



**OSU McDONALD-DUNN RESEARCH FOREST FMP  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #2**  
Tuesday, September 20, 2022

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

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members present: Jennifer Beathe, Jessica McDonald, Leo Williamson, Faye Yoshihara, Jim Fairchild, Dave Ehlers, Jesse Ott, Trey Jackson, Elise Kelley, Mike Kennedy (via Zoom)

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
Post meeting summary from the 9/16 FPC Meeting.	COF	Next week
Provide an overview of McDonald-Dunn's operational budget and expenses.	COF	Before the next SAC meeting
Compile recreation information (including master plan/vision documentation, data from surveys, etc.)	COF	Before the next SAC meeting
Add 'transparency and trust building' topic to the next SAC meeting agenda.	OC	Before the next SAC meeting

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

Turner Odell, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members. He shared that this meeting would be recorded and then posted online, based on additional feedback and overall direction provided and having addressed any outstanding concerns. He noted that this approach was intended to provide accessibility and transparency for the process along the way, and will be applied for all SAC and Faculty Planning Committee (FPC) meetings going forward. Following this update, he invited the SAC members to introduce themselves and then he provided a review of the agenda.

***Faculty Planning Committee Updates***

Holly Ober, College of Forestry, shared that the FPC met for the first time last week and reiterated that these meetings will follow the same format as the SAC meetings; hybrid, allowing members of the public to watch remotely, with written meeting summaries and recordings posted online following. She provided a review of the FPC's meeting agenda and highlighted high-level takeaways between the SAC and FPC discussion and input. Initial areas of alignment included general desire to make the new forest management plan accessible and understandable for all readers, address climate change, provide more clarity around 'financial sustainability' as it relates to budget and management decisions, as well as expanding community and cultural connections. Holly shared that the notes from the FPC meeting would be posted online soon and shared with the SAC.

### ***Public Engagement***

Regarding other ongoing engagement mechanisms, Holly shared that members of the public can now provide comments to the College, SAC, and FPC via a form on the [website](#) or pose questions to the College via a designated email address ([McDonaldDunnPlan@oregonstate.edu](mailto:McDonaldDunnPlan@oregonstate.edu)). Turner added that specific details regarding mechanism and interval of sharing with the SAC and FPC are still to be determined and would be discussed later in the meeting.

### ***Current Forest Conditions (from 2005 to today)***

Following up from discussion during the first SAC meeting and inquiries raised regarding the current status of certain topics related to better understanding what information may need to be addressed or updated in the new FMP, Holly provided the following responses:

- The 2005 FMP carefully defined evaluation metrics that were intended to be measured annually to enable adaptive management. These appear to have not been measured or documented. If additional information is found in historical documents, this will be shared with the SAC and FPC.
- Clarification about the charge letter from Dean DeLuca in October 2020 and development into the current roles and responsibilities within the process underway: SAC providing high-level input to inform scenarios for the FPC to move forward with technical development and operational modeling.
- Percent of acreage allocated to each theme in 2005: 4% reserves, 2% dedicated teaching areas, 11% dedicated research areas, 29% high return on investment (short rotation), 31% high quality wood (long rotation), 3% visually sensitive, 20% structurally diverse. Holly shared that although the intention to allocate themes according to these percentages remains, what's currently on the ground may be slightly different because the 2005 plan was suspended and therefore not fully implemented across all acres as envisioned. There is no map showing a current snapshot of the exact acreage in place today.
- 421 acres (3.6%) of the McDonald-Dunn is set aside in permanent old growth reserves. Also, older trees within younger stands are retained during harvests across the landscape.

- There are currently no active Northern Spotted Owl nests in the McDonald-Dunn, based on annual surveys conducted. There are barred owls.
- There is no record of any stream surveys conducted, as was intended in the 2005 FMP. There are upcoming surveys planned in 2023 in conjunction with the implementation of the Private Forest Accord stream regulations.
- There is no hunting in McDonald Forest, but there is in the Dunn Forest.
- Wildlife damage control includes physical barriers, chemical repellents, and planting of western redcedar bred for high terpene content (to deter browsing).
- An overview of long-term research projects currently in place in the forest, including an update on the status of downed wood and snag research which has been part of a CFIRP study. The College will provide more information about research underway on all forests by updating a database and sharing on a new webpage for more people to better see and understand going forward. One SAC member shared a suggestion to include relevant timeframes and to more clearly define what is meant by 'long term' research. A comment was made about how the length of a project is not always known from the start. For example, graduate students may take advantage of conditions in place from prior research, extending the lifespan of a short-term project into long term. It's important to document these opportunities.
- Overview of annual average timber volume produced (3.88 million board feet) and net revenue generated (\$1.59 million) from 2006-2022, in comparison to the projections of the 2005 FMP anticipating 6 million board feet. A question was asked about which harvests were specifically driven by research questions. In response, Holly shared that although each individual harvest may not have a direct link to a research project or question, the overarching goal of the 4 management themes is to create conditions that enable research/teaching/outreach to be done on various types of forest.
- Overview of average tree age distribution in 2005 (55 years), 2019 (69 years), and 2022 (67 years) and consideration of the 2005 FMP being in place the last three years. SAC members noted that although the overall averages demonstrated an older forest trajectory in 2019, the distribution of age classes was significantly different and as such, perhaps looking at annual averages wasn't the clearest way to develop a true understanding of the plan's impact.
- The recreation and outreach budget breakdown, averaging \$335,000 per year with 4% generated from donations and 96% from timber revenue, and 80% of that amount going to staff and student salaries.
- A carbon assessment inventory has recently begun. A graduate student will calculate the standing carbon stocks and analyze different carbon results based on different silvicultural treatments. Preliminary results are anticipated in 2023 with a final report in 2024.

An additional suggestion was made that if the College produced an annual operations report for the McDonald-Dunn, it could proactively address many of these questions by providing updates and

information at anticipated intervals for internal and external accessibility (e.g., public, students, faculty, etc.) and overall accountability to the plan going forward. ODF's annual report was referenced as an example with different types of information to consider including. There was also a request made for a budget overview of all expenses associated with managing the McDonald-Dunn (including FTEs associated with managing the research forests). Following this, there was continued discussion about the need to understand the entire budget in order to make recommendations on the plan that balance aspirations and reality, in addition to considering shifting the goal from 'net revenue' to 'sustainable revenue' to ensure that management of the forest is covered regardless of log prices over time. Some noted that this could be an opportunity to help students and new foresters see how the College plans for and responds to changes in managing a forest, and that there were many research questions associated with the costs of managing a forest and the revenue generated.

### ***Community Listening Session Input***

Turner provided an update on the first Community Listening Session, which was held on August 31 in a hybrid format with the intent to hear from the public on the substance of a new forest management plan. He noted that although many people signed up to participate online (70) only about 25 attended in-person and about 25 via Zoom, which presented challenges for planning and creating the same experience and opportunity for hybrid participants to engage in dialogue and provide input equally. He shared that this session was not recorded but that there was a written summary of all the comments captured, posted on the [webpage](#). He acknowledged that there was a spectrum of feedback expressed from members of the public about this approach, and that the format for the second and third Community Listening Sessions would be determined at a later date when a clearer picture regarding actual draft product development and opportunities for tangible input were on the horizon. Additionally, he shared that any SAC member input on these future sessions would be welcomed. Based on the three questions posed to gather input on various elements of the new plan, Turner then reviewed the general topic areas of comments received. He noted that a handful of comments were about the process in general, although that was not the focus of the listening session, but were documented and several have been addressed already, and will be considered in structuring future listening sessions and additional avenues for input. Turner then invited the SAC members to share their initial thoughts, reactions, what stood out to them, what to do with this information going forward, and input on future listening sessions (depending on what the FPC product development in order to solicit specific feedback) and what to learn from the public moving forward.

SAC member comments, questions, and discussion included:

- A question about how to address perceptions vs facts in public comments going forward.
- An observation that many of the public comments and expectations resonated more so with 'park master planning' and community's view of the McDonald-Dunn as an urban park, not

a research forest. To that end, a question was raised about whether there are alternative, non-timber financing mechanisms (e.g., environmental finance, recreation bond, etc.) to support the amenities that the community values and wants, but requires a cost to upkeep and provide. It was suggested that perhaps there should be a Community Listening Session about recreation to discuss funding options. Some added that these issues have been present overtime and some have been addressed by research forest staff. Information has been collected in past surveys, which can be found [here](#).

- An observation of the underlying theme of trust and relationship in the comments. There was discussion about the SAC's role in this and development of the plan to support more transparency and social license in decision making going forward, and a hope that this topic would be revisited again. There were also comments made regarding accountability, the potential for more legally binding assurances related to the Habitat Conservation Plan as part of the Private Forest Accords rules implementation and minimum standards that the College's forest will comply with and meet. It was clarified that an assessment will be done soon to identify what areas will be 'off limits' from harvest including riparian buffers, steep slopes, etc., and how those rules will then inform the modeling scenarios of the FMP.
- Regarding recreation, one member shared that a specific recreation plan had always been lacking. Planning for recreation was halted until this broader FMP is completed before plugging recreational pieces in. Currently there are no opportunities for new events to be held in the McDonald-Dunn, such as mountain bike races or fundraisers. There is a desire to plan forest and recreation management in tandem.
- A suggestion to prioritize opportunities to educate the public about the forest and specifically addressing what research is and entails (e.g., a variety of forest conditions, expenses, variables, temporal aspects, process of proposing and implementing, etc.), recognizing that the general public may not understand this important information as it relates to a research forest.
- A question about how representative the public comments were at the Community Listening Session and who might have been missing from the table, recognizing that typically the most interested, adjacent, or frustrated individuals are the ones who voluntarily show up to share those opinions.

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

As follow-up discussion about the key pieces of the 2005 FMP, Holly reviewed that the group had addressed goals and themes at the last meeting and would have the opportunity to review the special areas and issues today. Regarding the special areas and issues, she shared that these are unique features of the forest that need some special management to enhance or preserve (e.g., threatened/endangered species) or reduce and control (e.g., invasive plants) and are overlaid atop

the themes. Following this, she invited thoughts and comments from the SAC on the relevance of the 2005 list.

- Some affirmed that the list is still important and of interest, but noted that the 2005 FMP signaled that each of these topics would require a special plan which never came to fruition (oak savannahs/woodlands was an exception). There was interest in ensuring more oversight and direction, and consideration of realistic goals and sideboards, for the special areas and interests to fully realize good intentions. It was cautioned that if any new issues or areas are added, we must acknowledge that additional resources might be needed to address them.
- Clarification about whether these issues would inherently be addressed in the Private Forest Accord implementation approach, but could continue to be called out and overlaid if additional measures were deemed necessary. It was mentioned that PFA standards may change over time, so the plan must enable the ability to adapt to laws we don't yet know about.
- New additions were suggested to include 1) general fire mitigation and management and 2) WUI and housing adjacent to the forest, recognizing that there may be hazards to and from houses in various areas at different scales.
- A suggestion to prioritize local partnerships for restoration and to explore outside funding sources for this work.
- There was discussion about how recreation was written into the 2005 FMP as an 'issue' but should not be addressed as such, nor an afterthought in the new plan. Many agreed that taking an approach of considering how forest management can complement recreation, and not be in conflict was important, along with the emphasized need for a more formal, comprehensive recreation plan and strategy.
- A suggestion to better clarify 'sensitive species' to expand upon threatened or endangered.

To see how these special areas and issues would interact and overlay with the themes, the SAC revisited the themes. One member asked what it would look like to get rid of the themes and support a more nuanced approach to balancing management on the forest. Some spoke to the importance of adaptive management and highlighted a lack of clarity around what flexibility currently exists. As an alternative to adding an additional theme, a suggestion was made to add an overarching theme/management approach, to overlay all of the themes, related to managing a climate resilient forest. This resonated with others, who noted that climate change will impact everyone and all of the themes in linking research and questions for different management approaches in the future. There was general agreement that the research forest should be managed to look forward and include economic models/financial services for tomorrow that may not exist today.

### ***Next Steps S***



In closing, Turner noted that the next SAC meeting will be scheduled in sequence with the forthcoming FPC meetings. He reviewed that there are 3 SAC meetings to come and will orient around specific product input and development. He also clarified that COF and OC are not providing private SAC or FPC email addresses to members of the public but reiterated that there is now a mechanism for comments to be submitted via the College webpage. The SAC agreed that they would prefer to have those comments iteratively posted on a shared folder, with the link included in future communications as a reminder for them to be able to access and review at their individual convenience.

The meeting was adjourned.