

**OSU College of Forestry**  
**McDonald-Dunn Research Forest Faculty Planning Committee Meeting #10**  
**6 March 2023, 11:00am-1:00pm**  
**316 Peavy Forest Science Center (no participants joined via Zoom)**

Faculty Planning Committee Members present: Holly Ober (chair), John Bailey, Mindy Crandall, Vernita Ediger, Tiffany Garcia, Mark Kerstens, Dave Lewis, Laurie Schimleck

Ex Officio Members present: Cristina Eisenberg, Steve Fitzgerald, Brent Klumph, Carli Morgan (online)

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Member present: Jim Fairchild

## **I. Welcome, Introductions, & Overview of Recent and Upcoming Events**

Jim Fairchild joined this meeting, as liaison between the SAC and FPC.

The group reviewed the meeting agenda and the [planning website](#) which contains materials associated with past and future meetings and events. Three past and upcoming events were discussed:

- The first field tour of the forest for the SAC and FPC took place on Saturday, Feb 25. The second tour planned for Tuesday, Feb 28 was cancelled due to road conditions. The group was encouraged to visit a scheduling poll to indicate when they could potentially be available for a make-up date for the second trip.
- An SAC meeting took place on March 1. Discussion at this meeting focused on the definitions of the management strategies. Comments from the SAC will be the subject of the FPC's discussion at this meeting.
- The dates for 2 'Academic User Listening Sessions' (open forums) will be March 21 and 22. These will provide an opportunity for faculty, staff, and students to provide thoughts on what changes could make it more likely they would make use of the forest for research, teaching, and/or outreach, or improve the quality of their experience when doing so. A Qualtrics survey will be included in the meeting announcements as a means through which people can provide input if they would prefer not to attend a session. The FPC provided suggestions on improvements to the survey (e.g., ask if respondents are faculty, staff, or students; ask their departmental affiliation and if affiliated with OSU or some other university). Distribution will occur through department heads across the university and through graduate student groups.

## **II. Defining the New Forest Management Strategies**

The group was asked how/when they wanted to address the suggestions from the SAC regarding the defining guidelines for the 5 management strategies. They voiced a preference to hear the comments verbally and discuss them briefly, and then make edits individually between this meeting and the next after having time to think about them.

### **-Stand Establishment**

- The SAC recommended further clarification on how to operationalize the maintenance of 10% hardwood in the understory following harvests. The FPC discussed briefly, and agreed to insert wording to clarify this. An FPC member brought forth an additional need for

clarification: the section on intermediate treatments should specify the time period across which hardwoods are maintained if there is not an expectation for them to be maintained in perpetuity.

- The SAC suggested revisiting the statements regarding selection of planting densities so as to avoid the need for pre-commercial thinning (pct), for both even-aged short rotation and even-aged long rotation, to be sure it's clear whether pct is allowable if deemed necessary. The FPC agreed to insert wording to clarify this.

#### **-Stand Age**

- The SAC asked about the rationale for the upper age limit of trees in the even-aged long rotation, and questioned whether older ages might be more desirable. It was clarified that the 120-year limit was selected according to the expectation of this being the maximum mean annual increment (the average yearly volume growth per acre of a stand). This should be specified.
- The SAC suggested clarifying that in some ecosystems of concern, trees will not continue to increase in age over time, but rather senesce (e.g., red alder in riparian areas). This will be reworded.

#### **-Overview**

- Indigenous knowledge is currently only specified for 2 of the 5 management strategies (managed reserves and ecosystems of concern). The group discussed how although Indigenous knowledge may be more foundational to those 2, it should be included for all 5.
- The SAC expressed concern that there's mention of diverse forest values in the multi-aged/multi-species management strategy but not the other 4. The group will consider whether appreciation for values should be included for all strategies. If there's justification for having it only in one, then this will be made more clear.

#### **-Opportunities Created**

- The SAC suggested putting this material at the end of the document and arranging it in a table so that every topic (e.g., carbon, forest products) could be addressed across each management strategy. The chair displayed a rough draft matrix that organized all the bullet points from the definition table describing the 'Opportunities Created' according to each management strategy. The group agreed to work on filling in this matrix on their own time prior to the next FPC meeting.
- It was suggested that this table could be used to develop the metrics needed to evaluate the tradeoffs associated with different allocations of land area to each management strategy across the forests.
- A suggestion was made that we consider adding risks/downsides: should this information be added to this table or should an additional table be created to show this information?
- It should be made clear whether any comparative statements in this table are comparisons among management strategies or to some other external reference conditions. This should be easier to accomplish when the material is in a matrix form.

#### **-High-level Thoughts Expressed**

- There was a suggestion of considering desired future conditions along with a metric that could be used to assess whether conditions are on a trajectory to meet the desired conditions, rather than specifying them too quantitatively.
- It was pointed out that climate change adds additional uncertainty to all projections.

- It was suggested that messaging on tribal engagement in the forest management planning process be increased.

### **III. Scenarios and criteria to be used to evaluate tradeoffs among scenarios**

The group discussed the need to select metrics that could be used to evaluate tradeoffs among scenarios, according to a variety of forest values. They looked at a table that listed 6 values and metrics proposed by this group several weeks ago, and suggested additions and refinements.

- It was suggested that “Cultural Values” be added as a measure that would include Indigenous knowledge. This phrase is what’s likely to be used in the upcoming *Northwest Forest Plan*.
- It was suggested that other metrics be added to reflect biodiversity (e.g., # of rare species supported).
- It was suggested that a metric be added to reflect forest product creation.

There was discussion as to whether multiple climate scenarios should be modeled to encompass potential changes in climate. This led to the clarification that the intent is for this plan to follow an adaptive management approach, so that once additional information is available regarding climate change, refinements could be made to allow a new version of certain components of the existing plan rather than necessitating a whole new plan.

There was discussion as to constraints (e.g., thresholds above or below which we would not consider) for any particular metric. When discussing revenue in particular, it was explained that it’s no simple task to derive a single figure to describe the amount of revenue that must be generated from the forest, because the amount needed is dictated by what activities are supported (e.g., the more restoration or interpretation or invasive species control done on the forest, the greater the revenue stream needed to pay for these activities).

When discussing potential scenarios to model, the group discussed potential benefits to be gained from modeling a collection of scenarios that covers a large amount of each of the management strategies coupled with small amounts of all others. After discussion, this was the tentative suggestion:

	Scenario A (baseline)*	Scenario B (lots of EASR)	Scenario C (lots of EALR)	Scenario D (lots of MAMS)	Scenario E (lots of MREOC)
Even-aged, short rotation (EASR)	27%	40%	15%	10%	15%
Even-aged, long rotation (EALR)	29%	15%	40%	10%	15%
Multi-aged, multi-species (MAMS)	21%	10%	10%	40%	15%
Managed reserves (MR)	4%	10%	10%	15%	20%
Ecosystems of concern (EOC)	6%	10%	10%	10%	20%
Long-term learning	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

\*Scenario A represents what would be present on the forest if the current management plan were to continue.

### **IV. Next Steps**

- The Chair will share the latest version of the document describing the definitions of the management strategies so that the group can suggest refinements based on feedback from the SAC. A document with this feedback will also be posted for everyone to easily refer to.

- The Chair will share a table showing the metrics that could be used to evaluate tradeoffs among scenarios for the group to refine.
- The Chair will share the new matrix that contains all the bulleted points describing the opportunities created by each management strategy for the group to refine.
- At the next FPC meeting, the group will return to a discussion of scenarios.