategies to combat it.
- 9) Create roving land management crews to provide assistance/triage for (other places use national fire plan monies; tap in to big pots of money): prescribe burning, invasive plant eradication, mid-story removal, artificial RCW cavity installation, constructing compatible fire lines. A great opportunity for younger people looking for their first job and lots of properties looking for help; could pool money together to get more done.

- 10) Pull together funds specifically for research grants for universities to address unanswered management related questions; create pot of funds from various agencies specifically for research.
- 11) Creating training network to link up people who have expertise with those who have training needs.
- 12) Increase exposure through news articles, TV spots, Army publications and other media; with more emphasis on health of natural communities versus talking just about species.
- 13) Increase number of field trips and working sessions (brainstorming about problems and hands-on management issues); provide hands-on opportunities especially on how to deal with invasive species (what works and what is too expensive to bother trying; Fort Bragg has ongoing data collection; links to Exotic Plant Pest Council; species profiles exist).
- 14) The RMWG should hold a meeting once a year for all managers in geographic region; inform them of the partnership's management priorities so land managers can help the partnership reach its management goals (identify which landowners need to get money).
- 15) Create an award system for private landowners. Hold a special summit for private landowners and recognize them with awards as a way to give them more incentive.
- 16) Strategize how best to leverage different funding program dollars (like Private Stewardship Grants).

**F. List of indicators that will show we are making progress:**

- 1) More fruiting wire grass - will lead to more RCW clusters.
- 2) More acres of fire-managed longleaf pine habitat.
- 3) Increase in quality wildlife habitat.
- 4) Increased floral diversity.
- 5) Net growth of RCW clusters on private land.
- 6) Reduced number of complaints about smoke from fires.
- 7) Increased number of working forests for economic sustainability.

- 8) Reduced invasive species diversity.
- 9) Number of acres burned annually in Sandhills increases from 80k to over 100k.
- 10) Reduction in the number of species proposed for federal listings.
- 11) Emigrants to the Sandhills accept/understand LLP land management practices.
- 12) Increased number of acres having high species diversity.
- 13) Increased number of active members in partnership (what agencies are missing?).