



COLLEGE OF FORESTRY McDONALD-DUNN RESEARCH FOREST FMP
Joint Stakeholder Advisory Committee/Faculty Planning Committee Kickoff Meeting
Tuesday, June 14, 2022

Website: <https://cf.forestry.oregonstate.edu/our-forests/mcdonald-dunn-forest-plan>

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members present: Dave Ehlers (via Zoom), Dave Lewis, Elise Kelley, Faye Yoshihara (via Zoom), Jennifer Beathe, Jesse Ott, Jessica McDonald, Jim Fairchild, John Taylor (via Zoom), Kaola Swanson (via Zoom), Leo Williamson, Michael Karnosh, Mike Kennedy, Trey Jackson.

Faculty Planning Committee Members present: Ian Munanura (via Zoom), John Bailey, Laurie Schimleck (via Zoom), Mark Kerstens (via Zoom), Mindy Crandall, Tiffany Garcia, Vernita Ediger, Woody Chung.

OSU College of Forestry Staff present: Ann Van Zee, Brent Klumph, Carli Morgan (via Zoom), Holly Ober, Jenna Baker, Steve Fitzgerald, Dean Tom DeLuca.

Oregon Consensus Facilitation Team: Jennah Stillman and Turner Odell.

Public Attendees via Zoom Webinar: C. Shauger, David Chrostek, Janet Ohmann, Jenie Balkins, Joshua Hough, Kristen McAlpine, Mark Miller, P. Haggerty, Sheanna Steingass, Todd West.

Action Items

Action Item	Who	Date
Locate historical information collected for Appendix 10 of the 2005 plan (i.e., Annual Performance Reports).	COF	Before the next meeting.
Send the SAC a draft proposed approach for the community listening sessions regarding structure, timing, and how the SAC might engage with that information going forward.	OR Consensus	Before the next meeting.
Send the SAC draft Operating Principles document.	OR Consensus	Before the next meeting.

Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions

Turner Odell, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and Faculty Planning Committee members, as well as the College of Forestry staff. After Turner introduced Oregon Consensus and reviewed the agenda, the participants then introduced themselves and shared their affiliation as well as brief remarks about their role with and/or relationship to the OSU Research Forests.

Overview and Charge to the Committees

OSU College of Forestry Dean Tom DeLuca shared a brief overview of his background and how he came to the College of Forestry. He acknowledged the history of the McDonald and Dunn properties, their connection to the land grant mission, the unique opportunities afforded by the presence of research forest in close proximity to the college, and highlighted how the forests are managed to demonstrate multiple interests that are compatible with ecological values, human health and activities, and cultural objectives. He noted that although not a standard public forest, it is clear how important the McDonald-Dunn Forest is as a resource to the community. Dean DeLuca acknowledged some of the past and current management challenges, including but not limited to, the No Vacancy Harvest in 2019, COVID-19 access restrictions in 2020, wildfire closures in 2020, and general complaints regarding neighbor impacts, visitor parking, and logging trucks.

He shared that the McDonald-Dunn Forest is currently operating under the 2005 Forest Management Plan, which he noted is out of date and does not mention climate change or wildfire management. Although an effort to develop a new plan was initiated in 2018, it was put on pause and then restarted in 2020 with an ad hoc *Forest Planning Advisory Committee* charged with developing the College Research Forests Vision, Mission and Goals and to help set the stage for where the new committees are today. Dean DeLuca expressed that the development of this new plan provides an opportunity to shift the underlying philosophy and drivers for management decisions going forward; for all activities and decisions to be driven by research questions, and teaching and demonstration opportunities. He clarified that the College of Forestry will continue to generate revenue from the forests: the forests must be fully self-sustaining and are expected to support research and activities within the College. The forests will continue to have timber harvested in intensive management areas strategically placed in existing intensive management areas. Possibilities may exist to expand ecological reserve areas, depending on how research and demonstration areas are sited. The new plan is an opportunity to identify an inclusive balance of diverse best forest practices, uses, and values in the McDonald-Dunn Forest.

Following this, Dean DeLuca provided an overview of the SAC charge, which he shared was a new, ad hoc committee intended to engage an array of voices in the development of the forest management plan. He noted that the primary role of the SAC is to provide recommendations on the balance of uses, values and management practices; help ensure broader stakeholder and public input is understood and reflected; and to support the shift in management actions being driven by research, education, and demonstration needs. He clarified that the SAC is not a decision-making

body, but will work in tandem with the FPC, who will be responsible for the technical product development. To support this work, Dean DeLuca acknowledged that there may be FPC/SAC subgroup coordination around specific tasks and key points in the process. He also shared that Research Forest staff will be involved in the process as technical resources, but will remain ex-officio in terms of committee decision-making. Finally, he shared that the Dean of the College of Forestry will make all final decisions regarding the plan and that a *Research Forest Advisory and Implementation Committee* will be formed at the end of the process in 2024 to advise on implementation of the final plan.

Questions and Comments

- Could the *Vision, Mission, Goals Statement* be revisited to indicate that revenue from the forests need be generated solely to sustain the research forest operations, rather than also to support ‘the College’s research, teaching, and outreach mission’, as currently stated in the goal pertaining to financial sustainability in the *Vision, Mission, Goals Statement*? Concern was expressed that uncertainty introduced by the vague nature of the existing wording, which could potentially lead to suspension of a new plan as occurred with the 2005 plan.
 - Dean DeLuca responded the McDonald-Dunn Forests must be self-sustaining, and explained that surplus revenue goes into a contingency fund. The ‘financial sustainability’ goal could be reworded for the new McDonald-Dunn Forest plan to make it more clear that any surplus beyond the contingency fund would pay for research, teaching, and outreach associated with the Research Forests.
- Is there an inherent conflict between having as top priority the mandate that all management activities are driven by research, teaching, and outreach, and then secondarily consider revenue generation during a second stage of forest modeling and budget analysis?
 - Dean DeLuca responded that the preferred planning approach is to start with the Forests’ purpose being research, teaching, and outreach, not revenue demands. To give a general ballpark to plan for, Tom shared that annual revenues have previously been around \$1 million.
- Why was revenue so high (nearly \$3 million) during 2019?
 - Stephen Fitzgerald, Director of the Research Forests, shared that this was largely due to increased harvest on the Blodgett Forest (not the McDonald-Dunn) and was used to address a past deficit as well as building costs for Peavy Forest Science Center (a new building on campus). Dean DeLuca added that when he arrived at the College in 2020, there was a previous debt burden and that as log prices went up, they were then able to alleviate that debt. Now, there is a temporary hold in place on harvesting at the Blodgett Forest and plans to develop a management plan for that forest.

History and Context for Research Forest Management Planning

Stephen Fitzgerald, Director of Research Forests, shared a high-level overview of the history and planning for the McDonald and Dunn Forests, which included, but was not limited to: how and

when the forests were acquired by the College; the timeline for 2 different forest management plans from 1993-2022, and an acknowledgement of a period of time when there was no plan in place; an overview of revenue and recent harvests during 2014-2022; acknowledgement of the updated McDonald-Dunn Forest inventory in 2020-2021 for which the data is currently being compiled and will be used in the planning process. He also provided a review of the 2005 McDonald-Dunn Forest goals; described different management zone delineations and objectives; and provided additional background on the 2005 plan regarding special areas and issues.

Questions and Comments

- Is there any information from the 2005 FMP Annual Performance Report, which is listed in Appendix 10 but is blank? Even if an official report is not available, any framework would be helpful for this group to work from. Understanding if the plan's goals are being met is essential.
 - Stephen Fitzgerald shared that he didn't believe any Annual Reports were ever created after the plan was finalized but agreed to verify this.

2022-2023 FMP Process Overview

Holly Ober, Associate Dean of Outreach and Extension, College of Forestry, shared an overview of the FMP development process timeline, which included various opportunities for input throughout three phases that will occur from Spring 2022 through Summer 2023. She acknowledged that the first phase was initiated by a series of interviews with a number of stakeholders, conducted by Oregon Consensus, to identify key themes to be addressed in the planning process. Along with three public listening sessions that would be held to gather input from the broader community, Holly also explained the approach to inventory and engage academic users of the research forests to better understand who uses the forest for research, teaching, and outreach, and how. She shared that after initial information gathering, the second phase would focus on synthesizing what was heard and using that to inform modeling and refining potential management scenarios. The third phase would then be for Dean DeLuca and the Forestry Executive Committee to review and approve the plan. She clarified that there would be opportunities in every phase for review and input from the broader public, SAC and FPC to iteratively integrate feedback. The intention is that the new FMP is finalized during 2023 for implementation in 2024.

Questions and Comments

- How long is this new FMP intended to endure? Strategic planning depends on the planning horizon, with estimating costs and revenues, and other outcomes. The outcomes may change with time.
 - Stephen Fitzgerald responded that there is a desire for it to be an ongoing, dynamic plan that wouldn't have to go through a major rewrite process with every update. He added that this new plan could be iteratively reviewed and adapted as needed, in order to respond to changes or challenges along the way. When addressing financial implications of various scenarios, we may need to consider 5 and 10-year horizons.

- Will an RPF be put out for writing and modeling work?
 - Holly responded that she and Stephen have already engaged in early conversations with individuals who could potentially provide that support and will update the group as the process moves forward.

Participant Aspirations

Turner then invited the participants to each share their own hope or vision that would come out of this process. A summary of the responses included, but was not limited to:

- **Shared Learning.** In addition to a general desire to learn from one another, there was interest in learning more about forest practices, the different values received from forest, invasive species management, and general ecosystem functions, and how it can be improved. Also, developing an understanding of recreation's outsized impact and interconnectedness on the forest and research forest staff roles and capacity.
- **Finding a Pathway for Balance and Feasibility.** Seize the opportunity to show planning intentionality at the core of management, recognizing that it may be impossible for a plan to make everyone perfectly happy, but can make a good and thoughtful plan nonetheless. Balance values, goals, resources, uses, and recognizing what is actually within reach. Desire to rethink changing economics and realities for the strategic future, looking at things like financial sustainability and the reality of recreational demand.
- **Bringing in Broader Voices and Different Perspectives.** Build a plan that considers accessibility and inclusivity, and represents diverse voices and perspectives. Ensure those voices are heard in this process, and allow the inevitable tension that exists between different values to exist without dismissing, nor needing to address every aspect of it.
- **Building Trust and Community.** Conduct a clear and transparent process, and utilize this opportunity to rebuild trust and ties between the College and community. Deepen people's ties to the forest and to one another. Recognize the community's love for the forest and build that into how the forest is managed. Create a regular exchange of information sharing, input gathering, and celebration of work done to build social license and support going forward.
- **Integration and Coordination.** Find opportunities to make research on the forests more coordinated and strategic, perhaps by create a large framework of community-based questions that researchers could work on collaboratively to tackle. Consider opportunities to involve students in the planning process. Explore opportunities for the College to have more coordination with communications, committees, research forest staff, and faculty participation. Consider the diversity of tribal interest areas with the forest.
- **Create Innovative Opportunities.** Link recreation with learning opportunities. Strive to not simply provide a place to recreate but also an opportunity for forest visitors to learn about the forests while they are recreating through education in the woods.
- **Future-Focused Research.** Ensure academic use is maintained and support research that moves forestry forward in the future. Look for new, more relevant research opportunities

like changing technologies, wildfire, oak restoration and wildland urban interface, recognizing the ecological and social positioning of the McDonald-Dunn Forest. Use and research actual, effective adaptive management moving forward and connect with extension demonstration.

- **Climate Change and Wildfire Management.** Address urgent issues like climate change, fire mitigation, etc. These are key indicator topics and metrics for adaptive management. Partner with local fire management with other agencies and entities in the region. McDonald-Dunn Forest is well situated to show and teach people about fire management.
- **Durability and Adaptive Management.** Make a plan that can integrate, be fully implemented, and have accountability for the enduring framework, with transparently iterative content. Create an annual review process and strategy to ensure this. Consider reality-based monitoring for long term, achievable and impactful data. Embrace change and what it looks like on the ground. Annual contract/review/strategy about questions asked.

Following this, the full joint meeting of the SAC and FPC adjourned.

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Logistics Discussion

The SAC then briefly met to discuss next steps regarding scheduling, possible interest in a future site visit, and Operating Principles, which Turner noted was a process document for the group to agree on how they will work together. He shared that a draft of this document would be sent in advance of the next meeting for review. Following questions about the approach for the public listening sessions, Turner and Jennah acknowledged that they would follow-up with the SAC to share a proposed approach and gather SAC feedback on the structure, timing, and how the SAC might engage with that information going forward.

Faculty Planning Committee Logistics Discussion

The FPC also met briefly to discuss scheduling of the next meeting. Everyone provided information on their availability during the next few months. Holly promised to follow up with those individuals who were not present and then identify a date and time that worked for the majority based on input received. She also committed to sending a request for material FPC members would review in advance of the next meeting.