

OSU College of Forestry
McDonald-Dunn Research Forest Faculty Planning Committee Meeting #4
22 November 2022, 1:00-3:00pm
316 Peavy Forest Science Center and Online (via Zoom)

Faculty Planning Committee Members present: Holly Ober (chair), John Bailey, Vernita Ediger (online), Mark Kerstens, Dave Lewis, Ian Munanura, Laurie Schimleck (online)

College of Forestry research forest staff present: Jenna Baker (online), Steve Fitzgerald (online), Brent Klumph (online)

I. Overview of recent and upcoming events

The group reviewed the meeting agenda, an overview of the planning process, and the [planning website](#) where it's possible to view a list of upcoming meetings and events and see materials associated with past meetings and events (agendas, presentations, video recordings, written meeting summaries).

Discussion ensued about the most recent event, the second Community Listening Session (CLS) held on November 7. All who hadn't yet listened/watched the recording of this session were encouraged to do so to become familiar with the input provided. They were also encouraged to read through input provided through the Webform and email.

The group revisited what was covered thus far during the first 3 FPC meetings (the planning process; operating principles for the FPC; answers received to questions from various sources; discussion of strengths and shortcomings of various elements of the 2005 Forest Plan). Of particular note with the 2005 Plan was confusion regarding the exact meaning of 'themes', 'special areas', and 'special issues', and shortcomings associated with the zones dictating where themes occurred on the landscape, lack of flexibility that ultimately resulted in suspension of the plan, lack of accountability with no monitoring despite extensive thought being put into metrics that could have been used, and lack of transparency. At the last FPC meeting the group brainstormed about opportunities for future research, improvements that could be made to increase use of the forest for research/teaching/outreach, and improvements that could be made to enhance cultural and community connections. All this work, plus the input received thus far from the SAC, the CLSs, and other written input led to the creation of a draft document describing 'Overarching Principles' this group would refine later during this meeting. It was mentioned that Oregon Consensus had created a document summarizing input received thus far from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) that is expected to be shared with the FPC sometime after their meeting on December 5.

II. Homing in on 'themes', 'special areas', and 'special issues'

The group looked at a list the chair compiled of recurring topics that have arisen through all forms of input thus far. These included (in alphabetical order) *carbon sequestration, climate resiliency, conservation of at-risk species, invasive species, outreach/community engagement, recreation, restoration, Traditional Ecological Knowledge, wildfire, and wildland-urban interface.*

They then looked at a strawman list of 4 potential 'themes'. The term 'themes' was used in the 2005 Plan to describe 4 ways in which different forest stands across the McDonald-Dunn Research Forest were managed so as to reflect distinct objectives that various forest landowners at the time held,

and this term was used at the beginning of this conversation to describe some forest conditions/forest characteristics that might be applied across the McDonald-Dunn forest landscape to create opportunities where all the recurring topics mentioned above could be addressed.

Discussion ensued about what term should be used to describe new 'themes'. It was recognized that the term should reflect the dynamic nature of forests. Alternatives proposed were 'management regimes' or 'management emphases'. Regardless of the terminology, it was recommended that all of these be considered to fall within recognized 'active forest management zones', and then other types of zones be recognized where other values are emphasized (e.g., 'recreation zones'). It was suggested that the plan be formulated so as to appropriately recognize the many values the forests provide outside of the locations where timber harvest occurs.

It was suggested that the 'management regimes/emphases' are thought of as the locations where different types of research topics/themes might be conducted and/or where different types of management actions might occur (conservation, eradication). It was agreed that the group will need to return to the discussion of the most appropriate terminology.

The 4 strawman 'themes' initially proposed were:

- A. even-aged, short rotation
- B. even-aged, long rotation
- C. multi-aged, multi-species
- D. mature (existing reserves, retention of clumps of older trees)

It was suggested that perhaps grasslands should be included as an additional 'theme', and then clarified that meadows and oak woodlands were in the 2005 Plan considered 'Special Areas' because these areas need special management attention different from the forested regions. It was suggested that a 5th option be created to reflect restoration, and this received broad support from the group. It was pointed out that there are a variety of landowners interested in learning more about restoration, including federal agencies, TNC, and the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde. It was pointed out that A and B would be of interest to some industrial and small woodland owners, C to some private small woodland owners, and D to federal landowners.

The group agreed to these 5 options as the tentative 'forest management regimes' to advance:

- A. even-aged and short rotation
- B. even-aged and long rotation
- C. multi-aged and/or multi-species
- D. mature
- E. restoration

It was agreed that sticking with the wording from the 2005 Plan of 'Special Areas' and 'Special Issues' could lead to the assumption that these areas and issues are of lesser importance than those called out as 'themes', and therefore we should change the terminology and adjust emphases in the new plan. There was lingering questioning as to how the written plan should be structured so as to make it clear that some elements overlay everything, such as learning opportunities (research, teaching, outreach), human dimensions (recreation, cultural resources), and community engagement opportunities (communication, citizen science). Additional conversations will be needed.

There was conversation around connectivity and corridors that we'll plan to circle back to at a later date when we discuss the proportion of 'forest management regimes' and their location on the landscape.

It was also suggested that we think carefully about the possibility of the plan creating a framework that enables more integration in activities across the forest. Communicating about learning opportunities for students in other colleges should be a priority (e.g., trail building, interpretation).

III. Refinement of 'Overarching Principles'

The intent of this draft document is to provide ideas that serve as guidelines for the McDonald-Dunn Research Forest, that can be returned to throughout the planning process. The principles were organized under 5 subheadings: foundational premises, learning opportunities, economic sustainability, environmental sustainability, and social sustainability/recreation.

It was suggested that an additional foundational premise be added to reflect the fact that the forest is open to the public, and that the last subheading be split into two distinct subheadings. Discussion ensued about several of the written principles, and edits were made. The group will work on additional edits to the document independently outside of the meeting.

IV. Next Steps

The group was asked if anyone might volunteer to attend the upcoming SAC meeting on December 5 to serve as liaison between committees. The group was also reminded that the next FPC meeting, and last planned for the calendar year, will take place on Dec 6.