

OSU College of Forestry
McDonald-Dunn Research Forest Faculty Planning Committee (FPC) Meeting #15
17 October 2023, noon-2:00pm
316 Peavy Forest Science Center and Zoom

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

Ex Officio Members present: Jenna Baker, Steve Fitzgerald, Brent Klumph (online), Carli Morgan (online)

I. Welcome, Overview of Recent Events & Activities

The group reviewed the meeting agenda.

Steve announced that a land trade was made at the end of September between OSU and Starker Forest. After many years of discussion, OSU has acquired a 317-acre inholding in the center of the McDonald Forest (the Baker Tract) in exchange for the Spaulding tract (a 160-acre research forest west of Philomath) and 170 acres of the Dunn Forest in Section 17. The timing of this exchange simplifies the modeling process by negating the need to run 2 parallel models to assess land allocation implications with and without the potential swap.

The group reviewed the [forest planning website](#) which contains materials associated with past and future meetings and events. They also viewed some newly updated [COF Research Forest webpages](#), reviewed a diagram outlining the forest planning process, summarized the 5 new 'management strategies', the 5 'scenarios' that will be evaluated during the first of two anticipated rounds of modeling, and discussed the sequencing of future input-gathering opportunities (FPC meetings, SAC meetings, and Community Input Sessions).

II. Modeling of Biodiversity

A recap was provided of a gathering of a group of 8 faculty and graduate students in July to brainstorm about what approach could be used to model biodiversity. At the end, a decision was made to convene small groups of experts with taxonomic expertise to provide perspectives on relationships between various wildlife species and forest conditions. This approach is similar to one recently used to evaluate implications to biodiversity of various harvest options in the Elliott State Research Forest. The results of this approach will be folded into the larger modeling to enable an assessment of tradeoffs among land allocation scenarios.

III. Metrics to be used to Evaluate Other Forest Values

The group revisited the methodology that will be used to estimate various forest characteristics during the modeling process.

- **Carbon** – The growth and yield modeling will generate estimates of this. The resulting metric will be quantitative.

- **Culturally important species** – Cristina Eisenberg will be providing guidance on this. The exact nature of the metric is yet to be determined, but may be similar to that used for biodiversity.
- **Forest products** – Merchantable board feet of various forest products will be outputs from the modeling in Woodstock. This metric will be quantitative.
- **Recreation suitability & aesthetics** – There was much discussion as to whether this ought to be broken into 2 metrics: one to represent **aesthetics** and another to represent **recreation impact** that reflect recreationist’s concern about trail closures. There was conversation about how perceptions of a single stand change over time as a stand ages, and also about how individuals engaged in different types of recreation may have different preferences. We’ll continue to evaluate options for how exactly we might feasibly assess this.
- **Resilience** – There was discussion as to whether this should reflect only tree density and size or that plus tree species composition. Ultimately it was decided that 2 metrics should be included to reflect resilience: **resilience-density** and **resilience-composition**. Both metrics will be quantitative.
- **Revenue** – The research forest staff has developed lists of costs associated with various forest management activities, to be subtracted from estimates of revenue generated through timber harvest. This metric will be quantitative.
- **Wildfire risk** – An index will be developed that calculates this using data from FVS, taking into account canopy bulk density, canopy base height, and canopy cover). This metric will be quantitative.

IV. Writing of the New Plan

The group discussed the entire draft document, section by section.

- Chapter 1 (Introductory Context) is entirely drafted.
- Chapter 2 (Site Description) is mostly drafted but needs additional detail and updating. The group discussed the virtues of changing the sub-section originally envisioned as covering harvest history to one sub-section on disturbance history and a second on recreation history.
- Chapter 3 (New Management Paradigms) is partially drafted.
 - Cristina, Fitz, and Brent will meet to further discuss content for the section on Tribal engagement.
 - We’ll consider the possibility of creating heat maps to show concentrated areas of use for teaching and outreach (and possibly recreation), using Strava or some other mapping tool that allows users to enter locational data.
 - A section on potential funding sources will be moved to a logical location in the plan once other subsections are completed.
 - Plans for the section on biodiversity will be revised so that each of the Ecosystems of Concern has a subsection, and a subsection on management of hardwoods will be added. An appendix on the selection of leave trees for recreation will be considered.
 - Subsections about the various threats to forest health are drafted: some work will be needed to ensure the tone of each is in line with that of other sections.
 - The subsection on the wildland-urban interface will be moved from the forest threat section to the human dimensions section.
 - There is material written about recreation, interpretation, and communication strategies developed for other purposes, that could be the foundation for the section

on enhancing community engagement in this plan. Community science will be moved to the end of this subsection, since it's an opportunity for growth rather than an existing area of strength. A subsection on volunteers will be added, as well as perhaps a table describing annually recurring outreach and/or recreation events.

- We need to consider where to mention student use of the forests through student clubs, such as Conclave – perhaps in the section describing use of the forest for learning?
- Chapter 4 (Plan Implementation) will be developed late in the planning process.
 - There was a general suggestion of incorporating a recommendation in this section that modeling be re-run every 5 years, to ensure adaptive management over time.

V. Next Steps

- The FPC will meet every two weeks during fall term.
- Writing will be occurring throughout fall term, with FPC members contributing to initial drafts of various portions of the plan. Individuals currently working on specific sections include Jenna (community engagement), John (forest health), Mark (biodiversity), and Fitz (fostering learning opportunities).
- We need to decide on whether/how to assess recreation impact and/or aesthetics.
- We will investigate the possibility of creating heat maps to show areas of focused use for various activities (teaching and outreach; recreation).
- Exact dates for the next SAC meeting and first Community Input Session will be dictated by the timing of the modeling results, and will be publicized as soon as possible.