

Joint AMPC-IRST Meeting

27 October 2025 | Corvallis, Oregon | 9am-1pm

Meeting Minutes

AMPC and IRST Members Present:

- **AMPC:** (In person) Seth Barnes, Stacey Detwiler, Wendy Gerlach, Josh Seeds, Amanda Sullivan-Astor, Pablo San Emeterio; (virtually) Will Tucker, David Bugni
- **IRST:** (In person) Jessica Homyack, Kelly Burnett, Ellen Bishop, Rebecca Flitcroft, Josh Roering; (virtually) Michael Furniss

Action Items:

- INR will send copy of IRST FY 26 work plan to AMPC co-chairs – completed.
- INR will make available a copy of *Roles of Research and Monitoring in Adaptive Management*, on the INR website – completed.
- AMPC will discuss the Amphibian Research Question #1 in greater detail, clarifying the intent and language associated with genetic information on species.

Meeting Notes

- The IRST (Lisa Gaines – INR) and AMPC (Terry Frueh – ODF) shared the status of their work plans, progress to date, and key next steps. Discussion included mention of the revamped HCP biological goals and objectives, expected to be available in early 2026 and likely to inform effectiveness monitoring strategies.
- The IRST (Jessica Homyack, Rebecca Flitcroft) gave a PowerPoint presentation on the *Roles and Research and Monitoring in Adaptive Management*. There was discussion about core elements of the presentation, including different and complementary ways to think about adaptive management, noting the intersection of those concepts is an iterative process involving monitoring, collaboration, and uncertainty. Components of researchable questions, different types of monitoring, and examples of AMPC's research and monitoring questions in an adaptive management framework were presented. At the conclusion of the presentation, AMPC and IRST members discussed how the IRST can best support AMPC within the framework of Oregon's adaptive management program. Suggestions included convening AMPC-IRST early in the research question development process to efficiently exchange questions and answers.
- The bulk of the meeting was spent discussing a variety of other topics, including:

- Clarifying the roles of the Board of Forestry, AMPC, and IRST (Terry Frueh presented)
- Discussing additional ways to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of AMPC and IRST while maintaining the intended individual roles of the two committees. Suggestions included the IRST providing assistance to the AMPC re: clarifying scientific and other terms in researchable questions, synching the work plans of the two committees to better align timelines and deadlines, AMPC and IRST co-chairs participating in IRST and AMPC meetings, ensuring work plan tasks related to effectiveness monitoring incorporate both short- and longer-term goals, obtaining policy neutral options from the IRST on researchable questions to help AMPC better understand the consequences/content of researchable questions that are proposed, minimizing surprises by extending courtesies (such as giving the AMPC an opportunity to review draft RFPs before announcing), and conducting joint field trips (especially those focused on people conducting the research to address the researchable questions).
- Other general topics discussed included:
 - Fostering a relationship with the Board of Forestry by keeping them updated about progress and achievements;
 - Keeping communication open and clear re: compliance monitoring and adaptive management;
 - Considering an IRST presentation/explanation of elements of the RFP process;
 - Identifying potential topics for AMPC-IRST, such as effectiveness monitoring, creating opportunities for the AMPC to learn from the IRST as AMPC develops EM.
 - Identifying opportunities for AMPC and IRST to convene more often, particularly on topic-based issues.
- Addressing key questions for research topics
 - Amphibians: Attendees discussed Question #1 for the amphibian research topic to better understand AMPC's interest and intent on referencing genetics research. At the conclusion of the discussion, AMPC stated they would discuss further as a committee and provide a clarifying response to the IRST.
 - Road-Stream hydrologic connectivity: The group discussed the challenges the WA study faced getting an adequate sample of small landowners. Participants suggested that ODF and stakeholder groups (OSWA, AOL) might be able to help with landowner contacts.

- Eastern Oregon steep slopes: IRST clarified that metadata about available datasets would be collected as part of the literature review but not the full datasets, as that would involve considerably more effort than was anticipated in the options provided.