

**OSU McDONALD-DUNN RESEARCH FOREST FMP
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #7**
Thursday, April 13, 2023

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

Action Items

- The College will share the field tour documents electronically with any SAC or FPC members upon request
- Leo will follow up with additional thoughts on sideboards for how to quantify wildfire risk
- The College will develop an integrated index to analyze change for multiple values
- After Karl begins the first round of modeling, he will share an update about what elements were able to be incorporated into the model, which didn't, and why.

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members present: Mike Kennedy, Leo Williamson, Dave Ehlers, Faye Yoshihara, Jessica McDonald, John Taylor, Kaola Swanson, Trey Jackson, Jim Fairchild,

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

Oregon Consensus Facilitation Team: Turner Odell and Jennah Kiefer

Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Overview

Turner Odell welcomed the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and reviewed the Zoom best practices for the meeting since it was the first time that the group had met fully virtually. Following this, he reviewed the agenda.

General Updates

Holly Ober, College of Forestry, shared a [presentation](#) that included updates on recent events related to the McDonald-Dunn FMP development process. This included Two Academic User Listening Sessions for faculty, staff, and students throughout all departments of OSU who currently use the forests for teaching, research, or demonstration, plus those who might want to in the future. Holly explained that the intent of these sessions was to build upon an Academic User survey launched in Summer 2022 to develop a better understanding of where research and teaching are occurring in the forest (to avoid putting areas into management strategies that might conflict with the long-term teaching or research already underway), and to identify any constraints to access that could be integrated into the management plan to increase academic use. These were held in a hybrid format at two different times of the day. She shared that she heard ideas for potential, future academic research on tourism and opportunities for collaboration with Tallwood Design Institute around outreach and education through the use of field tours. There weren't many barriers or constraints to forest use raised other than the suggestion for additional research forest personnel to streamline managing resources associated with data and instrumentation for teaching and research in order to make new work more accessible and broaden opportunities for users in other disciplines outside of natural resources. Another suggestion was to consider renaming the various research forests managed by the

College to better reflect the array of activities that happen on each of them in different ways.

Holly also shared that the second SAC-FPC field tour was held on March 27th with nine attendees. A few SAC member shared their appreciation for the College coordinating the opportunity to be in the forest and have informal dialogue and observe the concepts being discussed in different areas of the forest. Holly shared that although there are no future field tours currently planned, if there was interest, it could happen again.

She then provided a review of the planning process phases and noted that the efforts coming up next included reaching agreement on the scenarios (proportions of each of the five management strategies), then the first round of modeling to outline the different merits of each scenario. After those initial results are available, there will be a community input session and opportunity for SAC input that will then refine the scenarios and inform a second round of modeling. She explained that in the meantime, FMP writing will begin.

McDonald-Dunn Management Scenarios & Modeling Approach

Management scenarios and evaluation metrics

Holly reviewed the different scenarios that would be modeled: Even-aged short rotation; even-aged long rotation; multi-aged/multi-species; managed reserve; ecosystems of concern; and long-term learning (acreage used for long-term research and recurring teaching and demonstrations). She highlighted that there would be a baseline scenario to demonstrate the current acreages of the most closely correlated management strategies if the status quo were to persist. A list of potential evaluation metrics was developed by the FPC and included biodiversity, carbon storage, cultural values, forest products, recreation suitability and needs, resilience, revenue, and wildfire risk, some of which could be qualitatively or quantitatively measured with relevant metrics. Once the modeling begins, these metrics will be further refined.

SAC feedback and questions included, but were not limited to:

- Suggestion for the College to engage other partners within the University that might have relevant metrics to add.
- Suggestion to include soil carbon sequestration, given that this is a huge area for potential research and quantification.
- A question as to whether the long age rotation periodic commercial thinnings delivered into products could be captured as sequestered carbon.
- A question about how to measure and model qualitative Tribal values such as understory composition for basketry materials, foraging, etc.
- A question about what sideboards there are to determine and quantify wildfire risk, given there are different indexes of risk and need to look at historic trends and data.
- A suggestion to look at estimates and plan associations that could be applied in modeling to capture quantitative measurements of values other than harvest yields.
- Clarify that the revenue value shown in the modeling is intended to display projected ‘net revenue’ after all personnel and operations expenses. Also, a suggestion to initially include the gross revenue and outline what all of the expenses are.
- Clarify the intention behind the revenue term “used for restoration”

Overview of modeling approach

Consultant, Karl Walters, provided an overview of the modeling approach which will use commercial software called Woodstock. He reviewed the harvest scheduling planning tool that prescribes areas of the forest to harvest, when to do so, selection criteria, reforestation methods, and other silviculture practices to maximize objectives. He explained the model components and corresponding purposes, inputs (forest type, age, site index, activities, and yield) as well as the various outputs (harvest volume and revenue). Karl noted that this linear model was primarily used for quantitative measurements driven by stand age and density and as such, it was not as suited to capture more qualitative metrics around recreation, cultural values, etc.

SAC feedback and questions included, but were not limited to:

- A question about how to incorporate other values reviewed earlier in the meeting that are not direct economic values into the system, and did not seem to be incorporated in the modeling. There was a unanimous, strong desire to incorporate multiple values to the greatest extent possible. Given that this would not be the right model for recreation values, change in biodiversity, etc. SAC members wondered if there would be other opportunities for modeling, other than the focus group/expert opinion scoring suggested by Stephen Fitzgerald.
- There was a discussion about rank choices and challenges in modeling mixed-age and mixed-species/uneven age management regimes, with a few SAC members noting the limitation of growth and yield models.
- One SAC member pointed out that the vast majority of [public comments submitted](#) in January and February wanted more trails (45 of 52 comments) and for the College to stop clearcutting in the McDonald-Dunn (2 of 52 comments), and wondered if the modeling would reflect that input gathered.

Next Steps

The SAC agreed to schedule its next meeting after the first modeling results were available, although there was not yet a clear window of time for when that would be. When Karl begins that first round of modeling, he will share-out what made it into the model, what didn't, and why. There will also be an opportunity for discussion between the first and second rounds of modeling to identify if any scenarios were not feasible and to understand why. When polled about the preference for a meeting in person (with a hybrid option) versus fully on Zoom, the SAC responded that either option was fine going forward.

The meeting was then adjourned.