OSU College of Forestry
McDonald-Dunn Research Forest Faculty Planning Committee (FPC) Meeting #22
30 May 2024, 11am-1pm
316 Peavy Forest Science Center and Zoom

<u>Faculty Planning Committee Members present:</u> Holly Ober (chair), John Bailey, Mindy Crandall, Cristina Eisenberg, Mark Kerstens, Dave Lewis (online), Laurie Schimleck (online)

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

I. Welcome, Overview of Recent & Upcoming Activities

Following introductions, the group reviewed the meeting agenda, the forest planning website which contains materials associated with past and future meetings, a diagram outlining the forest planning process, and they discussed an overview of activities for the near term future. Upcoming activities include the FPC, SAC, and community providing feedback on the results of Round 1 of the modeling, a second round of modeling, and then the FPC, SAC, and community providing feedback on the results of Round 2 of the modeling. All members of the FPC are welcome to attend the SAC meeting on June 3 and the Community Input Session on June 5 if they would like.

II. Overview of Modeling Intent & Process

The group talked about the complexity involved in managing the McDonald-Dunn Forest. This complexity stems from the need to be mindful of reaching all 10 goals outlined by the Research Forest Advisory Committee in 2021, the need to preserve the integrity of the many long term research projects already in place, and the large number of silvicultural options defined by the 5 "forest management strategies" that the new plan will put into play. They discussed broadly how the intent of the modeling process is to understand potential implications of allocating different proportions of forest acreage to each of the 5 management strategies so that we can weigh tradeoffs among options before any new management activities are implemented on the ground. They reviewed the 5 land allocation scenarios previously decided upon, shown below.

Management Strategies	Scenario A (baseline)	Scenario B (lots of EASR)	Scenario C (lots of EALR)	Scenario D (lots of MAMS)	Scenario E (lots of MR & EOC)
Even-aged, short rotation	25%	39%	15%	10%	15%
Even-aged, long rotation	27%	15%	39%	10%	15%
Multi-aged/multi-species	20%	10%	10%	39%	15%
Managed reserve	4%	10%	10%	15%	20%
Ecosystems of concern	6%	10%	10%	10%	20%
Long term learning & non-forest	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

III. Overview of Modeling Output & its Interpretation

The group looked at examples of the type of data the model can output.

They then reviewed the 8 metrics previously decided upon to be used to assess tradeoffs among the land allocation scenarios. The data used to estimate each metric was explained in detail. The metrics are **biodiversity**, **forest carbon**, **forest products**, **recreation acceptability**, **resilience – density**, **resilience – composition**, **net revenue**, and **wildfire hazard**.

As the group reviewed the actual modeling results, the following conversation topics emerged.

- A decision was made to alter the scaling used to calculate several metrics to simplify interpretation such that all would be presented in a way that lower values reflected greater potential concern (resilience – density, resilience – composition, wildfire resistance). Note that the name of the wildfire metric was changed from 'hazard' to 'resilience' to denote this change. After this change, low values on these metrics will reflect low resilience and resistance.
- The group suggested the results be shared with the SAC and community by presenting % change relative to the baseline scenario and actual raw numbers, rather than simplifying to categories describing degree of change from the baseline (---, --, - +, ++, +++).
- There was discussion of several changes that might be made before the second round of modeling.
  - The log prices should be edited because they've already changed since the data were originally provided to the modeler for round 1. A suggestion was made to use a longer-term average of log prices and/or conduct a sensitivity analysis.
  - There was a suggestion that we consider calculating *present value* in addition to or in place of net value.
- It was suggested that we highlight for the SAC and community all the details described in the guidelines for the 5 management strategies so it's clear, for example, where culturally important plants and indigenous knowledge are considered.

IV. Next Steps
- John will revise the calculations for 3 metrics (resilience – density, resilience – composition, and wildfire resistance) and Holly will update the handout and slide deck accordingly before sharing with the SAC and community.
- Holly will post the document that describes the 5 management strategies online and will revise the handout so that it links to this.
- Brent and Fitz will discuss what approach to use for log prices for Round 2 of the modeling.
- Dave, Mindy, and Fitz will discuss the concept of calculating present value for Round 2 of the modeling.
- Holly will disseminate a scheduling poll to identify a date for the next FPC meeting when we will discuss the input received from the SAC and community about the results from Round 1 and decide what scenarios to model during Round 2.