



Independent Research and Science Team Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity Baseline Assessment and Sediment Modeling Project 2026

Request for Proposals

Announcement Date: **DAY, DATE, 2026**

DRAFT NOTES:

Blue font is new text; bold is to call attention to it; underlined is hyperlinked

Black font is text already seen by the IRST

Red font is to call attention to

Pink font is information needed

Full Proposals Due: DAY, DATE, 2026, before 11:59 p.m. PT

Late and/or incomplete applications will not be considered.

Individual Requests: Not to exceed \$AMOUNT per year

Anticipated Funding: 1 project, Total approx. \$AMOUNT over NUMBER years

Project Duration: DATE through June 30, 2030

Available funding is set by the [Adaptive Management Policy Committee \(AMPC\)](#) based on [Oregon Board of Forestry](#) approval and subject to change and rescission.

The Institute for Natural Resources at Oregon State University is the housing agency of the Independent Research and Science Team.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Summary	3
I. Introduction	4
II. General Proposal Submission Information	6
A. Schedule of Dates for Proposal Submission and Review	6
B. Eligibility Information	6
C. Project and Proposal Criteria (what we seek to achieve)	6
D. Duration of Grant and Anticipated Deliverables	7
E. Funding	8
F. Cost-share Requirement	8
G. ODF Data Sharing Requirement	8
III. Proposal Development and Evaluation Process	9
A. Transparent Review Process and Guidance for Proposers	9
B. Proposal Development Process	9
C. Evaluation Process and Decision Criteria	10
IV. Full Proposal Submission Guidelines	12
A. Requested and Required Information for Full Proposal	12
B. Full Proposal Guidelines	12
B.1 Proposal Narrative	12
B.2 Supplemental Information	13
V. Award Administration Information	15
A. Notice of Award	15
B. Award Conditions	16
C. Reporting Requirements	16
VI. Contact	16
ATTACHMENT A: Example Agreement	17

Summary

The Independent Research and Science Team (IRST) will accept full proposals from researchers who are affiliated with an academic or research institution, industry, state/regional/federal agencies, Tribes, and NGOs. Projects that _____ are appropriate for this competition. The IRST prioritizes support for _____.

Proposed research projects must include an engagement and outreach component designed to integrate and engage **private landowners**, **potential information-users**, and **interested parties into the research process and ensure the research results will be practicable to these constituencies**. Projects will be selected through an open, competitive, peer-review process. Proposed work may begin on **DATE**. Available funding is determined by the Oregon Board of Forestry and may be subject to rescission.

Full proposals undergo independent external reviews for scientific excellence and the strength of the private landowner engagement and outreach plan, the field crew recruitment and retention plans, and the data management plan. The membership of the IRST will also review full proposals for alignment with the [scoping proposal](#) and this Request for Proposals (RFP). Please read all guidelines carefully in preparing your submission.

DRAFT

I. Introduction

The Oregon legislature directed the Board of Forestry 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 IRST, which supports the work of the AMPC by developing research and monitoring options in response to AMPC-developed research question packages and oversees research and monitoring to address the policy direction.

In Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) [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](#).

Road-Stream Connectivity

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?

The IRST seeks a proposal that encompasses the following components:

- Pre-survey Options 1 & 2 that 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.

Preference for a Watershed Approach

NEED THIS FROM SEAN, JEFF, ELLEN, AND MICHAEL

Public Benefit

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

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

Target Audience and Product Use

The primary audience for the Final Report is the IRST. Other audiences include the Oregon Board of Forestry, AMPC, and a diversity of interested stakeholders whose continued interest will contribute to the ODF Adaptive Management Program.

Products from the research project (Objectives 1-3) will be used by the IRST to assist the Oregon Board of Forestry in determining when it is necessary or advisable to adjust rules, guidance, and training programs to achieve the biological goals and objectives as set by the department for a habitat conservation plan to meet requirements of section 11(1) chapter 33, Oregon Laws 2022.

The AMPC will not use the results of one of the deliverables from this project – sediment modeling (Objective 4) – as an indication of measures of actual sediment amounts, individual sediment delivery points, or individual road segments. Sediment modeling results would not be used as the basis to recommend rule changes but could be used to inform future study or analyses.

Policy Context

NEED THIS FROM TERRY

II. General Proposal Submission Information

A. Schedule of Dates for Proposal Submission and Review

Request for proposal (RFP) announced	DATE
RFP information meeting	DATE
Written questions submission deadline	DATE
Responses posted on website	DATE
Full proposals due	DAY, DATE before 11:59 pm Pacific Time
Review period	DATE
Reviews to investigators	DATE
Investigator responses to reviews due	DATE
Tentative notice of funding decisions	DATE
Successful projects begin	DATE

Note: This timeline is subject to change. Any updates will be posted on Oregon State University’s (OSU) Institute for Natural Resources (INR) [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#) and disseminated through email.

B. Eligibility Information

Full proposals may be submitted by researchers affiliated [with an academic or research institution, industry, state/regional/federal agencies, Tribes, and NGOs](#). IRST members are also eligible proposers. As per OAR [629-603-0200\(6\)e](#), “If an IRST member applies for an RFP, the IRST shall ensure RFP selections follow conflict of interest standards as established by the Oregon Government Ethics Commission.” [Oregon Government Ethics law](#) defines two types of conflicts of interest: actual conflicts of interest (ORS 244.020(1)) and potential conflicts of interest (ORS 244.020(13)).

The project’s lead Principal Investigator (PI) must be deemed eligible by their institution to receive extramural funding. **Note:** Only one full proposal for each Principal Investigator may be submitted.

C. Project and Proposal Criteria (what we seek to achieve)

[An ideal proposal would apply rigorous science and an innovative approach to understanding road-stream connectivity baseline assessments and sediment modeling at a HUC ___ watershed scale.](#) All proposals must state how they support _____, and the research objectives and priorities identified in this RFP.

The IRST seeks a proposal that encompasses the following components:

- Pre-survey Options 1 & 2 that 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.

Proposals should also 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: _____

D. Duration of Grant and Anticipated Deliverables

The duration of proposed work is estimated to be about **4 years (48 months)**, **after the 2-3 month award set-up period**. The proposed work should begin **DATE**, at the earliest, and end no later than **June 30, 2030**. Requests for support exceeding **4 years** will not be considered. Proposals to continue work beyond the initial **4 years** should be entered into a future competition.

Anticipated Project Timeline

Project	Milestone	Completed <i>(months since project start)</i>
Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity Baseline Assessment and Sediment Modeling Project	Preparation for field data collection	15–18
	Complete data collection	27–30
	Complete data analysis & draft reports	42–46
	Complete final report	48

Anticipated Deliverables

Deliverables	General Date
Kick-off meeting	Within 3 weeks of project start
Progress reports due to IRST	Quarterly
Draft detailed final report	DATE/TIMING
Data*	DATE/TIMING
IRST returns draft to PI with comments	DATE/TIMING
Detailed final report*	DATE/TIMING

An after-action review meeting between the IRST and the contractor and other cooperators*	DATE/TIMING
---	--------------------

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

E. Funding

The maximum funding request for this competition is **\$AMOUNT** or less per year. Grant funding comes from the Oregon Department of Forestry and totals an estimated **\$AMOUNT** over **4** years for research related to road-stream hydrologic connectivity. Available funding is subject to change and rescission.

F. Cost-share Requirement

There is no cost share required for this grant opportunity.

G. ODF Data Sharing Requirement

NEED THIS INFORMATION FROM TERRY

DRAFT

III. Proposal Development and Evaluation Process

A. Transparent Review Process and Guidance for Proposers

The IRST is committed to a fair and transparent review process that addresses both study designs and study reports. As per OAR [629-603-0400\(4\)\(d\)](#), “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.” As such, the names of the Lead PI and/or CoPIs will be listed on INR’s IRST Grant Opportunities webpage, as will the names of the reviewers; however, the Lead PI and/or CoPIs names will not be associated with the submitted proposal.

The Institute for Natural Resources (INR) is providing guidance to PIs on preparing proposals that will easily blinded by INR after submission (i.e., to facilitate removal of identifying information). This guidance will also be available on INR’s IRST Grant Opportunities webpage:

- INR will redact names for all project personnel from all proposal materials before materials are publicly shared. Biosketches, information on current and pending support, and budgets and budget justifications will not be publicly shared. Full application materials will be shared with the reviewers.
- Consistent use of names and spelling is encouraged (e.g., use either nickname or full name throughout the proposal package, including budget materials).
- Be mindful when citing resources by the Lead PI and/or CoPIs. Although this may be helpful for traditional review, it may make anonymity impossible.

B. Proposal Development Process

The development and review of proposals is a multi-step process:

1. The IRST will conduct a question-and-answer period to help potential proposers better understand the research requirements and policy context, and to ask any clarifying questions. This will occur via an online meeting, as well as through the submission of written questions. Responses to written questions will be posted on the IRST RFP webpage.
2. Full proposals will be submitted via **DETERMINE MECHANISM TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS** before 11:59 p.m. Pacific Time, **DATE**. No incomplete or late proposals will be accepted. All provided narrative guidance must be followed.
3. Full proposals are rigorously reviewed by at least two to three reviewers with expertise in the proposed area of research. Reviewers follow the evaluation criteria provided below. **Proposers are required to provide at least three potential reviewers from outside of Oregon.** INR asks that proposers avoid reviewers who have any conflicts of interest (**LINK TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST DEFINITION**) with your proposal team. This information can be provided using **MECHANISM TO PROVIDE THIS INFO**.

4. *Optional Rebuttal*: Principal Investigators will have one week in **MONTH** to respond to reviewer comments via **MECHANISM TO PROVIDE THIS INFO (currently scheduled for DATES, but subject to change)**. Please plan accordingly as these dates will not be shifted to accommodate individual requests.
5. A review panel comprised of 2-3 external reviewers and an IRST Lead will evaluate the proposals using the review criteria provided below.
6. The full IRST will consider these evaluations and select a proposal to recommend for funding.
7. Final decisions for IRST-funded proposals are approved by the _____.
Recommended proposals are expected to complete _____.
8. Proposers will be informed of final decisions by **mid- or late-MONTH & YEAR**. INR and the IRST reserve the right to negotiate and/or adjust the final grant amount and work plan prior to award, as appropriate and consistent with university policy and funds available.

C. Evaluation Process and Decision Criteria

The IRST aims to fund a scientifically robust and innovative proposal that encompasses the following components:

- Pre-survey Options 1 & 2 that 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.

Proposals that do not follow the guidelines outlined in this RFP will not be reviewed. Each compliant full proposal will be reviewed by 2–3 external peer reviewers and an IRST Lead. External peer reviewers will provide both written comments and a proposal rating using the following criteria. All written peer reviews will then be provided to the IRST, who will review the proposals and external reviewer scores, and make the final funding recommendation to the AMPC, which will provide the recommendation to the Oregon Board of Forestry.

As per rule, all selected reviewers will be identified. INR will make their names available on its [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#), however, the reviewers will not be directly associated with individual reviews.

Review Criteria and Weight

Proposers should directly and explicitly address the following criteria within their proposal. Each submittal will be rated using a point system, with a total of 100 points possible. Proposers will be

evaluated based on the quality and extent to which criteria are addressed; failure to provide applicable information in the proposal will affect the score:

Specific Project Criteria (maximum total points for this section is 50)

- **Responsiveness:** How responsive is the proposal to the RFP criteria?
- **Timeline:** To what degree can the stated deliverables be completed within the proposed timeline?
- **Deliverables:** To what degree are the deliverables clearly defined?
- **Methodology:** To what degree does the project advance the state of the science through clear, understandable, and robust methods?
- **Soundness:** To what degree is the proposed project feasibly and technically sound?
- **Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC):** 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)?

Project Team Qualifications (maximum total points for this section is 25)

- **Knowledge:** Project team has specialized knowledge in the RFP topic areas.
- **Experience:** Project team has research or appropriate experience relevant to proposed work.
- **Project Understanding:** Project team has demonstrated understanding of needed research.

Project Budget (maximum total points for this section is 25)

- **Alignment:** Project budget is justified and aligned with project goals, deliverables, and milestones.
- **Reasonableness:** Project supplies, materials, equipment, personnel and other costs are clearly described and reasonable to produce described deliverables.

IV. Full Proposal Submission Guidelines

Below are details on developing and submitting the full proposal. This guidance is also available on INR's [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#). Full proposals must be submitted using **DETERMINE MECHANISM FOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSION**. Full proposal submittal instructions and requirements will be available on [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#).

A. Requested and Required Information for Full Proposal

A full proposal has three categories of requested and required information:

- Basic Information
- Proposal Narrative
- Supplemental Information

NOTE: Principal Investigators at OSU do not need to submit proposals through the Cayuse system.

B. Full Proposal Guidelines

Below are details on developing and submitting the full proposal. This guidance is also available on INR's [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#). Full proposals must be submitted using _____ . Full proposal submittal instructions and requirements will be available on [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#).

B.1 Proposal Narrative

There is a **15-page limit** for the narrative. The page limit includes graphs and tables but excludes references and the additional requested/required elements listed above. All pages must be single- or double-spaced, 12-point font (Times New Roman, Arial, or Calibri preferred), and printable on 8.5-inch x 11-inch paper, with 1-inch margins.

Your narrative should include the following sections:

a. Title Page (1-page limit)

This basic information should include:

1. Project Title
2. Project Duration, including start and end dates
3. Principal Investigator (primary contact for the project)
 - a. Title/Position
 - b. Institution
 - c. Telephone number
 - d. Mailing address
 - e. Email address
 - f. Conflict of interest declaration
4. Additional Team Members – name, institution, telephone, email, and conflict of interest declaration

5. Date of Submittal
6. [Abstract of Executive Summary \(300-words\)](#)

b. Technical Proposal/Project Approach (10-page limit)

Describe each **objective/component** of the proposed work plan and how it links to the deliverables in the Scope of Work. Give reviewers ample information regarding the following: 1) how you will access or generate the needed data and information needed for the analyses; 2) what methods and tools (e.g., models, special analytical approaches, etc.) you will use; 3) why the methods are appropriate and/or needed, and (4) the role of all project personnel.

c. Field Crew Recruitment and Retention Plan (1-page limit).

Describe how the proposer will recruit and retain field crew. This should include information about training field crew, an overview of field safety measures, continuous quality assurance/quality control, and milestones.

d. Outreach, Engagement, and Recruitment of Private Landowner Plan (1-page limit).

Describe how the team will engage with and recruit the participation of private landowners as part of the research. This should include information about how the proposer will introduce the needed work with landowners, how the landowner will be engaged during the work (roles and responsibilities) as well as how the landowner will be notified once work is completed.

e. Project Timeline (1-page limit)

Using the Milestones and Deliverables Timeline in the Scope of Work as a guide, provide a detailed outline of the team's proposed strategy and discuss how the success of the project (i.e., objectives, timelines, milestones) and outcomes of the project will be measured and reported.

f. Project Management (1-page limit)

Describe how the project will be managed to achieve the project's outcomes and deliverables.

g. References

Provide those cited in the narrative. Note: This is not part of the 15-page limit.

B.2 Supplemental Information

Supplemental information has its own page number limitations and does not count toward the 15-page proposal narrative limit.

a. Qualifications

- Supply curriculum vitae or biosketch for the PI, co-PIs, and key persons (2-page limit, each). Biosketches should include information regarding recent projects pertinent to this RFP call.
- Disclosure of Current and Pending Support:
 - I. A list of all current projects the individual is working on, in addition to any future support the individual has applied to receive, regardless of the source.

- II. Title and objectives of the other research projects.
- III. The percentage per year to be devoted to the other projects.
- IV. The total amount of support the individual is receiving in connection to each of the other research projects or will receive if other applications are awarded.
- V. Name and address of the agencies and/or other parties supporting the other research projects.
- VI. Period of performance for the other research projects.

b. Data Management Plan (2-page limit)

A Data Management Plan is required, and the contents of this plan (or absence thereof), and past performance regarding such plans, will be considered as part of proposal review. The Data Management Plan must include the following considerations:

- The types of data, software, and other materials to be produced.
- How the data will be acquired.
- Time and location of data acquisition, if scientifically pertinent.
- How the data will be processed.
- The file formats and the naming conventions that will be used.
- A description of the quality assurance and quality control measures during collection, analysis, and processing.
- A description of dataset origin when existing data resources are used.
- A description of the standards to be used for data and metadata format and content.
- Appropriate timeframe for preservation.
- The plan may consider the balance between the relative value of data preservation and other factors such as the associated cost administrative burden. The plan will provide justification for such decisions.
- A statement that the data cannot be made available to the public when there are **privacy concerns** (e.g., “This data cannot be cleared for public release in accordance with the requirements in _____)

The Data Management Plan must also include a brief description of how the PI will address the Oregon Department of Forestry’s data sharing requirements and explain how the data and metadata will be stored and provided. Funds may be budgeted in the project proposal for this task.

c. Budget and Budget Justification

Clear, concise, and accurate budget and budget justification reflect the proposer’s financial plan for accomplishing the effort contained in the technical proposal. The PI shall submit a full budget in sufficient detail so that a determination of reasonableness can be made. **The budget is to be completed using the [budget template \(HYPERLINK\)](#).**

Using a **budget justification template** ([HYPERLINK](#)), the lead PI is also required to provide complete justification for each dollar value entered for each project year in the budget for various categories, which may include the following:

- ***Direct Labor***: Direct labor should be detailed by level of effort (i.e., numbers of hours, etc.) of each labor category and the applicable labor rate. The source of labor rates shall be identified and verified. If rates are estimated, please provide the historical based used and clearly identify all escalation applied to derive the proposed rates.
- ***Fringe Benefit Rates***: The source of fringe benefit rates shall be identified and verified.
- ***Travel***: Travel costs must include a purpose and breakdown per trip to include destination, number of travelers, and duration.
- ***Materials/Equipment***: List all material/equipment items by type and kind with associated costs and advise if the costs are based on vendor quotes and/or engineering estimates; provide copies of vendor quotes and/or catalog pricing data.
- ***Subaward costs***: Submit all subaward proposals and analyses. Provide the method of selection used to determine the subaward. Note: A letter of commitment is required from each subaward source. **Please use the form** [HYPERLINK](#).
- ***Tuition***: Provide details and verification for any tuition amounts proposed.
- ***Indirect Cost***: Currently the negotiated indirect rate for awards is 26%. **Note: For OSU PIs, indirect cost is charged to all direct costs.** For non-OSU PIs, indirect cost is only applied to the first \$25,000.
- ***Any other proposed direct costs***: The source should be identified and verified.

d. Letters of Commitment and Support

As part of the full proposal application, the following letters of commitment are required or optional:

- Letters of commitment from each PI and co-PI's authorized representative (required) (please use the template provided here).
- Letter of commitment from each subaward source (required, if applicable)
- **Up to 3 letters of support from project partners or interested parties (optional; encouraged but not required)**

All letters should be submitted as PDFs.

V. Award Administration Information

A. Notice of Award

The IRST, via INR, will send an email to the Principal Investigator(s) (PI) notifying them that they have been selected to receive a grant. After the PI(s) acknowledge(s) that they have received the email

and accept(s) the grant award, an official “Notice of Award” will be sent. The Notice will include the following:

- 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

B. Award Conditions

In addition to the Notice of Award, OSU and INR prepare an agreement/contract that fully describes the conditions of the award for signature by all institutional partners. Principal investigators cannot sign on behalf of their home organization/institution/unit. The project cannot begin until the agreement or contract is fully executed.

C. Reporting Requirements

NEED TO DETERMINE THESE

VI. Contact

Researchers preparing full proposals for possible IRST funding should contact the program with questions.

For questions about the application, review, and approval process, and the overall funding policy, contact INR Director Lisa Gaines (<mailto:lisa.gaines@oregonstate.edu>, (541) 737-1976).

For questions on technical aspects or questions about private landowner engagement, contact INR Forest Landscapes Program Manager Sean Gordon (<mailto:sean.gordon@oregonstate.edu>, (541) 725-6617).

ATTACHMENT A: Example Agreement

THIS WILL BE A SEPARATE DOCUMENT.

DRAFT