



## Document 4

*For 13 June 2024 Meeting*

### Notes from IRST's May 7, 2024 meeting about refining the roads package questions

#### Roads package IRST four-step process

1. Develop the goal of the literature review (e.g., call for proposals) and logistics (who will conduct review).
2. Develop specific literature review questions.
3. Conduct the literature review.
4. Determine how the IRST will process the information from the literature review.

#### Progress on IRST four-step process

1. **Develop the goal of the literature review (e.g., call for proposals) and logistics (who will conduct review).**

##### IRST goals of the literature review (DRAFT)

- a. Hydrologic connectivity (quantification and what it means to the resource)
- b. Biological goals and objectives include roads reduced episodic sediment delivery to streams (currently)
- c. Trend targets/effectiveness

2. **Develop specific literature review questions.**

##### IRST goals of the literature review (DRAFT)

- a. **Baseline status.** What is the baseline status of hydrologic connectivity of roads prior to the implementation of the OFPA road rules effective Jan 1, 2024?
- b. **Trend Monitoring.** What are the trends in the status of hydrologic connectivity of roads over 5-year intervals? These trends should be assessed for the same variables in question 1.
- c. **Determination of rule effectiveness.** Within 20 years, to what extent are road rules associated with hydrologic disconnection effective at achieving biological goals and objectives?

3. **Conduct the literature review(s).**

Need to discuss the protocol the IRST would like to use to conduct a literature search on effectiveness monitoring - Consider approach, scope, timeline, entity to conduct.

4. **Determine how the IRST will process the information from the literature review.**

Need to discuss

## Live notes (in blue font) during the May 7<sup>th</sup> discussion

These preliminary research questions were approved by the AMPC as a substantial decision at their October 23, 2023 meeting.

1. Baseline Report.

a. Baseline status. What is the baseline status of hydrologic connectivity of roads prior to the implementation of the OFPA road rules effective Jan 1, 2024?

“Levels” changed to “status” to reflect the need for an inventory.

Literature review would focus on statistical and experimental designs.

What are the baseline levels “status” (inventory) (how we define this and how it is evaluated is critical to the utility of this effort – statistical design and methods to approach this – need a sampling design to approach this – look at how different scientists have approached a statistical design that represents a variety of road types when we do not know the population is a big sticking point at start of project) of hydrologic connectivity<sup>1</sup> of roads prior to the implementation of the Oregon Forest Practices Act (OFPA) road rules<sup>2</sup> effective Jan 1, 2024? (monitoring question – need to determine what levels mean)

There may be “grades” of HC – not just connected or disconnected – aspects of seasonality, fire, etc. that should be considered in terms of the grade of connectivity and disconnectivity at the sites.

How do we incorporate landowner approval into the design when we don’t know the population of roads?

We don’t need a literature review prior to finalizing the questions, but a detailed hybrid systematic review that includes schematic review of available scientific literature coupled with exploration of additional information/gray literature is appropriate.

Does HC include sedimentation, chemical transport, etc.?

LR can help identify what is known and not known – but we can move forward without a lit review because of knowns.

At what point is a road hydrologically disconnected from a stream?

How do we define HC?

b. How do these levels vary based on landowner type and East/West region?

c. What other factors or variables within the regulatory framework of the FPA might be relevant? (connection back to regulatory framework)

2. Trend Monitoring. What are the trends in the ~~status~~ levels of hydrologic connectivity of roads over 5-year intervals? These trends should be assessed for the same variables in question 1.

3. Determination of rule effectiveness. ~~Within~~ ~~in the long term~~ 20 years, to what extent are road rules associated with hydrologic disconnection effective at achieving biological goals and objectives? What exactly are we evaluating re: effectiveness? Effectiveness of new alternatives and new BMPs? Can someone from ODF walk us through timelines/FREA? 5-year inventory piece that landowners are responsible for (inventory road systems) – 2<sup>nd</sup> piece includes selection of high conservation value areas (areas with greatest connection with the idea that we would prioritize road upgrades there). We should coordinate with them on methodologies.

Is “Effectiveness” the biggest conservation bang for the buck, and will we be able to assess this?

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: “hydrologic connectivity” is not defined in rule. This term refers to the degree to which a road is hydrologically connected to a stream, whereas the definition in rule (“hydrologic disconnection” [OAR 629-600-0100(71)]) focuses on the process for removing this connectivity.

<sup>2</sup> For the FPA rules effective starting Jan. 1, 2024.

Maybe road abandonment is a critical piece.  
Knowing where people are upgrading roads – sample that.