

**OSU McDONALD-DUNN RESEARCH FOREST FMP  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1**  
Tuesday, August 30, 2022

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

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

OSU College of Forestry Staff present: Holly Ober and Stephen Fitzgerald

Oregon Consensus Facilitation Team: Jennah Stillman and Turner Odell

**Action Items**

Action Item	Who	Date
Share notes from 8/31 Community Listening Session with the SAC	OC	Before Meeting #2
Begin gathering high-level information requested regarding the current status of the McDonald-Dunn since 2005. Provide an update on this at the next meeting, as possible.	Research Forest Staff	Before Meeting #2

***Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions***

Turner Odell, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the Stakeholder Advisory Committee and invited members to introduce themselves. Following this, Turner reviewed the agenda and the meeting purpose, which he noted was to begin reviewing core elements of the [2005 McDonald-Dunn Forest Plan](#) and evaluating whether or how that material might be considered in the development of a new forest management plan.

Holly Ober, College of Forestry, shared a brief presentation ([here](#)) that covered background information about the McDonald-Dunn Research Forest management planning history. She also provided clarification about the College’s research forest property ownership and obligations to research, teaching and outreach/extension, which are different from other public forests, but acknowledged that it is clear how important the McDonald-Dunn is as a resource to the community. Holly explained that the Stakeholder Advisory Committee members had been selected by the College of Forestry to help serve the important function of bringing in a broad array of perspectives from outside of OSU. Individuals were selected so as to represent a variety of interests in the forests

and expertise in forest management. She clarified that the SAC would work in tandem with the internal Faculty Planning Committee and would have an opportunity to review and consider information that came forth from the public engagement listening sessions along the way. She shared that the SAC's role is intended to be collaborative and iterative, and to remind the group that the first kickoff meeting had been recorded and posted on the webpage, along with the meeting summary, for review and public access.

### ***Operating Principles***

Turner then reviewed the [Draft Operating Principles](#) with the SAC members, and provided the group with an opportunity to collectively review, clarify, and refine the content before gauging agreement on the updated version. The two primary topics of discussion were whether or not to record meetings and clarification of SAC representation and responsibility.

Regarding recording, Turner explained that the facilitation team had received a request from a member of the public to record meetings, and when the question had been posed to the SAC for their input, had also received mixed responses about whether to do so. Although an additional mechanism of transparency and recordkeeping, some felt that it may hinder their ability to speak freely and creatively about new ideas, if they were going to be on the record as such. Given that the original direction and invitation was made under the assumption that meetings would not be recorded, he shared that all SAC members must be in agreement with a potential shift to recording and that if any member dissented, keeping meetings unrecorded would remain. He also noted that if others felt differently and strongly about this, the conversation could be revisited by the group.

Regarding representation, Turner clarified that some SAC members were serving as a part of a formal organization or agency and that others were here on behalf of their personal interest and perspective, such as 'neighbors.' He shared that individuals are not expected to serve as a representative for all neighbors in their area and could encourage others interested in the process to attend the public engagement sessions.

Following no further edits and discussion, the SAC members all agreed to adopt the Operating Principles.

### ***2005 McDonald-Dunn Forest Management Plan Review: Goals***

The SAC members engaged in discussion about the 'Goals' section of the 2005 FMP and the updated Vision, Mission, and Goals that were developed in 2021 by the College of Forestry. It was clarified that the 2021 Goals were developed to serve as guidance for *all* of the research forests, and that the goals specified in the new management plan for the McDonald-Dunn could be reworded, and could be weighted differentially. Guidance on this from the SAC would be welcomed.

*SAC feedback for the McDonald-Dunn FMP Goals included, but was not limited to:*

- Make the new FMP accessible both for external viewers to understand and as an internal management document.
- Include cultural heritage goals and consult the tribes to ensure they are recognized and that the goals are representative.
- Prioritize opportunities for forest ecosystem services, and strive to exceed minimum expectations rather than adopting a simple regulatory compliance approach.
- Accountability mechanisms are important going forward.
- Consider changing the term “working forests” to “actively managed forests”.
- Clarify what “demonstration” actually means and what/how it has happened on the McDonald-Dunn in the past.
- How does the financial sustainability component fit into these goals? Is there a bottomline that the forest needs to generate to support operations? Should the SAC first start with that number in mind and then adjust goals from there?
- Need to discuss and determine how to reflect equity, diversity and inclusion in the plan.

**The SAC members then identified information about the current forest status, since 2005, that could be helpful to make recommendations for the new FMP going forward:**

- Current % of acreage for each theme
- Current acreage managed for old growth
- Any active Northern Spotted Owl nests (particularly Oak Creek Basin)
- Current long term research projects in place
- Downed wood/snag research status and/or findings
- Bibliography of studies that have been conducted in McDonald-Dunn since 2005
- Volume of timber produced annually since 2005 from McDonald-Dunn
- Stream survey frequency and findings
- Status and amount of hunting in the Dunn
- Current damage control practices
- Recreation budget
- Updated forest inventory
- Information on possibilities around opportunities for carbon credit programs and into the future (what may not be present/known now)
- Carbon inventory results
- Research Forest DEI and outreach

Stephen Fitzgerald, COF, shared that he would look into this list of requested information but did acknowledge the small Research Forest staff team and limited capacity for additional data gathering. He explained that the SAC could help prioritize what information and to what degree would be most useful in developing recommendations.

***2005 McDonald-Dunn Forest Management Plan Review: Themes***

Holly then shared an overview of the ‘Themes’ from the 2005 FMP, which were intended to reflect four distinct management objectives of interest to various forestland owners and managers in Oregon at the time the plan was developed. She asked the SAC to consider if it makes sense to continue using these themes by keeping and modifying them, if any are missing to address other current or future issues, or if they are even still relevant and should be removed in full. What is the best use of space and opportunity on the McDonald-Dunn? The themes, she explained, don’t need to address every single goal. Rather, they are intended to create different overarching conditions across the forests for students and researchers to utilize in research, teaching, and outreach/demonstration.

*SAC feedback for the McDonald-Dunn FMP Themes included, but was not limited to:*

- Suggestion to include ‘climate resilient management’ as a theme.
- Suggestion to include ‘wildlife habitat restoration in a managed forest’ as a theme.
- Suggestion to include ‘fire management’ as a theme.
- Suggestion to include ‘early seral habitat and ecosystem disturbances’ as a theme.
- Some community members want to see changes made post-No Vacancy Harvest codified, and there being more than 3% set aside as old growth reserves. Build upon feedback that was provided during that time around that event and incorporate it into the new plan so the community feels heard.
- These 4 themes are still of interest to many. Private forest owners still have an appetite for learning about growing forests quickly (theme 1).
- All landowners have different goals and objectives, so this is hard to fully encompass, but there is private interest in learning more about different property management approaches.
- Considering the unique McDonald side ‘viewshed’ management (theme 3), what was learned about financial implications?
- Provide opportunity for public input on future themes to see where people may have strong opinions about what they’d like to see on the land and where.
- How adaptive are the theme categories? Where is flexibility built in?
- The ‘short rotation/high-return on investment’ theme (them 1) called for use of fertilizer to enhance growth rates. Several rotation cycles would be needed before evidence of nutrient depletion or decline in productivity would be evident, so this theme must be in place for many years before research questions can be answered.
- Manage the forest for multiple values, not just timber production. Are there more economic models that could be put into the FMP to better assess this aside from harvest revenue?
- Orient themes around new, important questions for the 21st century (gathered from the public, researchers, etc).
- Strong desire to orient more management around carbon sequestration.
- Suggestion to layer onto existing themes rather than starting from scratch.
- Are all themes focused on Doug Fir trees and management?
- When does a ‘special area’ become a theme?

- The Grand Ronde Tribe's interests are reflected in themes 2 and 4. The Tribe's management plan looks at management drivers rather than overall style, which is a tool for being more nimble. Currently writing a new 10-year management plan, so this McDonald-Dunn process is timely and helpful for the tribe. Recreation use and fire are primary drivers to informing those areas in the new plan.

Some SAC members felt that the four themes were still valid and allowed for questions and specific needs to be addressed within the overarching categories. Others felt that perhaps these weren't the right categories for explicitly encompassing and addressing the changing needs of society and climate, and that removing the themes might be a preferred approach. Many had questions about how flexibility and adaptive management would show up within the themes to weigh different values and achieve desired balance, and whether these metrics could be modeled. Holly added that the group hadn't gotten to discuss 'Special Areas and Issues' today, which is an important piece to contextualizing the Themes. This would be on the agenda for the next meeting.

### ***Next Steps***

Holly shared that FPC is meeting in two weeks and will have discussion about similar topics (goals, themes, and review of changes since the 2005 FMP) and that there was a desire for information to flow back and forth between the SAC and FPC, with recognition of not asking too much of people's time. There is potential for representatives from each committee to attend each committee's meetings to help that flow of information. She added that as the process is now getting going, the relationship and information exchange between committees will become more clear. The intent is for the work of the SAC to be built upon by the FPC, which is intended to do the technical work and modeling of the recommendations provided by the SAC and public input.

Regarding the content development moving forward, someone asked if there were sideboards for potential scenarios to be modeled. Also, what, if any expertise was missing from the FPC to address those questions and information requested by the SAC and public? Holly shared that she would relay those questions to the FPC, and that if any additional information would be helpful to the SAC, to reach out to OC and COF.

Turner shared that in addition to reviewing the 'Special Areas and Issues' and hearing a report-out from the FPC's first solo meeting, the next SAC meet would provide an opportunity to review and discuss the input gathered from the first Community Listening Session. He clarified that SAC members are welcome to attend the public engagement events and that the SAC could discuss different ways of engaging and structuring the future public sessions down the road, if desired.

The meeting was adjourned.