

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP

WHITE HAT:

Clarification questions:

- What are the acronyms in Strategy 1.2?
- Wording on Strategy 1.1: create THE NC Sandhills Fire Management Council; and instead of “Fire Management” should be “Prescribed Fire Management”
- Objective 1: What is a “landscape management concept” and what are “conservation lands”?
- Objective 2: Define “compatible”
- What are specific responsibilities of NC Sandhills Fire Management Council (management and/or administrative and/or implementation)?
- Is there more detail as far as specific steps, timelines, etc.?
- Why have a landowners working group and a land managers working group, why separated?
- Strategy 1.5: Are research studies/findings implemented?
- Strategy 1.4: Define “landscape level”
- Strategy 1.1: Why use word “impacting” versus facilitate/better promote or other more positive word?

RED HAT:

Initial reaction or feelings for the plan:

- Doesn't seem as comprehensive as it should be/could be
- Too general, lacks "how to implement" strategies
- Hard sell for private landowners and most will think you are meddling
- 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
- Need more information
- Great beginning
- Like it, this is what partnerships are all about, opens doors for working collaboratively
- Objective 1 and 2 very general and almost incomprehensible wording
- Good start, some questions would be answered if looked at whole plan
- Tired of looking at it

BLACK HAT:

Potential problems, obstacles or difficulties with the plan:

- So many different working groups and meetings, it is hard to participate and still do work on the ground
- Inability to reach consensus on compatibility is a big stumbling block between private and public land managers
- Need to improve on outreach to private landowners
- Perceived conflict between Partnership and public's perception of Partnership
- Working with private landowners to communicate conservation goals is a challenge, though it can be done
- Be cautious about not being too vague when develop objectives and goals; want more specifics and be as clear as possible
- 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
- Need to truly let goals, objectives and strategies specifically link together; this could be more explicit
- This group must address invasive species issues; this is a huge hole
- Fire management on private lands and inability to burn on so many days is a problem

- Conflict between tree stocking levels (basal areas) for different objectives (RCW, pine straw and timber), relates to compatibility and other issues
- Funding is a stumbling block

YELLOW HAT:

What like about the plan and vision:

- Like that it addresses research and hopefully can be applied to management
- Vision: Private landowners will have an environmental conscience that is in balance with commodity production
- 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
- Have gotten a lot of different people together and talking and new relationships built which have been very helpful, and have been responsible for first regional prescribed fire council
- The partnership of so many different entities is impressive
- Vision: That conservation becomes an integral part of people living in the Sandhills and the public takes pride in natural resources found here
- Doing conservation on a bigger scale than normally happens, not just a few acres but truly at the landscape level
- Vision: Over time significantly increase acreage of fire-managed longleaf pine (reverse the trend)
- Like education and communication that helps best take care of longleaf pine ecosystem, strives toward ecosystem level management and protection for all partners to protect ecosystem while striving for sustainability

- We're moving forward and partnership is building success and momentum
- Vision: In late 80s when conversations began they brought positive results, hope that this creates the same kind of momentum and maintained
- Have a partnership and group committed to putting this together and getting it down on paper, result of a lot of hard work
- Vision: We'll continue to meet and refine and will go a long way to reach that goal
- Building relationships and lots of progress on people sharing knowledge, techniques and equipment
- Simply that plan exists is great, and represents a lot of "firsts", take credit for what accomplished and so can be example for other regions that should be doing this
- Vision: Can't do it all, don't have to re-do the hard work so can now build off of and improve this to address new issues and threats going forward

GREEN HAT:

New strategies to consider:

- Using land managers, forestry consultants and land owners who manage for other values to communicate with others; seeing someone like themselves having success
- Make sure to engage communications working group on everything we do in terms of management to get the word out, especially in terms of fire council; benefit will be more and better general knowledge by the public (especially Yankees/regionally diverse populations) (Note: Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, etc. are always looking for speakers)
- Keep eye out for new issues (like development encroachment, new demands on recreation from growing populations, future fire restrictions) and problems associated with that (like invasive species)
- Reference poster, handout and presentation on weed management
- Establishment of smoke-acceptable districts
- Do site visits that talk about invasive species
- 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)
- Need to develop strategies to address loblolly invasions in longleaf pine ecosystems and provide landowners with strategies to deal with it

- Roving land management crews to provide assistance/triage (other places use national fire plan monies; tap in to big pots of money): prescribe burning, invasives eradication, working on RCW mid-story removal, put in artificial cavities, put in compatible fire lines; great opportunities for younger people looking for first job and lots of properties looking for help; could pool money together to get more done
- Pulling funds specifically for research grants for universities to address unanswered questions; create pot of funds from various agencies specifically for research
- Creating training network to link up people who have expertise with those who have training needs
- See more news articles, TV spots, Army publications and other media; want to see more emphasis on health of natural communities versus talking just about species
- See more field trips and working sessions (brainstorming about problems and hands-on management issues); provide hands-on especially on how to deal with invasives (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)
- Group should have meeting once a year for all managers in geographic region; inform them of priorities so can all help Group reach goals (identify which landowners need to get money)

- Hold special summit for private landowners and recognize them with awards and give them more incentive (Award system for private landowners)
- Strategize in whole partnership how best to leverage dollars (like Private Stewardship Grants)

GOLD HAT:

List of indicators that will show we are making progress:

- More fruiting wire grass, will lead to more RCW clusters
- More acres of fire-managed longleaf
- Quality wildlife habitat
- Increased floral diversity
- Net growth of RCW clusters on private land
- Fewer complaints about smoke from fires
- More working forests for economic sustainability
- Reduced invasive species diversity
- Number of acres burned in Sandhills to go from 80k to over 100k annually
- Reduction of future federal listings
- Yankee acceptance of land management in South
- Species diversity
- Increased active members in partnership (what agencies are missing?)