

**OSU College of Forestry
McDonald-Dunn Research Forest Faculty Planning Committee (FPC) Meeting #25
18 Oct 2024, 11am-12:30pm
316 Peavy Forest Science Center and Zoom**

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

Ex Officio Members present: Jenna Baker, Steve Fitzgerald (online), Brent Klumph (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 meeting was to discuss results from recent modeling which investigated a new suite of land allocation scenarios. Upcoming activities include an SAC meeting on Oct 25 to develop recommendations after discussing these results, and opportunities for the community to provide input after discussing these results on Oct 28. The FPC is welcome to attend both of these events.

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 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. These scenarios are shown in Table 1 (next page). After discussing the initial results of this modeling, changes were incorporated to improve accuracy, based upon input from the FPC, SAC, and community. The FPC and SAC then looked at results from a new round of modeling (Round 1v2), conducted in September, investigating these same 5 initial scenarios. Upon reviewing these results, it was decided that 7 new scenarios would be investigated (Round 2) in October. These scenarios are shown in Table 2 (next page).

Table 1. Five initial scenarios investigated in round 1 (in late May) and revisited in round 1v2 (in September).

Management Strategies	Scenario A (baseline)	Scenario B (high EASR)	Scenario C (high EALR)	Scenario D (high MAMS)	Scenario E (high 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%

Table 2. Seven new scenarios investigated in Round 2 (in October).

Management Strategies	Scenario G (high EALR & MAMS, moderate EASR)	Scenario H (equal EALR & MAMS, high MR)	Scenario J (high MAMS)	Scenario K (high EALR)	Scenario L (high MAMS & EALR, equal others)	Scenario M (high EALR & MAMS, low EASR)	Scenario N (equal EALR & MAMS, high EOC)
Even-aged, short rotation	14%	10%	8%	8%	10%	5%	9%
Even-aged, long rotation	35%	24%	8%	50%	20%	35%	25%
Multi-aged/multi-species	20%	24%	50%	8%	33%	25%	26%
Managed reserve	8%	15%	8%	8%	10%	9%	8%
Ecosystems of concern	6%	10%	8%	8%	10%	9%	14%
Long term learning & non-forest	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

III. Discussion of New Results

The results were first presented in a way that enabled comparisons between metrics for Scenario A (the baseline) with metrics for each of the 7 new scenarios. The same results were then presented in a way that highlighted which of the scenarios provided maximum and minimum values for each metric.

Several discussion threads ensued:

- There was a conversation about how to present the results in a way that eases interpretation. It was suggested that either red text be used in the tables to show values that decreased from the baseline or consider slightly different coloring of cells to show this.
- It was questioned whether it would be wise to have a very high percentage of the research forest allocated to any one management strategy, necessitating small acreage to all others, and it was agreed that this was not ideal from the standpoint of experimental design and replication for research purposes. It was therefore suggested that scenario J, which performed well, be adjusted rather than considered as a true possibility to implement.
- It was suggested that scenario L was a good option, followed by scenarios M and N, for the following reasons: (1) these are economically viable, have relatively high forest carbon, have relatively high composite biodiversity scores, include 25% or more MAMS, have no single management strategy represented by >35% of total forest acreage, and MR and EOC are each higher than present but not unrealistically high.
- It was explained that MAMS is operationally challenging to implement on the ground given the size of the research forest staff, it is difficult to find operators who can execute these types of harvests, and it would be difficult ecologically to transition some stands from their current trajectory to MAMS. For these reasons, scenario J, calling for 50% of acreage to move to MAMS, would be difficult to actualize. That said, having substantial acreage allocated to MAMS would allow the research forest to be a leader in researching how to do it well, so having 33% (scenario L) could be advantageous.
- It was suggested that consideration be given to what is appropriate for the forest to function in terms of providing learning opportunities: should there be minimums for EOC and MR?
- Scenario H, with the highest acreage of MR, has the lowest net revenue, forest products, and resilience-density, but highest carbon and recreation acceptability. It would be helpful to determine a minimum threshold for MR.
- Support was expressed for scenario L, if modified to include slightly more in EALR. It was considered desirable because of the 10% MR and EOC. Scenario M was appreciated because it has more EALR, but adjustments would be wanted to increase MR and EOC to 10% each.
- From a recreation perspective, MAMS was rated as having relatively high acceptability. Also, there will likely be concern expressed by forest visitors when EALR stands are harvested because of the drastic changes in aesthetics.
- It was mentioned that 5% of EASR may be too little from a research perspective, and appreciation was expressed for scenario L, which had each management strategy represented by $\geq 10\%$. It was suggested that 10% be considered the minimum for any management strategy in final scenarios moved forward for the Dean's consideration.
- The following 3 new allocations (Table 3) were tentatively suggested as possibilities to move forward to the Dean, along with rationale describing the benefits and shortcomings of each. The group will wait to hear from the SAC, community, and Cristina as to other concerns and preferences before finalizing the recommendations at the next FPC meeting.

Table 3. Tentative ideas on land allocations to recommend to the Dean for final consideration.

MANAGEMENT STRATEGY	A	X	Y	Z
Even-aged, short rotation	25%	10%	10%	10%
Even-aged, long rotation	27%	30%	26.5%	23%
Multi-aged/multi-species	20%	23%	26.5%	30%
Managed reserve	4%	10%	10%	10%
Ecosystems of concern	6%	10%	10%	10%
Long term learning & non-forest	17%	17%	17%	17%

Next, the group discussed options for presenting these new modeling results to the SAC and community. It was agreed that the SAC should see all 7 models, and also that it could be helpful to rule out a few of them before presenting the community. SAC input will be requested on how to present to the community.

- Consider not including J and K, since these were extreme bookends that could not viably be implemented on the ground.
- Consider dropping G because it has low EOC and MR, making the FPC reluctant to consider it further, and N because it has high EOC and therefore also won't be considered further.
- Consider sharing info on net revenue thresholds to increase the community's understanding of economic sustainability.

IV. Writing of the New Plan

The subgroup working on crafting recommendations on management of riparian Ecosystems of Concern has met, developed an outline, and begun writing. They anticipate having material ready for review by the end of October.

The subgroup working on crafting recommendations on management of oak and prairie Ecosystems of Concern has met, reviewed the text written by INR for the new plan and the material crafted as an appendix after the 2005 Plan was written. They expect to have material ready for review by the end of October.

Cultural resource sections are currently being worked on and are awaiting review from another entity in the university. Sections on current and future forest conditions have been worked on to the extent possible prior to selection of a final scenario to carry forward. The biodiversity section will be reviewed by the end of October. The recreation section should be done by mid-November.

V. Next Steps

- Holly will send a calendar invitation for the next FPC meeting on Nov 4, when we will discuss the input received from the SAC and community about the results from Round 2 and finalize scenario recommendations to the Dean.
- Groups and individuals will work on writing/revising specific sub-sections of the plan and Holly will incorporate these into a single primary draft.
- The FPC will plan to meet 1 or 2 more times beyond the Nov 4 date to discuss revisions to the maximum age limit for tree harvest, to brainstorm about alternative sources of revenue, and other remaining loose ends that become apparent as writing continues.