

**OSU McDONALD-DUNN RESEARCH FOREST FMP
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #3
Monday, December 5, 2022**

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

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

OSU College of Forestry Staff present Holly Ober and Stephen Fitzgerald

Oregon Consensus Facilitation Team: Turner Odell and Jennah Stillman (via Zoom)

Action Items

Action Item	Who	Date
Provide an overview of McDonald-Dunn's operational budget and expenses.	COF	Next SAC meeting
Schedule SAC Meeting #4	OC	Done
Send partially completed SAC input document to FPC for review	COF	Done

Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Overview

Turner Odell, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members and invited everyone to introduce themselves. He then reviewed the agenda and noted that the majority of the meeting time would focus on reviewing and refining the draft SAC input document. He clarified that the draft was initially compiled by Oregon Consensus and was exclusively based on the SAC meeting summaries and any comments or suggestions raised by members to date. The purpose of this document is to serve as an initial work product and clarify ideas and recommendations from the SAC to the Faculty Planning Committee about how the work plan should evolve, guiding forthcoming technical work.

Following this, Turner provided a high-level review of Community Listening Session #2 which included the overall format, themes, and topics that arose on November 7th (e.g., improving transparency, accessibility, and engagement related to forest management decision-making; enhancing partnerships between the College of Forestry and various groups or entities within the community; etc.) He encouraged SAC members to watch the [recording](#) or read the [summary](#) to hear the comments, ideas, and information shared by a diversity of people who engage with the McDonald and Dunn forests.

General Updates

Holly Ober, College of Forestry, shared a [presentation](#) that highlighted the overall McDonald & Dunn Research Forests Management Planning Process phases and steps, which she noted has evolved along the way in an adaptive response to feedback and suggestions. With the work currently in Phase 2: Synthesizing, Modeling, and Refining, she explained that this phase will encompass more SAC meetings, FPC meetings, and Community Input Sessions. She clarified that there had initially only been one Community Listening Session scheduled and that a second one had been added to create more space for broad-based listening - these two have been completed. Holly also noted that there would be one forthcoming Academic User Listening Session which is intended to include all academic users from throughout the university (not just the College of Forestry). She shared that the hope is to get more people interested in using the forest and better understand any constraints and how they can be addressed going forward. Additionally, she shared that there would be two forthcoming Community Input Sessions that would be scheduled subsequent to specific draft work products in order to gather community feedback on further developing and refining those products. She also clarified that the [webform](#) and email address (McDonaldDunnPlan@oregonstate.edu) would remain open for anyone to submit comments and questions along the way and then provided an overview of the [website](#) layout (which is constantly evolving in response to input), contents, and various ways to engage.

Holly then provided a high-level summary of the FPC meetings, discussion topics, and work focus to date. She shared that one draft product in development was an ‘Overarching Principles’ document, which is intended to be a compilation of all input to date from the FPC, SAC, Community Listening Sessions, webform comments, etc., distilled into 22 principles. Although still a work in progress, she added that the hope is to share it with the SAC soon for review and feedback. She also shared one suggestion that the FPC had made to clarify the themes referenced in the 2005 plan, by calling them ‘management regimes’ going forward. The forthcoming scenarios that would be drafted, she explained, would be compilations of different proportions of each management regime across the landscape. The SAC would have an opportunity to review multiple draft scenarios and evaluate the tradeoffs of each, in order to provide feedback and refinement and inform the decisions on what will be modeled. Holly then clarified that the SAC and FPC would both be providing input on 1) what themes (management regimes) and proportions should be included in the plan, 2) what other components are needed in the plan and what needs to be given more or less attention, and 3) how the plan itself should look. Following this, the work will then shift to modeling with two more community input sessions to follow. She noted some initial writing of the plan substance can begin while modeling is underway for sections that are not dependent upon the modeling. She noted it was up to SAC members individually to decide what/how much engagement they would like in the writing phase. There were no questions.

SAC Input for FPC Consideration

Turner reiterated that this draft document is intended to collectively reflect the SAC’s priorities. He clarified that the SAC isn’t required to reach a consensus on everything given their role as an advisory group, but that strong alignment can be more persuasive, while also holding space to reflect differences accordingly. He shared that three SAC members had provided comments and edits on the document prior to the meeting and that ultimately the group itself would need to make decisions about what to move forward. There was a brief discussion about which version of the document to work from for today’s discussion and an agreement was reached to use Michael Karnosh’s version that had Faye Yoshihara’s edits on top. Given that Jim Fairchild’s version included more comments

rather than redline edits, he agreed to bring those forward in the discussion as it related to additional edits or clarifications needed. The SAC members made edits directly to the document based on their discussion. The redlined version can be found [here](#).

Some of the topics and questions that they covered included but were not limited to:

- A question about if or how the FPC's Guiding Principles would interface with this SAC document and a desire for them to sync up. In response, Holly shared that there will need to be a decision about how much time to put into editing documents and whether to merge them or keep them separate. Turner added that most of the SAC's input was geared towards the FPC for consideration in early scenario modeling, but could also include recommendations around the broader plan development process for drafting groups, and potential recommendations around the implementation of the plan which could go to the Dean, College, etc. There was an agreement to capture a list of 'plan adjacent recommendations' with suggestions that are relevant to the FMP but not included in the plan itself.
- Faye clarified that some of the edits she had integrated were based on hearing repeated themes from the community input, but had not explicitly been part of the SAC's discussion. The SAC generally agreed that it was appropriate to bring those considerations forward into this document and then had a discussion about how explicit to be about referencing specific past events (i.e. No Vacancy Harvest) for contextual information versus providing broader direction. There was general agreement to keep the SAC's input document at a higher level but that specific background information could be included at the beginning of the FMP to provide context for the past 10 years and help bring users or readers along to understand what all has shaped and informed the plan.
- Some SAC members shared concerns about the lack of SAC interaction with the FPC and a desire to ensure that this critical input is clearly communicated and considered. Turner reminded the group about the potential opportunity for liaisons between the two committees and forthcoming subgroups to work on drafting sections of the plan.
- There was a clarification about sequencing the forest management planning and recreation planning. Some SAC members noted that they had shared and heard comments about a desire to involve recreation planning more holistically and be considered in the initial planning steps rather than a subsequent afterthought. Steve Fitzgerald, College of Forestry, explained the difference between the Forest Management Plan and the Recreation/Visitor Use Plan, which he shared would be developed in a separate process. The SAC noted that their recommendations around recreation could be used as a foundation for informing the future recreation planning effort. One member made a suggestion to clearly communicate the difference between the two plans and processes on the website and more broadly so that people don't expect that a recreation plan will be a specific output of this effort, given that this appears to be the current assumption.

FMP Components - Information Review and Discussion

Given the group's work on the input document and desire to get recommendations to the FPC on management regimes and scenarios for forthcoming modeling, this agenda item was tabled to continue that work.

Next Steps

There was agreement amongst the SAC members to share the updated draft document with the FPC to the point that it had been edited and agreed upon, and also clearly communicate that it is a work in progress. Holly shared that she would send the updated document to the FPC with the content that had been confirmed for their next meeting. There was agreement amongst the SAC to schedule an additional meeting in short order to finish the input document.

The meeting then adjourned.