OSU College of Forestry
McDonald-Dunn Research Forest Faculty Planning Committee (FPC) Meeting #23
16 Sept 2024, 10am-noon
316 Peavy Forest Science Center and Zoom

Faculty Planning Committee Members present: Holly Ober (chair), Mindy Crandall, Cristina Eisenberg, Tiffany Garcia, Mark Kerstens, Dave Lewis

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

I. Welcome, Overview of Recent & Upcoming Activities

Following introductions, the group reviewed the meeting agenda, the forest planning website which contains materials from past and future meetings, a diagram outlining the forest planning process, and they discussed activities anticipated in the near future. Upcoming activities include an SAC meeting on Sept 25, a second round of modeling, and then opportunities for the FPC, SAC, and community to provide feedback on the results of Round 2 of the modeling which will investigate a new suite of scenarios relative to Round 1. All members of the FPC are welcome to attend the SAC meeting on Sept 25.

II. Overview of Modeling Intent & Process

The group talked through a recap of the intent and mechanics of the modeling process. The aim of the modeling is to understand potential implications of allocating varying proportions of forest acreage to each of the 5 defined management strategies so that we can weigh tradeoffs among options before any new management activities are implemented on the ground. The group reviewed the 5 land allocation scenarios previously decided upon for initial investigation in Round 1, 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%	**19%**
Ecosystems of concern	6%	10%	10%	10%	**19%**
Long term learning & non-forest	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Next there was discussion of the changes that were made to improve the accuracy of the modeling.

- o The biodiversity metric was revised so that the "Multi-aged/multi-species" management strategy reflected taxa responses to all 3 silvicultural prescriptions that could be implemented (group selection, variable retention, and shelterwood).
- o A third element was added to increase the precision of the wildfire resistance metric. It previously included crown bulk density and canopy base height, and now also includes surface fuel loading.
- o Economic implications were further investigated by assessing results when modeled according to 2023 vs 2024 log prices and when modeled according to 4 and 5% discount rates. It was decided most prudent to use the more conservative 2024 log prices and 4% discount rates.

The group 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**. It was noted that a decision was made not to add another metric to these analyses to reflect culturally significant species, as was proposed at a previous meeting, but rather to incorporate specific management tactics that will nurture these species holistically across the entire forest. The modeling per se will not need to account for culturally significant species because Research Forest staff will be making a commitment forest-wide to enhance these taxa.

III. New Results

The results were first presented in a way that easily enabled comparisons between values in Scenario A (the baseline) with values in each of the other 4 scenarios. The same results were then presented in a way that highlighted which of the 5 scenarios provided maximum and minimum values for each metric. Then, the maximum possible values were shown. Finally, the scenarios that maximized each forest characteristic were shown.

There was discussion about a variety of topics. Extensive conversation revolved around wanting to ensure the plan is resilient to future changes in the economy and changes in leadership. It was explained that the values shown for net revenue indicate projections of surplus, once current revenue needs are met for expenses such as salaries, roads, building maintenance, etc. These projections do not take into consideration funds being sequestered into a financial reserve (i.e., a "rainy day" pool that would help the research forests weather a downturn in the economy, as was experienced in 2008), or any funds being returned to the College to facilitate research as has been past practice. It was suggested that consideration be given to scenarios with a reasonable net revenue value to reduce the likelihood of a future leader suspending this new plan or releasing existing staff when faced with an economic downturn.

A preference was expressed to begin a discussion of potential new scenarios to model, then pause to hear SAC suggestions, and then reconvene to finalize requests to the modeler. Remarks included the following:

- - Ensure managed reserves are not too limited, given community interest in these being expanded over current acreage (which is 3.6% of forest acreage)
- - MAMS is generally given high acceptability ratings from recreationists, once some time has passed since disturbance, so consider higher amounts of this

- It was noted that ecological conditions on the McDonald-Dunn Forest could not allow for EOC to encompass any more than ~10%, so there's no good reason to model scenarios with higher percentages of EOC (i.e., it's not realistic to convert areas with extremely little to no oak to oak savannas).

Suggestions were made to consider the following additional scenarios:

- One that combines a mix of original scenarios C and D (see **scenario F** below).
- One that has high EALR, substantial MAMS, and decreasing amounts of EASR, MR, and EOC (see **scenario G** below).
- One that has high MR and EOC, substantial MAMS, and decreasing amounts of EASR, MR, and EOC (see **scenario H** below).
- One that has equally high amounts of EASR, EALR, and MAMS, with moderate amounts of MR and EOC (see **scenario** I below).
- One that has extremely high MAMS, and modest amounts of all else (see **scenario J** below).
- One that has extremely high EALR, and modest amounts of all else (see **scenario K** below).
- One that has high MAMS, substantial EALR, and modest amounts of EASR, MR, and EOC (see **scenario L** below).

Suggestions for new scenarios to consider modeling in Round 2

Management Strategies	Scenario F (mix of C&D)	Scenario G (another mix of C&D)	Scenario H (lots of MR, equal EALR & MAMS)	Scenario I (equal EASR, EALR, MAMS)	Scenario J (a lot of MAMS)	Scenario K (a lot of EALR)	Scenario L (another mix of C&D)
Even-aged, short rotation	11%	14%	10%	21%	8%	8%	10%
Even-aged, long rotation	26%	35%	24%	21%	8%	50%	20%
Multi-aged/multi-species	26%	20%	24%	21%	50%	8%	33%
Managed reserve	10%	8%	15%	10%	8%	8%	10%
Ecosystems of concern	10%	6%	10%	10%	8%	8%	10%
Long term learning & non-forest	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The group expressed a preference to meet shortly after the SAC meeting to make final recommendations on exactly which scenarios the modeler would address in Round 2 of modeling.

IV. Remaining Tasks for the FPC

There was discussion about how to tackle some of the remaining work to be done on the new plan.

- Revising the maximum age limit for tree harvest – *will be tackled by entire FPC*
- Brainstorm about alternative sources of revenue – *will be tackled by entire FPC*
- Develop/revise guidelines on management and restoration of oak and prairie EOCs – *will be tackled be a subgroup (Cristina, Mark, Carli, Fitz, and maybe Tom K)*

- Develop guidelines on management of riparian EOCs – *will be tackled be a subgroup (Tiffany, Mindy, Kevin B, and maybe Dana)*

V. Next Steps

- 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 about the results from Round 1 and decide what scenarios to model during Round 2.
- Holly will send out individualized versions of the draft plan to each FPC member who will be leading the writing/revising of specific subs-sections and these authors will use "track changes" in Word when making edits so the changes can then be incorporated into a single primary copy
- Holly will send out material and schedule first meeting for each of the 2 subgroups that will work on refining guidelines for the EOCs (one for riparian and one for oak savanna and prairies)