

**Oregon Consensus - Summary of Assessment Interviews**  
McDonald & Dunn Research Forest Management Planning Process  
(*What we heard ...*)

- **Overview of Key Themes**
  - The McDonald and Dunn Forests are highly valued as a community asset
  - The forests provide multiple values (recreation, wildlife, carbon, timber, research, education, etc.)
  - Accountability to a forest management plan has been missing and trust in forest management has diminished as a result of management actions and inaction
  - A new forest management plan, developed with stakeholder and public input, can provide an opportunity to demonstrate a new approach to forest management with transparency and accountability
  - There is an opportunity to center research, education, and demonstration in new paradigms for the forests' management
  
- **Current/Past Forest Management – Observations and Concerns**
  - Interviewees voiced a wide range of views about current forest management
    - Some perceived a good, well-balanced approach to management, including harvest practices and amounts
    - Others held strong concerns with current and past management actions, especially about a perceived emphasis on generating revenue from harvest
  - Observations about the 2005 Plan
    - Some felt the 2005 plan was a good plan on its face – based on the same basic concepts as in the 1996 plan and developed with stakeholder input
    - But the 2005 plan was essentially abandoned after several years
    - Subsequent harvest and management action were subject to no plan
    - Some expressed concerns that there was no external communication about the suspension
  - Concerns about forest management, transparency, and accountability
    - While some felt adequately informed about forest management, others felt less informed and some had very strong concerns
    - In particular, some felt that the abandonment of the 2005 plan, the *No Vacancy* harvest, the harvest of older trees, and harvest in certain areas was a huge breach of trust, and the College's response has been inadequate
  - Recreation and neighbor impacts
    - Recreational access was a highly appreciated value
    - Recreational use also has negative impacts, especially as such use is increasing
      - Heavy recreational use can adversely impact ecological and wildlife values
      - Heavy recreational use results in adverse impacts to neighbors due to traffic and overcrowding at access points
    - Some abutting landowners also have concerns about invasive species and increased wildfire risk and want additional resources devoted to maintenance of buffer areas

- **Future Forest Management – Suggestions and Aspirations**

- Many interviewees hoped to see a better and more clearly articulated balance of uses reflected in the plan:
  - Research, conservation, wildlife habitat, carbon sequestration, old growth conservation, appropriate recreation, maintenance for wildfire risk abatement, and harvest
  - There were various views about what would be the appropriate balance among different uses, and particular areas for those uses
- Some saw an opportunity for stronger ties to research needs and educational uses for the forests, including broader (and balanced) faculty engagement, innovation and leadership (in industrial, conservation, and ecological), and research in diverse (non-forest management) fields
- Some wanted to see the plan demonstrate innovation and reflect changing priorities in forest management and community values
  - E.g., there is an opportunity for better integration of climate resilience and wildfire concerns into forest management planning
- Some suggested that the new forest plan have clear accountability and transparency mechanisms built in along with long term opportunities for broader public/stakeholder engagement, communication, and education during implementation of the plan – transparency and accountability were seen as key to rebuilding trust

- **Process for Developing a New Forest Management Plan – Observations and Suggestions**

- Interviewees wanted to see transparency around the forest management planning process, including transparency around the budget (expenses and disposition of revenues from harvest) to inform decisions and support understanding going forward
- Engage stakeholders and the public early on and along the way, and provide clarity on how information is used or when/why it is not.
- Ensure there is clarity about the role of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, any relevant sideboards on the Committee's role, and the Committee's space for input
- Avoid potential conflicts of interest in the decision-making hierarchy