

OSU College of Forestry
McDonald-Dunn Research Forest Faculty Planning Committee Meeting #8
6 February 2023, 11:00am-1:00pm
316 Peavy Forest Science Center and Online (via Zoom)

Faculty Planning Committee Members present: Holly Ober (chair), John Bailey, Kevin Bladon, Mindy Crandall, Tiffany Garcia, Mark Kerstens, Dave Lewis, Ian Munanura, Laurie Schimleck (online)

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

I. Overview of Recent and Upcoming Events

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

An upcoming event the group discussed was the field tour of the forest for the SAC and FPC. Two trips will likely be offered: one on a Saturday morning and one on a weekday afternoon. A scheduling poll was distributed last week; everyone was reminded to indicate their availability so that dates could be selected. In response to the question of what individuals felt would be highest priority to see during the tour, suggestions were examples of stands in each of the 4 existing Themes from the 2005 Plan, and locations used heavily for teaching, long-term research projects, and restoration areas.

Another upcoming event discussed was the 'Academic User Listening Session', which will provide an opportunity to gather input from faculty, staff, and students across OSU who do or could make use of the forest for research, teaching, and/or outreach. Dates will be selected after determining the dates of the field tours, as Oregon Consensus may attend the field tour and will definitely facilitate the listening session.

An opportunity was provided to provide final thoughts on the 'Overarching Principles' document. No additional input was given, so a request was made that everyone use this document as a reminder of the principles we should be sure are reflected in the new forest plan as writing gets underway.

II. Defining the New Forest Management Strategies

A handout was distributed that provided draft definitions for each of the 5 forest *management strategies*. The foundation of this document was definitions from the existing silvicultural Themes in place from the 2005 Plan, with updates provided by Research Forest Director, Steve Fitzgerald.

The group was given the option to spend time working through the definitions in detail during this meeting or forming a subcommittee to work on this separately and then report back to the group. Two members initially suggested that one subcommittee could work on refining the first 3 *management strategies* that are driven explicitly by silviculture (even-aged short rotation, even-aged long rotation, multi-aged multi-species) and another could work on the remaining two (mature/reserves, restoration of ecosystems of concern). Steve Fitzgerald provided a brief overview of each of the 5 *management strategies*. The group then voiced a preference to spend time working on refining the definition of the 'Mature/Reserve' *management strategy*. After much discussion, it was suggested that a dichotomy be created, with the following draft distinctions:

- Stands currently designated as ‘Reserves’ would remain unmanaged, with the possible exceptions of invasive plant removal and reforestation following major disturbance.
- Stands designated to move from some other current silvicultural Theme from the 2005 Plan into this new *management strategy* (and taken out of the timber base) would be called ‘Managed Reserves’ and would be managed with a light touch. These stands would not be harvested – all management efforts (e.g., reforestation, thinning, underburning) would be implemented with the intention of getting them onto a trajectory so that they would develop characteristics typical of old growth forests.

A member suggested that with these *management strategy* definitions and other topics to arise later in the management plan development process, the fundamental role of the FPC should be to define the principles upon which management decisions will be made (in this case, to define the principles used to make decisions under each *management strategy*), and then subgroups with technical expertise could operationalize. In this spirit, a new row will be added to the top of the table of *management strategy* definitions to make the intent of each clear. The Chair will draft this prior to the next meeting and the committee will work to refine. At a future Community Input Session, we will solicit feedback on draft definitions.

Volunteers who agreed to serve on the subcommittee to further refine the silvicultural details of each *management strategy* were John Bailey, Dave Lewis, and Steve Fitzgerald. It was agreed that a second subgroup to further discuss mature/reserves and restoration of ecosystems of concern was not needed at this time.

II. Developing Scenarios and Criteria to Assess Tradeoffs Among Them

‘Scenarios’ are collections of different proportions of the 5 *management strategies*. The rationale for modeling several scenarios is to enable a weighing of the relative merits of each. The group was asked to consider what values/characteristics they would like to see assessed, as tradeoffs are evaluated among scenarios comprised of different proportions of each *management strategy*. The group discussed biodiversity (which could be evaluated through **stand age class distribution** and **forest cover**), carbon storage, patchiness/connectedness/fragmentation, recreation suitability, resilience (evaluated through **stand density index**), revenue, and wildfire risk (evaluated through **basal area**).

Next the group discussed opportunities provided by each of the 5 *management strategies*.

Even-aged, short rotation	Even-aged, long rotation	Multi-aged, multi-species	Reserves & Managed reserves	Restoration of ecosystems of concern
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dependable financial returns • Ability to adapt to changing climate • Quality hunting experiences on Dunn • Early seral habitat for biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dependable financial returns • Niche market for high quality wood • Aesthetic appeal • Older forest conditions, which are uncommon on the landscape in the region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-aged stands of varying degrees of complexity will promote biodiversity • Aesthetic appeal • Quality recreation opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Late-seral conditions with minimal management to promote biodiversity • Carbon sequestration • Forest conditions which 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance biodiversity • Reduce wildfire risk in the WUI • Implement TEK • Learn about restoration principles, invasive treatment, the

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits of strong edge effects for wildlife • Learning opportunities about climate adaptation, forest product production, early seral habitat, harvest operations, regeneration, veg treatments, carbon sequestration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon sequestration • Stands of a variety of ages across the forest to provide a diversity of habitat conditions (promote biodiversity) • Learning opportunities about costs associated with rotation lengths longer than is typical, thinning operations, effects of varying the quantity of legacy elements retained at time of harvest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest conditions which are uncommon on the landscape in the region • Learning opportunities about managing with complex silvicultural techniques, regeneration, variation in financial returns from complex silvicultural operations • Carbon sequestration in multi-aged stands and multi-species stands 	<p>are uncommon on the landscape in the region</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning opportunities about long-term risks from climate change and climate-induced disturbances as tree densities increase, outreach on reasons to manage reserve 	<p>ecology of native plants, first foods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create new knowledge for external partners as well as student from many colleges across OSU • Social license
---	--	--	--	--

It was suggested that a poll be sent out to FPC members to ask their thoughts on what scenarios to use as bookends in the first round of modeling.

There was discussion about how the modeling is a necessary step to help determine what land allocation percentages (scenarios) are viable. Given the premise that the research forests are financially self-sustaining, it was suggested that we build in buffers to ensure there is adequate revenue to sustain the necessary forest management over time. If there's an expectation for more active restoration than has been done in the past, additional revenue will need to be generated elsewhere on the forest to support this.

III. Next Steps

- The Chair will add a new row to the top of the table describing the draft management strategy guidelines, to make clear the principles underlining each. This will be brought back to the FPC to refine further at the next meeting.
- A subcommittee will refine the draft silvicultural guidelines, and then the FPC will finalize at our next meeting.