

# RFP Template Updates

- IRST notes from 17 July IRST meeting
- RFP template updates

# Reminder

Some slides and IRST notes (in blue font) from 17 July  
IRST meeting

# Slide: Potential components of RFP responses

## Research proposal

A detailed document describing what will be investigated, why it is important, and how the researcher will conduct the research. Generally, it includes:

- A statement of the purpose of the project in the words of the respondent
- Introduction
- Background/review of literature
- Rationale (the questions the researcher is examining)
- Methods (design, procedure, analysis, timeline)
- Significance and conclusion
- Budget
- References

The purpose of a research proposal is to convince readers that the research is worthwhile, credible, and practical.

## Scope of work

An agreement describing the work to be performed and focuses on deliverables and how the deliverables are to be completed. In addition to project objectives, scopes of work typically include:

- Individual tasks
- Schedule
- Milestones
- Deliverables and other end products that are expected to be provided by the performing party.

How the project will be paid for is often included.

# IRST notes

**Both will be competitive as required in rule**

## **Roads RFP**

- Respond to a research proposal versus a scope of work
- Need to start with clear questions – we want interpreted information that answers the questions on the table

## **Rapid review of Eastern Oregon steep slopes RFP**

- Seems designed for the scope of work because framework we are asking for is narrow
- Front-end work IRST would need to do would be beneficial to ensure what we need. Would not want to open the door to this seeming like a pilot project for a lot more work to be done in the future.

# Slide: Road-stream connectivity

***Can this work be awarded to one research team? Or, can it be awarded to different research teams? And, do they have to respond to all elements, or just one or more?***

## IRST Comments

- Don't break this up – could create inconsistencies in this 1 project and create challenges for the IRST to pick and choose elements of numerous proposals.
- Maybe we break it into 2 RFPs (one for components 1-3, and the other for component 4. Noting if someone could do all 4, in stages, we would accept responses as 1 single proposal. Another perspective: would not want to separate 4 from the other steps.
- ODF is likely the holder of the data for #1 – let's ask them if they can do it and when they could deliver it by. **IRST could get a definitive answer from ODF on if they could do step #1 GIS analysis, then decide next steps.** We need to know what approach is reasonable before we put out an RFP. Is the road layer sufficient to allow it to be the basis for sampling?
- **Action item:** Sean will send a request to Terry and Emily – asking if this is a possibility.
- ODF does #1; then IRST issues an RFP to answer 2-4 (in an ideal world).
- If ODF cannot do #1, we may wish to consider an RFP that is strictly about #1, then once we receive the deliverables, we send out another RFP for 2-4.
- **Action item:** Restructure table with timelines – decision tree graphic

The Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity Project will include these components:

- 1) Pre-survey Options 1 & 2 to save time and money by using geospatial data to identify optimal field work for the study;
  - a) ODF Evaluating the data (ODF may be able to do this . . . ) – they may be in the best position to do this work (time needed: 3-6 months)
  - b) IRST RFP (university or contractor): The other piece is a research project – how to use GIS to get at some attributes (time needed: 13 months)
- 2) Sample stratification based on differences in ownership (large vs. small landowner) and geography (eastern vs. western Oregon);
- 3) Baseline assessment of road-stream hydrologic connectivity soon after the start of the new Forest Practices Act (FPA) rules; and,
- 4) Sediment modeling to assess trends in sediment delivery from roads to streams.

# Slide: Rubric for reviewing submitted proposals

- ***What criteria should be used to evaluate/review the proposals that are submitted in response to the RFPs?***
- ***Would the criteria be different if a research proposal is being submitted versus a response to a scope of work?***
- ***How do we evaluate each category (points, written comments, both)? Are the categories weighted differently?***

## 1. Specific Project Criteria

- a. Proposal is responsive to the specific RFP criteria and stated goals and objectives can be met within proposal timeline.
- b. Deliverables are clearly defined.
- c. Proposed project advances the state of the science through clear and understandable robust methods.
- d. Proposed project is feasibly and technically sound.

## 2. Project Team Qualifications

- a. Principal applicants have specialized knowledge in topic area.
- b. Principal applicants have research or appropriate experience relevant to proposed work.
- c. Principal applicants have demonstrated understanding of needed research.
- d. Principal applicants have experience working in (e.g., Lidar, the field and collecting data – this rubric would be different in each proposal – project-specific criteria)

## 3. Project Budget

- a. Project budget is justified and aligned with project goals, outcomes and timelines.
- b. Project supplies, materials, and personnel costs (if applicable) are clearly described and reasonable to accomplish goals and objectives.

# IRST notes

- **Criteria to use**
  - Project timeline is achievable.
  - Do we want something about adequate QA/QC of field effort?
  - Apply different weights to different criteria (should be RFP specific)
  - Like quantitative scale in addition to narrative characterization – gives solid foundation for comparing across proposals
  - Can INR develop a straw man scoring system, or can we designate an IRST subgroup for this?
- **Anonymity**
  - During initial stage, is submitter going to be blinded? Rule states that until 2028, authors cannot be anonymous, even the reviewers (there are issues associated with knowing and no knowing authors).
    - In rule: “A peer review process that is transparent and addresses both study designs and study reports. The IRST shall not grant anonymity to authors, handling editors, or peer-reviewers before January 1, 2028. After January 1, 2028, the IRST may modify the anonymity requirements to peer reviewers by a substantial decision of the IRST”
  - Could we do it in a staged process – initial review blinded, but then evaluate based on experience, who, etc.
  - Peer reviewers would be listed on INRs website as “reviewers of proposals.” Comments would not be directly associated with an individual reviewer.
- **How will submitter recruit field workers? A key question. Gets at QA/QC.**

- Is there an opportunity for AMPC to look at the RFP to ensure it hits the mark? We don't want feedback on methods, etc. – but to ensure they feel like it's going to answer the questions. We could do “courtesy viewings” with AMPC say, 1 week before we send out RFP – not to contribute to methods, etc., but to identify anything egregious.
- After proposals have been accepted – do we need to provide some context for how we're going to be working with successful candidates as part of the RFP? “Should you be accepted, these are the expectations for engagement, etc.” E.g. interactions with IRST, INR as administrators – put in award administration information section?

**Action item:** Rubric template

# Reviewing submitted proposals: IRST notes from 10 June IRST meeting

## General

- IRST would benefit from outside review of proposal before the awards are given, noting an amalgam of internal and external review could occur when some level of topic expertise exists on the IRST. Each RFP could be handled differently.
- Reviewers may need some education/information leading into reviewing a proposal – to ensure they have the context, etc. Keep the education/information SIMPLE – avoid unwieldy instructions to reviewers.

## Role of IRST

- At least one member of the IRST participating in each review would be a “**project lead**” – go-to for steep slopes (e.g., Ellen would be the lead), etc. IRST members are most familiar with AMPC intent, which would serve the overall process. All IRST members would ~~have opportunity~~ be encouraged to read/review proposals. Two potential levels of review – read/review and detailed review with ranking.
- Project lead could parse through review and identify key questions or issues that require further IRST input. Comments could be filtered through lead IRST reviewer.
- NSF panel approach – each member has a subset of proposals for which they are lead, but all members have and review all proposals.

# Reviewing submitted proposals: Notes from the June IRST meeting (continued)

## Questions

- # of reviewers?

Do we want proposers to propose reviewers? We should have a **minimum** number of reviewers (perhaps including IRST members) – e.g., 3 reviewers, no more than one (or some other #) of which can be an IRST member.

- **IRST Notes:**

- More detailed expensive projects may have more reviewers. Ranking, weighting, and reconciliation among reviewers – not just the focus on the numbers. 2 reviewers – coordination and expense not trivial. Getting good reviewers is difficult – we can build nominal honoraria into budgets.

- If we receive a large number of proposals, could we winnow them down? Perhaps those that meet a certain threshold are sent to IRST/reviewers for formal review and scoring.

- **IRST Notes:**

# Updates to RFP Template

- [Link to template from June & July meetings](#)
- The remaining slides highlight only updated information

# Outline of the RFP

## 1. Request for Proposal Announcement

## 2. Research Project Description

### 2.1 Background

### 2.2 Description of Funding Opportunity

### 2.3 Research Project Objectives

### 2.4 Research Project Deliverables and Deadlines

### 2.5 Public Benefit

## 3. Award Information

### 3.1 General Information

### 3.2 What to Expect if Awarded a Grant

## 4. Eligibility

### 4.1 Eligible Applicants

### 4.2 Conflict of Interest

## 5. Application and Submission Information

### 5.1 Content and Form of Application

### 5.2 Proposal Submission Deadline

## 6. Evaluation Process

### 6.1 Evaluation Process

### 6.2 Criteria for Selection

## 7. Award Administration Information

### 7.1. Notice of Award

### 7.2 Award Conditions

### 7.3 Reporting Requirements

# 1. Request for Proposal Announcement

**Request for Proposal Title:** Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity Baseline Assessment and Sediment Modeling Project

**Funding Opportunity Number:** TBD

**Estimated Award Ceiling:** \$1.4 million for Year 1; \$2.7 million for the 25-27 biennium

**Estimated Total Program Funding:** \$5.4 million for the overall Road-Stream Connectivity Research Program

**Contact:** Institute for Natural Resources

All awards within this grant program will be subawards of a grant given to the Institute for Natural Resources at Oregon State University by the Oregon Department of Forestry.

Important Dates	
	<b>RFP Announced</b> Date
	<b>RFP Information Meeting</b> Date
	<b>Written Questions Submission Deadline</b> Date
	<b>Responses Posted on Website</b> Date
	<b>Full Proposal Deadline</b> Date
	<b>Award Notification</b> Date
	<b>Funding Start Date</b> Date

# 2. Research Project Description

## 2.1 Background

## 2.2 Description of Funding Opportunity

## 2.3 Research Project Objectives

## 2.4 Research Project Deliverables and Deadlines

## 2.5 Public Benefit

The Oregon legislature directed the Board of Forestry (Board) to set up the Adaptive Management Program in 2022. The Program helps inform rulemaking by using the best available science to assess the effectiveness of rules to achieve the Biological Goals and Objectives (BGOs) described in the Private Lands Aquatic Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP).

The Adaptive Management Program includes two advisory bodies: (1) the Adaptive Management Program Committee (AMPC), which develops the policy direction for the program, including the research questions; and, (2) the Independent Research and Science Team (IRST) which supports the work of the AMPC by developing research and monitoring options in response to AMPC-developed research question packages and by overseeing research and monitoring to address the policy direction.

In [629-603-0100\(8\)](#), “requirements of baseline and trend monitoring of road rules” was one of three topics called to be prioritized in the initial phase of the Adaptive Management Program. In response to the AMPC’s road-stream connectivity research questions, the IRST produced a scoping proposal.

# Research Project Description

2.1 Background

2.2 Description of Funding Opportunity

2.3 Research Project Objectives

2.4 Research Project Deliverables and Deadlines

2.5 Public Benefit

As per OAR 629-603-0200, the IRST develops requests for proposals (RFP) in an open, competitive process. Based on the following AMPC research questions related to a baseline report for road-stream hydrologic connectivity (RSHC):

- a. What is the baseline status of hydrologic connectivity of roads prior to the implementation of the OFPA road rules effective Jan 1, 2024?
- b. How does the status of hydrologic connectivity differ based on landowner type and East/West region?
- c. How do particular elements of the regulatory framework (e.g., road location) or site characteristics (e.g. geology) contribute to hydrologic connectivity?

# Research Project Description

2.1 Background

2.2 Description of Funding Opportunity

2.3 **Research Project Objectives**

2.4 Research Project Deliverables and Deadlines

2.5 Public Benefit

The IRST seeks a proposal that encompasses the following components:

- Pre-survey Options 1 & 2 save time and money by using geospatial data to identify optimal field work for the study;
- A sample stratification based on differences in ownership (large vs. small landowner) and geography (eastern vs. western Oregon);
- A baseline assessment of road-stream hydrologic connectivity soon after the start of the new Forest Practices Act (FPA) rules; and,
- Sediment modeling to assess trends in sediment delivery from roads to streams.

# Research Project Description

- 2.1 Background
- 2.2 Description of Funding Opportunity
- 2.3 **Research Project Objectives**
- 2.4 Research Project Deliverables and Deadlines
- 2.5 Public Benefit

And, can address each of the following objectives:

## **Component 1: Geospatial data to identify optimal field work for the study**

Objective(s) or Questions: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Component 2: Sample stratification based on differences in ownership (large vs. small landowner) and geography (eastern vs. western Oregon)**

Objective(s) or Questions: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Component 3: Baseline assessment of road-stream hydrologic connectivity soon after the start of the new Forest Practices Act (FPA) rules**

Objective(s) or Questions: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Component 4: Sediment modeling to assess trends in sediment delivery from roads to streams.**

Objective(s) or Questions: \_\_\_\_\_

# Research Project Description

Overall Project timeline

- 2.1 Background
- 2.2 Description of Funding Opportunity
- 2.3 **Research Project Objectives**
- 2.4 Research Project Deliverables and Deadlines
- 2.5 Public Benefit

## Anticipated Project Timeline

Priority	Project	Milestone	Completed (months since project start)
1	Road-stream Hydrologic Connectivity Baseline Assessment and Sediment Modeling	Award contract	2–3
		Prep for field data collection	15–18
		Complete field data collection	27–30
		Complete data analysis & draft reports	42–46
		Complete final reports	48–50

# Research Project Description

- 2.1 Background
- 2.2 Description of Funding Opportunity
- 2.3 Research Project Objectives
- 2.4 Research Project Deliverables and Deadlines
- 2.5 Public Benefit

## Anticipated Deliverables

Deliverables (Examples)	General Date
Kick-off meeting	Within 3 weeks of project start
Progress reports due to IRST	Quarterly
Periodic meetings	
Data*	
Detailed final report*	
PowerPoint presentation of final report	
An after-action review meeting between the IRST and the contractor and other cooperators*	

\* Indicates deliverables as defined in rule, OAR [629-603-0200\(6\)b](#).

# Research Project Description

- 2.1 Background
- 2.2 Description of Funding Opportunity
- 2.3 Research Project Objectives
- 2.4 Research Project Deliverables and Deadlines
- 2.5 Public Benefit**

This project will contribute to the knowledge around road-stream connectivity by:

- Assessing hydrologic connectivity between roads and streams, and models associated amounts of sediment delivery.
- Including all the connectivity-only metrics listed in Option 1 of the scoping proposal, plus the modeled delivery of road sediment to streams.
- Informing the development of performance targets and the effectiveness of road rules in achieving BGOs related to hydrologic disconnection and sediment delivery.

Products from the research project (Objectives 1-3) will be used to \_\_\_\_\_.

However, the AMPC will not use the results of sediment modeling (Objective 4) that may come out of this project as an indication of measures of actual sediment amounts, individual sediment delivery points, or individual road segments. Sediment modeling results alone would not be used as the basis to recommend rule changes but could be used to inform future study or analysis.

# 3. Award Information

3.1 General Information

3.2 What to Expect if Awarded a Grant

*No new information at this point.*

# 4. Eligibility

4.1 Eligible Applicants  
4.2 Conflict of Interest

*No new information at this point.*

# 5. Application & Submission

5.1 Content and Form of Application  
5.2 Proposal Submission Deadline

*No new information at this point.*

# 6. Evaluation Process

## 6.1 Evaluation Process 6.2 Criteria for Selection

1. Specific Project Criteria (maximum total points for this section is 50)	Score (1-5)	Category Weight
<b>Responsiveness:</b> How responsive is the proposal to the RFP criteria?		200%
<b>Timeline:</b> To what degree can the stated deliverables be completed within the proposed timeline?		100%
<b>Deliverables:</b> To what degree are the deliverables clearly defined?		100%
<b>Methodology:</b> To what degree does the project advance the state of the science through clear, understandable, and robust methods?		200%
<b>Soundness:</b> To what degree is the proposed project feasibly and technically sound?		200%
<b>QA/QC:</b> How well does the field work proposed incorporate quality assurance/quality controls into its approach (e.g., approach taken to recruit field workers, approach taken to ensure data is collected per stringent standards)?		200%
2. Project Team Qualifications (maximum total points for this section is 25)	Score (1-5)	Category Weight
<b>Knowledge:</b> Project team has specialized knowledge in the RFP topic areas.		200%
<b>Experience:</b> Project team has research or appropriate experience relevant to proposed work.		200%
<b>Project Understanding:</b> Project team has demonstrated understanding of needed research.		100%
3. Project Budget (maximum total points for this section is 25)	Score (1-5)	Category Weight
<b>Alignment:</b> Project budget is justified and aligned with project goals, deliverables, and milestones.		300%
<b>Reasonableness:</b> Project supplies, materials, equipment, personnel and other costs are clearly described and reasonable to produce described deliverables.		200%

# 7. Award Administration

## 7.1. Notice of Award

## 7.2 Award Conditions

## 7.3 Reporting Requirements

The IRST, via the Institute for Natural Resources, will send an email to the Principal Investigator(s) (PI) notifying them that they have been selected to receive a grant. After the PI acknowledges that they have received the email and accepts the grant award, an official “Notice of Award” will be sent to them. The Notice would include the following information:

- Period of performance
- Name of the principal investigator
- Dollars committed and/or obligated
- Future year commitments
- Cost sharing (if required)
- Accounting and reporting obligations
- Deliverables
- Payment to awardee
- Special terms and conditions
- General terms and conditions

# 7. Award Administration

7.1. Notice of Award

7.2 Award Conditions

7.3 Reporting Requirements

In addition to the Notice of Award, Oregon State University and the Institute for Natural Resources, prepare an agreement/contract that fully describes the conditions of the award for signature by all institutional partners. It is important to note that principal investigators can not sign on behalf of their home organization/institution/unit. The project can not begin until the agreement or contract is fully executed.

## **QUESTION:**

If possible, should an example of the OSU agreement/contract be part of the RFP materials?