

OSU College of Forestry
McDonald-Dunn Research Forest Faculty Planning Committee Meeting #6
20 December 2022, 1:00-3:00pm
125 Peavy Forest Science Center and Online (via Zoom)

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

College of Forestry research forest staff present: Jenna Baker, Steve Fitzgerald, Brent Klumph

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members present: Jesse Ott (online), John Taylor

I. Introductions and Overview of recent and upcoming events

Two members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee joined this meeting so as to increase information sharing between the two committees. It was mentioned that from this point forward, we will try to have at least one member of each committee attend meetings of the other committee.

Following introductions, an SAC Member expressed appreciation for more regular opportunities to increase communication between the two groups, and suggested that each strives to include in all documents enough detail so that misperceptions and misunderstandings are minimized in the future. The other SAC member agreed with this and expressed appreciation for the research forests.

The group reviewed the meeting agenda, an overview of the planning process, and the [planning website](#) which contains materials associated with past and future meetings and events.

The chair highlighted the different components of the planning process covered thus far:

- [Phase Ia](#) – Gathering of input and information from a variety of sources
- [Phase Ib](#) – Discussions and assessment of the 2005 Plan by the SAC and FPC
 - o [Phase IIa](#) – Synthesizing: this is what's currently underway
 - The SAC is preparing a synthesis document reflecting their input on the development of the forest management plan along with that of others from the community, to be shared with the FPC. They will soon discuss potential 'management regimes' for the new plan, 'scenarios' (proportions of each management regime across the forests), and necessary components of the new plan (e.g., chapters, appendices).
 - Similarly, the FPC is preparing an 'Overarching Principles' document to summarize tenets to guide the management of the research forests, to be shared with the SAC. Following this we will return to discussions of potential 'management regimes' for the new plan, scenarios, and necessary components (chapters, appendices) of the new plan.

II. Refinement of 'Overarching Principles' Document

The intent of this document is to provide ideas that serve as a foundation for the McDonald-Dunn Research Forest, that can be returned to throughout the planning process to ensure important concepts are not left out. It was clarified that this document will be shared with the SAC at whatever point in time the FPC feels it is ready for sharing.

- The 6 subheadings are currently **Foundational Premises, Create Learning Opportunities, Illustrate Economic Sustainability, Exhibit Environmental Sustainability, Nurture Social Sustainability & Cultural Values, and Foster Recreational Opportunities.**
- The group began with discussion of the section on **Nurture Social Sustainability & Cultural Values** and made edits.
- The group then edited the section on **Foster Recreation Opportunities.**
- Next, the entire document was looked over to address any areas previously identified as needing additional consideration.
- Discussion ensued about potential benefits to be had from a reorganization of the content within the document. It was clarified that the intent of this document is to serve as a touchpoint during the planning process to ensure that important principles are reflected in the plan, rather than to serve as a blueprint for the ordering of content within the plan. The document might ultimately be included as an Appendix in the plan, or may simply reside in the collection of documents associated with the planning process.
- The chair promised to upload a clean version of the document to the Box folder that FPC members could revisit if they'd like to suggest additional edits.

III. Management Regimes and Scenarios

The chair reviewed some information presented previously about the 4 'themes' included in the 2005 Plan to describe 4 ways in which different forest stands across the McDonald-Dunn Research Forest were managed so as to reflect distinct objectives that various forest landowners at the time held, and how we're now referring to analogs in the new plan as 'Management Regimes' (terminology proposed at the 22 November FPC meeting). It was explained that the FPC and SAC will be asked 3 things:

1. Suggest a suite of 'management regimes'
2. Suggest a suite of 'scenarios' (varying proportions of each management regime across the forest)
3. Suggest criteria that could be used to evaluate tradeoffs associated with each scenario to ultimately be used in deciding the final proportions of each management regime across the forest

The group reviewed a list of topics that have repeatedly emerged during Community Listening Sessions, SAC meetings, and FPC meetings, and returned to the tentative list of management regimes developed by the FPC on 22 November:

- even-aged, short-rotation
- even-aged, long-rotation
- multi-aged/multi-species
- mature
- restoration

It was suggested that we consider differentiating those forest benefits that are absolutely necessary from those that are hoped for but not essential. For example, the Dean has made it clear that the Research Forests must be self-sustaining, so although the plan can be written in such a way as to enable harnessing emerging opportunities to generate revenue in the future, there can be no point in time during which the forests are not self-sustaining (i.e., it would be irresponsible to count on

revenue from a source that is not currently certain). Thus, revenue generation at all points in time that sustains all aspects of forest operations is essential.

Mature – There was discussion as to whether forest stands in the ‘mature’ management regime would be managed, or whether these would be no-touch reserves. It was clarified that if there were unexpected natural events (e.g., windstorm, wildfire), some management actions might be needed, and therefore it might be best to avoid calling these ‘reserves’.

Restoration – There was mention that this would be a small proportion of the forests. The location and extent of this management regime would be dictated by current conditions to a much greater extent than all other management regimes. It was suggested that the name might be refined to something like ‘oak and meadow restoration’ to more clearly define the true intent.

Scenarios – It was suggested that it might be helpful to include one scenario that represents current conditions, as a baseline against which other scenarios could be evaluated.

IV. Components of the 2005 Plan vs the New Plan

The group looked at the Table of Contents of the 2005 Plan and a strawman draft of a Table of Contents for the new plan. The proposed new outline folds the management regimes into the core material of the plan, on equal footing with many other topics rather than ahead of it as the premise upon which all else rests. It was suggested that desired future conditions be defined early in the plan and then a clear connection made between current conditions/scenarios/future conditions, to make apparent the rationale behind the land allocation decisions.

V. Next Steps

Group members will complete the poll to identify when we will have our standing meetings during winter term. The chair will upload a clean version of the Overarching Principles document to the Box folder that FPC members could revisit if they’d like to suggest additional edits.