

**OSU College of Forestry**  
**McDonald-Dunn Research Forest Faculty Planning Committee (FPC) Meeting #24**  
**3 Oct 2024, noon-1:00pm**  
**316 Peavy Forest Science Center and Zoom**

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

Ex Officio Members present: Jenna Baker (online), Steve Fitzgerald (online), Brent Klumph (online), 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 from past and future meetings, a diagram outlining the forest planning process, and they discussed future events and activities. It was clarified that the primary intent of this brief meeting was to decide what scenarios to include in the new round of modeling which will investigate a different suite of land allocation scenarios than originally assessed. Upcoming events will include an FPC meeting to discuss Round 2 modeling results, an SAC meeting sometime Oct 22-24, and a Community Input Session sometime Oct 28-30.

### **II. Synopsis of Modeling Intent & Process**

The group talked through the intent and mechanics of the modeling process. The aim of the modeling is to gain a better understanding of the likely implications of allocating varying proportions of forest acreage to each of the 5 defined management strategies. The modeling enables an assessment of tradeoffs among options before new management activities are implemented on the ground. The group reviewed the 8 metrics previously decided upon to be used to assess tradeoffs among the land allocation scenarios. These metrics are **biodiversity, forest carbon, forest products, recreation acceptability, resilience – density, resilience – composition, net revenue, and wildfire hazard.**

They recapped the 5 scenarios investigated in the first round of modeling (Round 1), completed in late May, described in Table 1 below. After discussing the initial results of this modeling, changes were incorporated to improve accuracy, based upon input from the FPC, SAC, and community, and a new round of modeling was run to investigate these 5 initial scenarios (Round 1v2).

### **III. Final Selection of New Scenarios to Investigate in Round 2**

The group was reminded that after looking at results from the most recent modeling (Round 1v2) conducted in early September, the FPC met on September 16 and tentatively suggested 7 new scenarios (scenarios F through L in Table 2 below). The SAC met on September 25 and individuals expressed support for scenarios C, D, H, and J, and little support for scenarios B, E, and I. One SAC member suggested an additional scenario for consideration (scenario M in Table 2).

The following discussion ensued:

- Should there be one more scenario included, that has the maximum feasible acreage for *Ecosystems of Concern*?
- The group should keep in mind what is feasible in terms of converting existing forest conditions to new. Extreme scenarios, such as J, may not be operationally possible.
- Final decisions as to what scenarios are best for the McDonald-Dunn Forest might be helped most if the next group of scenarios modeled pushes the boundaries of the amount of each management strategy (e.g., J maximizes MAMS, K maximizes EALR, H maximizes managed reserves, and there could be a new option added that maximizes EOC).
- It was suggested we ensure there is a minimum of 5% of EASR in every scenario.
- Consider removing F, as it is fairly redundant with G, H, and L.
- Consider removing I, as it is quite similar to A.
- Consider new options of 5% EASR, 40/20% EALR/MAMS, 8% MR, 10% EOC.
- There was recognition of the community's interest in expanding managed reserves above the current acreage, which is <4%.
- Consider revising M to include 5% EASR, pulling this from MAMS.
- It would be good to consider minimum acreages needed for each management strategy from the standpoint of conducting research.
- Support for L was voiced, because it has EOC and MR at 10% each.
- It was agreed to move forward with G, H, J, K, L, a modified version of M, and a new scenario, N (see Table 3); do not move forward F or I for modeling.

It was agreed that we would confer with the modeler to determine whether the acreages included in the new riparian buffers defined according to the Private Forest Accord are included in the "non-forest" portion of the *Long-term Learning & Non-forest* category or the *Ecosystems of Concern*, and use this information to decide what percentage EOC to include in new scenario N, which will push the EOC acreage to the upper limit of what's feasible.

#### **IV. Next Steps**

- Holly will send a scheduling poll to the group to identify a date for the next FPC meeting, sometime in mid-to-late October. At this meeting the group will discuss the results from Round 2 and begin considering what scenario(s) to recommend to the Dean.
- Holly will confer with the modeler about where the new riparian buffer acreage is allocated, and adjust the new scenario N accordingly.
- Holly will draft a table showing the scenarios decided upon by the FPC and send out for review prior to sending to the modeler.

