

**OSU College of Forestry  
 McDonald-Dunn Research Forest Faculty Planning Committee (FPC) Meeting #26  
 4 Nov 2024, 11am-noon  
 316 Peavy Forest Science Center and Zoom**

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

Ex Officio Members present: Jenna Baker (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 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 develop recommendations on land allocation scenarios, taking into account recent input from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) and the community.

**II. Overview of Modeling Intent, Process, Results, and Input Received**

The group recapped the intent and mechanics of the modeling process. The aim of the modeling is to understand potential implications of allocating different proportions of forest acreage to each of the 5 defined management strategies to enable evaluation of 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, and then recapped the 5 scenarios investigated first and 7 additional scenarios investigated next. They looked over results, presented in a way that enabled comparisons between metrics for Scenario A (the baseline) with metrics for each of the 11 other scenarios.

It was highlighted that the reason the group is considering alternatives to what is currently in place is because there’s a belief the research forest can be moved to new conditions that are improved over current (e.g., conditions that confer higher biodiversity, more forest carbon, greater recreation acceptability, greater resilience and greater resistance to wildfire, while still producing forest products and adequate net revenue to support all the needs of the forest). The modeling process is intended to increase understanding of the implications of having more or less of the forest managed through short rotation forestry, long rotation forestry, managed reserves, complex multi-aged/multi-species stands, and a smaller or greater emphasis on restoration of ecosystems of concern.

The group reviewed input received from the SAC meeting on 24 October 2024, Community Input Session on 28 October 2024, and webform (Table 1).

Table 1. Summary of input received from the recent SAC meeting, Community Input Session, and webform regarding percent of acreage to allocate to each management strategy.

Management Strategy	SAC ① <b>G</b>	SAC ② <b>new</b>	SAC ③ <b>H</b>	SAC ④ <b>D</b>	SAC ④ <b>J</b>	SAC ⑤ <b>J</b>	SAC ⑤ <b>A</b>	CIS ① <b>G</b>	Webform ① <b>G</b>	Avg
<b>EASR</b>	14	14	10	10	8	8	25	14	14	13
<b>EALR</b>	35	27	24	10	8	8	27	35	35	23
<b>MAMS</b>	20	24	24	39	50	50	20	20	20	30
<b>MR</b>	8	8	15	15	8	8	4	8	8	9
<b>EOC</b>	6	10	10	10	8	8	6	6	6	8

<b>Edu+</b>	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
<b>total</b>	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

\*EASR = Even-aged, short rotation; EALR = Even-aged, long rotation; MAMS = Multi-aged/multi-species; MR = Managed reserves; EOC = Ecosystems of concern; Edu+ = long-term research and non-forest

The group then compared the average values across all input received and noted that these were quite close to the tentative suggestions they had derived at their last meeting for final land allocation recommendations (Table 2), with FPC tentative suggestions including *less* Even-aged Short Rotations and *more* Managed Reserves and Ecosystems of Concern than the average across all input received.

Table 2. Tentative ideas on land allocation recommends to advance to the Dean for final consideration.

<b>MANAGEMENT STRATEGY</b>	<b>A (baseline)</b>	<b>X (proposed)</b>	<b>Y (proposed)</b>	<b>Z (proposed)</b>
<b>Even-aged, short rotation (EASR)</b>	25%	10%	10%	10%
<b>Even-aged, long rotation (EALR)</b>	27%	30%	26.5%	23%
<b>Multi-aged/multi-species (MAMS)</b>	20%	23%	26.5%	30%
<b>Managed reserves (MR)</b>	4%	10%	10%	10%
<b>Ecosystems of concern (EOC)</b>	6%	10%	10%	10%
<b>Long term learning &amp; non-forest</b>	17%	17%	17%	17%
<b>TOTAL</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%

### III. Final Recommendations on Land Allocation Scenarios

Discussion ensued as to why individuals felt a minimum of 10% acreage should be allocated to each management strategy and the benefits and drawbacks of having more or less MAMS and EALR.

- From the perspective of economics and climate adaptation... because the *net revenue* metric doesn't account for climate change, we should be sure to take into account the climate resilience metrics (*resilience-density* and *resilience-composition*). Generally, MAMS fairs better on these than EALR due to challenges associated with Douglas-fir. For this reason, **scenario Z** seems best. The research forest has an opportunity to lead the way to adapt to climate change as it unfolds, and Z could help in this regard. (Dave Lewis)
- From the perspective of wildfire resistance, the key will be underburning. Even-aged management may be slightly easier than MAMS to do wholesale site prep to reduce fuel loads. On the other hand, MAMS provides research opportunities and recreation benefits. Along with those benefits there is risk because MAMS has the steepest learning curve. (John Bailey)
- From the perspective of aquatic ecosystems and wildlife species of conservation concern, it's important to have a diversity of habitats, to protect and recognize aquatic ecosystems within the forest, and to provide connectivity across ecosystem types with a diversity of management approaches and treatments. Therefore, it would be good to de-emphasize EASR and emphasize Managed Reserves and Ecosystems of Concern. To maximize research opportunities and provide recreation opportunities, there should be a minimum amount of each of the 5 management strategies. (Tiffany Garcia)
- Strong support was expressed for having a minimum of 10% of each management strategy, recognizing that this is a big increase for Managed Reserves and Ecosystems of Concern, as well as a big decrease for EASR. **Scenario Y** seems better than Z due to interest in long rotations and concern about the uncertainty surrounding financial returns from MAMS. Also, there is concern due to the

uncertainty around implementation of MAMS and how it could impact local jobs. Implementing MAMS is research in and of itself, whereas EALR is more of a sure bet, so less risky. (Mindy Crandall)

- From the perspective of terrestrial biodiversity, MAMS provides interesting research opportunities. Also, the community has expressed an interest in less clearcut-forestry and greater connectivity, so would prefer not to dip below 10% for EOC and Managed Reserves. **Scenario Z or Y** seem best. (Mark Kerstens)
- It was noted that EALR and MAMS both involve growing bigger/older trees. If the forest is set up to grow bigger/older trees, that means bigger/older trees will be cut. This provides many ecological benefits along the way.
- It was noted that if/when wildfire occurs in the Managed Reserves, the EALR and MAMS stands will become important as providers of large trees and structural characteristics of older forests. Acreage in these two management strategies is a good landscape approach to providing older forest conditions.
- Bringing in Tribal perspectives and Indigenous knowledge, there's a preference for **Scenario Z, followed by Y**. Tribal forest management previously focused on EASR with some EALR, but there's growing preference for MAMS and an intention to steward some areas toward old growth conditions over time. Scenario Z demonstrates our commitment to conservation, cultural sensitivities, and reserves managed in a way to promote resilience. (Cristina Eisenberg)
- From an operational perspective, concerns were expressed about the implementation of large acreages of MAMS. It is labor-intensive, so the College would likely need to hire consultants to lay out the harvests and it could be challenging to find entities able to implement them. **Scenario X, then Y, then Z** would be preferred. (Brent Klumph)
- There will be a long transition period from current conditions to get to X, Y, or Z, so adaptive management will be essential. Z may be an end goal, and the forest will pass through X and Y on the way.
- Concern was again raised about the challenges associated with conversion from current forest conditions to those that are drastically different. **Scenario X** should be the initial goal, with potential transition to Y over the longer-term. Even-aged forests are easier to manage, and we have the knowledge to do it. (Laurie Schimleck)
- It was recommended that the language be shifted from "adaptive management" to "active adaptive stewardship" to keep in line with new, developing federal policy. "Stewardship" encompasses conservation and sustained extraction and managed reserves. We can't control nature, but we can steward it to promote climate resilience.
- It was suggested that "Managed Reserves" be re-titled "Stewarded Reserves". This is a new era – a paradigm shift for how research forests are stewarded, with nature as the driver.
- From a risk management standpoint, **Scenario Y** is best, as it hedges bets between the more extreme X and Z. Also, there is concern about increasing challenges associated with getting Douglas-fir established in some areas on the McDonald-Dunn Forest. (Carli Morgan)

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

- It was decided that we would not request that the modeler investigate these 3 final scenarios.
- Holly will summarize all perspectives expressed today from the standpoint of strengths and weakness and send to the group for an accuracy check.
- Holly will send a scheduling poll for the next FPC meeting sometime in mid to late Nov 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.