

**OSU McDONALD-DUNN RESEARCH FOREST FMP  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #5**  
Wednesday, January 18, 2022

Website: <https://cf.forestry.oregonstate.edu/our-forests/mcdonald-dunn-forest-plan>

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members present: Jessica McDonald, Dave Ehlers, Leo Williamson, Kaola Swanson (via Zoom), John Taylor, Mike Kennedy, Faye Yoshihara, Trey Jackson, Jim Fairchild, Jennifer Beathe.

OSU College of Forestry Staff present: Holly Ober and Stephen Fitzgerald

Oregon Consensus Facilitation Team: Turner Odell and Jennah Stillman (via Zoom)

***Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Overview***

Turner Odell welcomed the group, invited everyone to do a round of introductions, and then provided a review of the agenda. He shared that the main objective was to discuss and gather input on the draft themes/management regimes, which will eventually inform the modeling scenarios.

***Stakeholder Advisory Committee Input Document***

Turner shared that the most recent version of the SAC's document was from 12-13-2022, based on the group's last meeting discussion and refinement. He observed that this document can continue to be a useful reference and serve as a touchstone on big-picture issues as the development of the Forest Management Plan moves forward. He added that it also included some plan-adjacent considerations which could be revisited to see if there were any specific recommendations that the SAC would want to make to the College related to the plan. He asked the SAC to share thoughts on whether they'd like to continue working on this document or move on, and revisit it as needed.

A few SAC members responded and generally, all agreed that the collective wordsmithing on this document was done and to focus their efforts on the overarching Guiding Principles document. One SAC member shared that for the SAC input document, they felt it was important to include text that clarified the context and phase of the process during which it was developed in order to clearly convey the circumstances to the broader public. Another SAC member raised concerns about the potential for ongoing misunderstanding regarding the SAC's intention by the FPC, and subsequently, that it may be misunderstood by the broader public. They requested that there be an intentional follow-up effort to try and mend this, and for more direct crossover between the two committees (e.g., walking through work products together to identify and address disconnect). Other SAC members shared this desire and wondered how to create more connectivity and balance between the scientific and stakeholder perspectives in the process going forward. Turner responded that the work was now shifting to the drafting and product development phase and that the SAC will have an advisory role in reviewing draft products and providing input for refinement.

**ACTION:** John and Faye offered to do one more review of the SAC input document to integrate the suggested context and get it to a good enough point to move on. OC will send them the most recent version of the document.

### ***Faculty Planning Committee's Overarching Principles***

Holly shared that the Overarching Principles document had been developed based on the SAC's input summary, Community Listening Sessions, and the FPC's discussions to date. She added that it was intended to serve as a touchpoint in the plan development to ensure that all critical elements are addressed. Turner then asked the SAC members for their general reactions to the Overarching Principles document and noted that any input would be relayed to the FPC.

The SAC's feedback was generally positive and the group felt that much of their input was included. One SAC member wondered if there was anything critical missing or that should be more clearly called out in the Overarching Principles. There was a suggestion to include "climate change and biodiversity" in the "Foundational Premises" section. One SAC member suggested including context about social sustainability and the community contributions that the forest produces (e.g., jobs, wood fiber for building houses, etc.) There was discussion about the "Illustrate Economic Sustainability" section, with some SAC members feeling like it did not provide clear direction as written. There were also questions and concerns about the statement, "without requiring funding from outside sources." While recognizing that the forest needs to be self-sustaining, many of the SAC members wanted to ensure that the College was not precluded from pursuing alternative funding opportunities (e.g., endowment, carbon credits, etc) and would be poised to capitalize upon them. As such, there was a suggestion that this language could be more inclusive and acknowledge other revenue streams, not just timber harvest, in order to build support for those. It was also clarified that the Overarching Principles are the minimum set of criteria for the plan to cover and that more details would be fleshed out in the scenario modeling and the important, forthcoming conversations about trade-offs.

**ACTION:** Holly will share the SAC's feedback and suggestions with the FPC and consider making edits to the Overarching Principles to integrate their input.

### ***Draft Management Regimes***

Holly shared a [presentation](#) about the planning process underway and noted that it is still currently in "Phase II: Synthesizing" and will soon move to modeling and refining, then writing. She clarified that the remaining synthesis work is to determine management themes/regimes and scenarios (sets of target proportions for each management theme), and then to consider necessary components of the new FMP. Other upcoming steps included an Academic User Listening Session within the next couple of months and forthcoming Community Input Sessions (I and II) that will be scheduled when there is a draft product from modeling to get feedback on.

She then reviewed the prior management themes from the 2005 FMP, which, she noted, included forest objectives, desired conditions, and management actions/timing to represent the suite of landowner objectives and ensure research relevancy. Following this, she reviewed the new, proposed draft management themes that the FPC had developed during their last meeting:

- A. Even-aged, short rotation
- B. Even-aged, long rotation
- C. Multi-aged and multi-species\* - new
- D. Mature

#### E. Restoration (e.g., streams, oak woodlands, prairies)\* - new

The SAC members provided feedback on the high-level management themes. There was a discussion about what terminology to use for this organizational information, and some expressed concerns about the phrase “regimes” and tentatively suggested using “management strategies” instead. There were questions about the definitions (e.g., Where does uneven age fit in? Who decides what ‘mature’ is, and how does that relate to ‘reserves?’), and a suggestion was made to clarify these before moving forward with modeling. Holly also responded that further development of the definitions would happen and that this would be a topic of future conversation. The SAC also discussed how revenue streams or needs may interface with the subsequent work from each strategy. Holly clarified that management strategies A-C were primarily focused on Doug Fir for wood products and revenue. One SAC member shared that an important part of teaching forest management could involve navigating grant programs in order to build a more comprehensive resourcing approach. Another SAC member asked if there would be pushback if community members didn’t see an explicit strategy that called out the viewshed or visual sensitivity of any areas. Holly shared that she would relay this feedback to the FPC and that there would be more detailed definitions drafted for each of the management strategies for the SAC’s review.

#### ***Scenario Development***

Holly shared that the next step would be to create different *scenarios* with varying proportions of the five management strategies on the landscape. Although the scenarios had not yet been developed, she shared that this would be an important step for the SAC’s input to evaluate different tradeoffs among ecosystem services, and available revenue to support other activities in the forest, and other outputs. Holly clarified that the scenarios that will move forward in modeling will be determined by the SAC and FPC, and that one scenario will reflect the current baseline status of the forest. To that end, she added that some research projects are on their own trajectory or are in untouchable areas and will not be impacted by new management decisions.

The SAC members shared questions about the scenario development approach, such as how definitive the allocated percentages have to be, and whether there is any flexibility given that part of the goal is experimentation and the need for adaptive management as part of the education and learning process. There was a suggestion that language be included in the plan that addresses this in order to respond to fire or incorporate new learnings.

#### ***Draft Table of Contents***

Holly then reviewed the 2005 FMP Table of Contents and presented a proposed outline for the new FMP for the SAC and FPC to review and provide feedback on. There was a question about where fire management would be included in the plan and subsequent discussion about how general content could be organized going forward.

#### ***Work Plan and Timeline***

In closing, Holly reviewed the remaining timeline for the development of the new FMP, highlighting that modeling would start soon and tentatively go through June. She also shared that writing could begin with some sections that are not dependent upon the modeling results. The SAC expressed that they were interested in reviewing the scenarios and providing input prior to the modeling moving forward and that they would like to see what the baseline of current conditions looked like. There

were questions about what the inputs and outputs for modeling would be, and some noted that the modeling step felt a bit like a black box. Holly shared that this information could be provided ahead of time and there could be a discussion about the scenario tradeoffs. There was an agreement to schedule the next SAC meeting to discuss the management strategy definitions, inputs and outputs to be included in the modeling, and the range of scenarios.

Holly asked the group if there was interest in an optional field tour on the McDonald-Dunn forest. A handful of SAC members expressed interest, with a suggestion for this to be a joint engagement opportunity with the FPC. Holly shared that the College would work to schedule a half-day gathering and query both groups for availability.

The meeting was adjourned.