OREGON CONSENSUS

NATIONAL POLICY CONSENSUS CENTER
Hatfield School Of Government

ELLIOTT STATE RESEARCH FOREST

Science Advisory Panel Meeting
Wednesday, October 21, 9am-12pm

Attendees: Jennifer Allen (PSU), Eric White (USFS), Gwen Busby (Greenwood Resources), Randy Rosenberger (OSU), Tom DeLuca (OSU), Matt Sloat (Wild Salmon Center), Linda Nagel (CSU), Ryan Haugo (TNC), Gordie Reeves (OSU), Katy Kavanagh (OSU) , Caitlyn Reilley (OSU)

Facilitation team: Peter Harkema (Oregon Consensus) and Jennah Stillman (Oregon Consensus)

Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Jennifer Allen, Chair of the Science Advisory Panel, welcomed the group and thanked them for their time and continued engagement in contributing their expertise to help shape the Elliott State Research Forest. Peter Harkema, Oregon Consensus, then reviewed the day's agenda. SAP members introduced themselves and welcomed Gordie Reeves, who was in attendance to share a presentation on the Riparian Research Strategy.

Elliott State Research Forest Process Updates

Tom DeLuca, Dean of the OSU College of Forestry, shared that work on the proposal is continuing and further refinements have been driven by input gathered at the last meetings of the SAP and also the Department of State Lands Advisory Committee. Recent efforts involved reanalyzing additional data related to marbled murrelet occupancy on the Elliott State Forest, as OSU is concerned with taking into consideration all available information to the research design, but this reanalysis ultimately proved to not have a significant impact on the previously proposed treatment assignments to the watersheds. Additionally OSU created a condensed version of the proposal and initiated a peer review process by distributing this to a diverse range of scientists, both locally and internationally. This feedback (comments and responses to those comments) will be attached as an appendix to the proposal and shared back with the SAP for review. Dean DeLuca noted that there is still a need to better convey the temporal aspect of the research design. As is, the mapping component provides a snapshot in time, which is limiting in the public's perception. He sought input from the SAP on how to better convey this information. There was a brief discussion on how to spatially convey the spectrum of research questions occurring across the entire forest as a whole overtime, rather than leading with treatments, which can be perceived to graphically place emphasis on harvest.

Next week, a series of public listening sessions will commence, organized into formal presentations and opportunities for public testimony, as well as sessions for drop-in Q&A time with representatives from DSL, OSU, and other individuals involved with the research design and proposal development.

Science Advisory Panel Input and Discussion on Estimated Start-up Research Program Expenses

Randy Rosenberger shared a draft spreadsheet of the projected research program expenses and explained that this was in an effort for OSU to better understand some of the costs associated with transforming the Elliott into a research forest. The main components were focused around building infrastructure for a remote research station, forest inventory and research plot installation, and research/monitoring equipment in key areas (carbon. aquatic, and terrestrial wildlife). He noted that this total cost estimate erred on the high side as a preventative starting point and that this is separate from the operational budget. This rough accounting was also intended to showcase major expenses and was not representative of the full suite of costs associated with managing the research forest. These numbers will be used to help the Land Board understand the full picture of financing research and management on the ESRF.

The SAP members present provided their reflections during the discussion, some of which include, but are not limited to:

- Related to the timing of expenses, there was a suggestion that it could be helpful to lay out costs in a progression of years and by category to provide a better expense profile over time.
- The current document mainly reflects biophysical research costs as they are often composed of expensive physical equipment, and there was a lack of social science costs (i.e. permanent traffic counters). The upfront demonstration of investment and value in social science could be more strongly stated.
- Additional items that were embedded in the current budget, but not explicitly listed were: IT data storage and software, as well as aerial hyperspectral imaging.
- The personnel section did not indicate positions outside of academic/research positions. SAP inquired about how this budget reflect OSU's interests in supporting the local community with job opportunities. This could be an opportunity to add trainee positions, under technicians, or somewhere for an entry level position. OSU notes there were other personnel accounted for in the operations and management budget that would address some, but not all of these types of positions.

Science Advisory Panel Input and Discussion on Aquatic and Riparian Area Research Strategy

Gordie Reeves provided an overview of the Aquatic and Riparian approach, as OSU is trying to move towards building an "outcome based" riparian protection strategy as opposed to fixed width buffers. One of the large-scale research programs would be to design several riparian scenarios that reach the same potential outcome for wood delivery and lay them out in an experimental fashion to test the assumptions in the model and the response to disturbance. With a focus on maintaining riparian ecological processes, this design would encompass a number of evaluation options, in addition to the output of wood.

SAP members provided their reflections during the discussion, some of which include, but are not limited to:

- There was support for this framework and the ability to study riparian buffer design, in reference to the timely conversations and policy focus around stream buffer widths in Oregon and opportunities to measure ecosystem services with flexible treatments.
- There was a question around the certainty of different treatments and their outputs, acknowledging that this a working hypothesis that will need to be evaluated, but is useful as a foundation for developing a research program.
- Recognizing the role of natural disturbances in this design highlighted the potential need for more informed discussion around the ecological trade-offs vs social/economic costs. What

might be the social aspects of doing this management and will it affect how people use these areas, and then what are those ecological tradeoffs? There could be benefit in further highlighting the research design's importance in understanding the role of natural disturbance in ecological and social processes. How to communicate the acceptance of landslides in a public arena?

- There was a suggestion to more explicitly incorporate climate risk/hazard management acknowledgement, which relates to disturbances.

Next Steps

OSU is striving for an early November deadline to have the full proposal materials nearly completed in order to allow for adequate time for the land board to review, in preparation for the December State Land Board meeting. Any additional ideas, suggestions, or questions can continue to be sent to the OSU team outside of SAP meeting times. Peter noted that although the next SAP meeting was set for November 4th, this may be pushed back to a later date. OC will send out a poll to see if there is a consensus for an additional date in November.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:29am.