



Document 2

For 22 January 2026 IRST meeting

Independent Research and Science Team Eastern Oregon Steep Slopes Rapid Systematic Literature Review Project 202X

Request for Proposals

Announcement Date: **DAY, DATE, 202X**

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 \$80,000

Anticipated Funding: 1 project, Total approx. \$80,000 over 8 months

Project Duration: DATE through DATE

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
Acronyms	4
I. General Information	5
A. Introduction	5
B. Schedule of Dates for Proposal Submission and Review	5
C. Eligibility Information	5
II. Overview, Purpose, and Statement of Work	6
A. Overview and Purpose	6
Adaptive Management Program	6
Background and Project Overview	6
Relevant Documents	7
Purpose	8
B. Statement of Work	8
Overview of the Specifications of Work	8
Specifications of Work	8
C. Duration of Grant and General Timeline	10
D. Funding	11
III. Full Proposal Submission Guidelines	12
A. Requested and Required Information for Full Proposal	12
B. Full Proposal Guidelines	12
B.1 Title Page	12
B.2 Proposal Narrative	12
B.3 Supplemental Information	13
IV. Proposal Development and Evaluation Process	15
A. Transparent Review Process and Guidance for Proposers	15
B. Proposal Development Process	15
C. Evaluation Process and Decision Criteria	16
V. Award Administration Information	17
A. Notice of Award	17
B. Award Conditions	17

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

C. Reporting Requirements	17
VI. Contact.....	17
Appendix A: AMPC Eastern Oregon Steep Slopes Research Questions Package.....	18
ATTACHMENT A: Example Agreement	22

DRAFT

Acronyms

AMP	Adaptive Management Program
AMPC	Adaptive Management Program Committee
CEE	Collaboration for Environmental Evidence
DOI	Digital Object Identifier
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
INR	Institute for Natural Resources
IRST	Independent Research and Science Team
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
ORS	Oregon Revised Statutes
OSU	Oregon State University
PFA	Private Forest Accord
PI	Principal Investigator
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
RFP	Request for Proposal
URL	Uniform Resource Locator
USFWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

I. General Information

A. Introduction

The Institute for Natural Resources (INR), acting on behalf of the Independent Research and Science Team (IRST) for the Oregon Department of Forestry’s Adaptive Management Program, seeks a contractor to undertake a rapid systematic review of the evidence of, and knowledge gaps related to, the impact hillslope processes have on ^{draft} Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) species and their habitats in Eastern Oregon.

The IRST anticipates awarding one contract from this request for proposal (RFP). Any contract awarded via this RFP will have a specific timeline to complete the deliverables. The term of the contract is expected to end on **DATE** but may be extended past that date for follow-up questions, etc., upon mutual agreement of the parties.

B. ^{Schedule} Schedule of Dates for Proposal Submission and Review

Item	Timeline
Request for proposal (RFP) announced	DATE
Written questions submission deadline	
Responses posted on website	
Full proposals due	DATE (before 11:59 pm Pacific Time)
Review period	
Tentative notice of funding decisions	
Notice to non-awardees	
Award agreement set up	
Awarded project begins	Approximate 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 ([LINK](#)) and disseminated through email.

C. Eligibility Information

Full proposals may be submitted by individuals and organizations with the capacity, expertise, demonstrated experience, and qualifications to successfully complete the tasks and the deliverables. IRST members are also eligible proposers. As per Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) [629-603-0200\(6\)e](#), “If an IRST member seeks to respond to 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, if such funding is pursued. **Note:** Only one full proposal for each Principal Investigator may be submitted.

II. Overview, Purpose, and Statement of Work

A. Overview and Purpose

Adaptive Management Program

Based on stakeholder negotiations documented in the [Private Forest Accord Report](#), the Oregon legislature, in [Senate Bill 1501](#) in the 2022 session, directed the Board of Forestry to update the state’s forest practice rules and established the Adaptive Management Program (AMP).

The AMP will help design effectiveness monitoring of forest practices rules and the inform future rulemaking to support the state’s application for a programmatic habitat conservation plan (HCP), and subsequent incidental take permits from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The goal of the program is to use the best available science to assess the effectiveness of rules for achieving the biological goals and objectives described in the HCP. The AMP 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.

Background and Project Overview

“The goals of the Private Forest Accord (PFA) commitments regarding timber harvest on steep slopes is to provide large wood and sediment consistent with maintaining or improving aquatic habitat within large basins over long timeframes...To accomplish this, sediment sources and debris flow runout paths will be identified and a subset of these will be managed during timber harvest activities to retain trees and other vegetation. These actions, together with other HCP commitments, are intended to provide high-quality habitat to support recovery and long-term conservation of the species covered by this HCP on private forestlands...”

The PFA does not prescribe new management measures for landslide initiation zones or debris flow traversal channels in Eastern Oregon. The PFA authors agree that Eastern Oregon’s unique geologies and climates likely mean that these processes are different in magnitude, frequency, and impact on the covered species, when compared to Western Oregon. Similarly, the impact of timber harvesting on these processes is potentially different in Eastern Oregon. In light of this uncertainty, the PFA authors agree that the Adaptive Management Program examine the scientific literature on the impacts that hillslope processes have on the covered species in Eastern Oregon. The primary focus will be on upslope initiated shallow rapid slides and how timber harvesting may impact these in Eastern Oregon environments. A secondary and more limited focus is whether other hillslope processes that likely affect covered species are changed by forest practices.”

In Aug 2024, the AMPC research question package pertaining to eastern Oregon steep slopes was finalized:

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

Overarching Question: What impact do hillslope processes have on the covered species included in the draft HCP and their habitats in Eastern Oregon?

- Primary Focus: What does the literature say about upslope initiated shallow rapid slides and how timber harvesting may impact these in Eastern Oregon environments?
- Secondary Focus: Are there hillslope processes other than upslope initiated shallow rapid slides that may affect covered species within the draft Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and are these processes changed by forest practices?

Only those amphibians and fish species identified in Section 1.4 of the Private Forest Accord Report (2022) are considered “covered species,” as defined for use in developing a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) consistent with USFWS and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (2016), and thus are relevant to the overarching question. Road impacts on shallow rapid slides were not considered for the primary and secondary focus questions. Similarly, other hillslope processes unrelated to mass wasting were excluded for the secondary focus question.

Based on these questions, in January 2025 the IRST submitted to the AMPC a research scoping proposal framing how these questions could be addressed using literature reviews, which would assess the robustness of conclusions based on the literature and identify key gaps that might prompt the need for additional research. The IRST conducted a scoping review to characterize the potential amount and nature of the existing relevant scientific literature. It was intended, not as a comprehensive literature review, but as a necessary first step to support the development of a research proposal package to inform the AMPC and Board of Forestry decisions about the utility of soliciting further literature review or research via requests for proposals. The Board of Forestry approved the AMPC research agenda, which included a rapid systematic review, in September 2025.

Relevant Documents

Document Name	Document Location
Private Forest Accord Report (2022), Chapter 3	https://www.oregon.gov/odf/aboutodf/documents/2022-odf-private-forest-accord-report.pdf
Draft Habitat Conservation Plan	URL?
AMPC’s steep slopes research questions package (2025)	Appendix A of this RFP
IRST’s eastern Oregon steep slopes scoping proposal (2025)	https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/concern/technical_reports/5d86p7775
Collaboration for Environmental Evidence guidelines (2022)	https://environmentalevidence.org/information-for-authors/

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

Purpose

OAR [629-603-0200\(6\)\(b\)](#) authorizes the IRST to develop an RFP in an open, competitive process for research projects in the AMPC-developed research agenda. As such, the IRST seeks a contractor to conduct a rapid systematic literature review that will inform the extent of knowledge about whether forest practices on private lands in eastern Oregon are affecting hillslope processes that in turn may affect HCP-covered species.

The products and deliverables from this project will be used to evaluate and inform regulation, policy, technical guidance, training, and identify information gaps. The target audiences for this project are the Adaptive Management Policy Committee, the Board of Forestry, the Oregon Department of Forestry, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and ultimately Oregon’s citizens.

B. Statement of Work

Overview of the Specifications of Work

The contractor will conduct a rapid systematic literature review of the evidence and knowledge gaps as per the finalized AMPC research questions (for full contextual information see [Appendix A](#)) including the following elements:

- Meet regularly with the IRST;
- Follow Collaboration for Environmental Evidence (CEE) guidelines and collaborate with the IRST to develop a review protocol;
- Conduct a rapid review in accordance with the protocol;
- Analyze the evidence;
- Write a final technical report that documents the search and review process for transparency and replicability, summarizes the state of knowledge, identifies knowledge gaps, and contains “evidence tables”;
- Submit the final report and all supporting documentation, including data; and
- Participate in an after-action meeting at the end of the project.

Submission of a final report and data, and conducting the after-action meeting, are requirements in OAR [629-603-0200](#).

Specifications of Work

The IRST expects the following tasks and deliverables:

Task 1. Project Management

The contractor will coordinate with the IRST to manage this project effectively and efficiently to accomplish this statement of work. The contractor will provide a preferred approach to managing this project, in cooperation with the IRST, that specifies how the contractor will keep the IRST informed of progress on tasks and deliverables and keep the project on time and within budget. In

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

addition to the technical aspects of managing the project, the contractor will engage with the IRST as follows:

- A kick-off meeting
- Regular interactions with the IRST
- An after-action review meeting (required in rule)

Task 2. Conducting the Rapid Systematic Review

A rapid systematic review process is more simplistic than a full systematic review, as described in CEE guidelines:

- 1) Reduce review and inputs beyond the IRST (e.g., no external workshops);
- 2) Reduce the number of databases searched and experts consulted;
- 3) Rely on only one reviewer, rather than two or more independent reviewers, when screening and extracting information from each publication;
- 4) Limit the critical appraisal of study validity;
- 5) Limit the literature database to only relevant documents, rather than including those that were rejected; and,
- 6) No compilation of available empirical datasets.

This review would extract data from the documents, summarize the state of knowledge, and identify research gaps, but would not capture some gray literature that might be identified by subject experts via workshops or other venues. This option could begin to describe the differences in the drivers of mass wasting processes eastside vs. westside, and what is known about related species habitat vulnerabilities on the eastside. The search and review process would be well documented for transparency and replicability, however, relying only on one or two reviewers without consistency checking could increase the potential influence of individual biases. Because relevant empirical databases would not be compiled, later use in model calibration for risk or susceptibility assessment would not be possible.

Activity 2.1. Develop a protocol for conducting rapid systematic reviews, including the list of questions, eligibility criteria, search strategy, study selection, data extraction, risk of bias and certainty assessment, synthesis method and statistical/data analysis plan. The final search strategy and methodology would be developed in consultation with the IRST.

- **Deliverable 2.1a.** Written protocol per the above-mentioned components.

Activity 2.2. Perform the rapid systematic search according to the protocols, including summary of findings tables, and evidence to decision/evidence to recommendations tables.

- **Deliverable 2.2a.** Spreadsheet (e.g., Google sheet), including available studies related to the above thematic area, according to the above-mentioned methods, and containing the following variables (at a minimum): title, Uniform Resource Locator (URL), Digital Object Identifier (DOI), summary description of the study, comparators.

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

- **Deliverable 2.2b.** Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) study flow diagram and table of characteristics of included studies.
- **Deliverable 2.2c.** Detailed written description of the methods (search, data extraction, bias assessment, etc.), interim report of the review and data analysis, and preliminary findings.

Task 3. Final Report

The contractor will produce a narrative final report of the review that synthesizes and summarizes the literature and findings. The final report will include:

- **Deliverable 3.1.** A draft systematic review report, including synthesis of findings and presentation of the systematic review (and meta-analysis, if appropriate), including the use of tools for appraisal of the evidence, descriptive tables of the included studies, and review results. The draft report will be reviewed by external reviewers and the IRST. Based on the review comments, a final report will be produced.
- **Deliverable 3.2.** Final copies of data.
- **Deliverable 3.3.** Final copy of systematic review report.
- **Deliverable 3.4.** Support for preparation of evidence synthesis for the IRST, including evidence to decision tables and slide decks, when appropriate.
- **Deliverable 3.5.** A presentation to the IRST at a planned meeting.

Task 4. After-action Review Meeting

This will be a meeting between the IRST, the contractor, and other cooperators (e.g., ODF, etc.).

C. Duration of Grant and General Timeline

The duration of proposed work is estimated to be about **8 months**, after the 2- to 3-month award set-up period. The proposed work should begin **DATE** at the earliest, and deliverables, including the final report, are due no later than **DATE**.

General Project Timeline

Deliverables	General Date
Kick-off meeting	Within 3 weeks of project start
Interactions with IRST liaison and for key decisions/milestones	Monthly, as needed
Conducting systematic rapid review	
Draft technical scientific final report submitted for review	16 weeks before project end
External and IRST review period	15-9 weeks before project end
Data*	12 weeks before project end

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

IRST returns draft to PI with external and IRST comments	8 weeks before project end
Detailed final report* and all supporting documents submitted	2 weeks before project end
An after-action review meeting between the IRST and the contractor and other cooperators*	Last day of project

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

D. Funding

The maximum funding request for this competition is **\$80,000**. Grant funding comes from the Oregon Department of Forestry. Available funding is subject to change and rescission.

There is no cost share required for this opportunity.

DRAFT

III. 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 ([LINK](#)). 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 ([LINK](#)).

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 ([LINK](#)). Full proposals must be submitted using _____ . Full proposal submittal instructions and requirements will be available on IRST Grant Opportunities webpage ([LINK](#)).

B.1 Title Page

The title page (1-page limit) must include the following basic information:

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. Total Budget Amount
7. Abstract or Executive Summary (300-word limit)

B.2 Proposal Narrative

There is a **10-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-

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

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. Technical Approach (10-page limit)

The technical approach must describe the proposer’s demonstrated understanding of the project by establishing a clear grasp of the requested tasks and deliverables considering the goals and desired outcomes. The approach must also include a detailed description of how the rapid systematic review will be conducted, and how the approach links to the deliverables in the Statement of Work. The proposer should describe any proven systematic approach to completing the work and should articulate the data and methods used in projects of similar scope and complexity as detailed in this RFP. The proposer should also highlight any suggestions for tasks and deliverables that could provide enhanced efficiency, i.e., robust deliverables.

b. References

Provide those cited in the narrative. Note: This is not part of the 10-page limit.

B.3 Supplemental Information

Supplemental information has its own page number limitations and does not count toward the 10-page proposal narrative limit.

a. Project Timeline (1-page limit) (required and scored)

Using the tasks, deliverables, and general timeline in the Statement 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.

b. Project Management (1-page limit) (required and scored)

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

c. Qualifications (required and scored)

- **Project Team Overview.** The proposer should provide a summary of all team members and their roles, including subcontractors and senior management advisors. The proposer should demonstrate that the proposed team members and sub-contractors have the expertise, past performance, and qualifications to handle all aspects of the work to successfully implement the project. The proposer should describe who will fill the role of project manager and demonstrate that the project manager has sufficient and similar experience to ensure the project will be well managed.
- **Key Persons.** Supply curriculum vitae or biosketch for the PI, co-PIs, project manager, and other key persons (2-page limit, each). Biosketches should include information regarding recent projects pertinent to this RFP call.

d. Demonstrated Experience (required and scored)

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

The proposer shall submit a list of recent projects that demonstrate the key personnel's experience that are similar to the Scope of Work/Specifications detailed in this RFP. For each project, the proposer should include a brief description of the project and the final deliverable(s), and the name of funder/recipient of the final product(s).

e. Budget and Budget Justification (required and scored)

The proposer shall submit a clear, concise, and accurate budget and budget justification that reflects the financial plan for accomplishing the effort contained in the technical proposal. The proposer shall submit a full budget in sufficient detail so that a determination of reasonableness can be made.

The proposer 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 [\(LINK\)](#).
- *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.

f. Letters of Commitment and Support (not required)

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).

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

All letters should be submitted as PDFs.

IV. 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 (OAR [629-603-0400\(4\)\(d\)](#)). INR is also providing guidance to PIs on preparing proposals that can be 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:

- 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 difficult to maintain.

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 following the process outlined in Section III.C of this RFP. Proposers are required to provide the names, affiliation, and primary expertise of 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 the proposal team. This information can be provided using **MECHANISM TO PROVIDE THIS INFO**.
4. A review panel comprised of external reviewers and an IRST Lead will evaluate the proposals using the review criteria provided below.
5. The full IRST will consider these evaluations and select a proposal to recommend for funding.
6. The IRST selects the successful proposer, as per [629-603-0200\(6\)\(d\)](#)

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

- 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

Proposals that do not follow the guidelines outlined in this RFP will not be reviewed. Each compliant full proposal will be reviewed by external peer reviewers and an IRST Lead. External peer reviewers will provide both written comments and a proposal rating using review criteria (C.1.). All written peer reviews will then be provided to the IRST, who will review the proposals and external reviewer scores, and award the grant. The reviewers will not be directly associated with individual reviews.

As per rule, [those serving on the review panel](#) will be identified. INR will make their names available on its IRST Grant Opportunities webpage ([LINK](#)).

C.1. 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 final score:

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

- **Relevance:** 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 produce an objective, reliable, and extrapolatable product through clear, understandable, and robust methods?
- **Technical Merit:** To what degree is the proposed project feasibly and technically sound?
- **Quality Assurance and Control:** How well does the proposed work incorporate quality assurance/quality controls into its approach?

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)

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

- **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.

V. Award Administration Information

A. Notice of Award

The IRST, via INR, will send a grant award notification email to the PI for. After the PI(s) acknowledge(s) receipt of email and acceptance of 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 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

Proposers preparing full proposals for possible IRST funding should contact INR 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).

Appendix A: AMPC Eastern Oregon Steep Slopes Research Questions Package

A. Preliminary research questions

The research questions apply east of the crest of the Cascades¹ in Oregon and are to be answered via literature reviews. In addition to articulating an overview of relevant literature, the review should provide an assessment of how robust the conclusions from the literature are and key areas in which additional research may be needed.

Overarching Question:

What impacts do hillslope processes have on the covered species in the draft HCP and their habitats in Eastern Oregon?

Primary Focus:

What does the literature say about **upslope initiated shallow rapid slides and how timber harvesting may impact these in Eastern Oregon** environments?

Secondary Focus:

Are there **hillslope processes other than upslope initiated shallow rapid slides** that may affect covered species within the draft HCP and are these processes **changed by forest practices**?

B. Research Question Package

The remainder of this document provides contextual information that details the context for the preliminary research questions, as required by rule². The following are organized per the elements in this rule.

E. **B.1 The type of research**³

AMPC response:

This research is of type OAR 629-603-0100(1)(a): “Conduct effectiveness monitoring by assessing the degree to which the rules facilitating particular forest conditions and ecological processes achieve the biological goals and objectives. This assessment may include evaluation of cumulative effects.”

¹ Note: ODF maintains a regulatory GIS layer of the FPA delineation between eastern and western Oregon.

² OAR 629-603-0200 (3)(a)

³ OAR 629-603-0200(3)(a)(A)

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

F. **B.2 The rule, biological goals and objectives (BGOs), or other issue being studied⁴**

AMPC response:

The BGOs⁵ are listed below with those applicable to these questions highlighted:

“Overarching Goal: Forest practices that support the survival and recovery of the covered species by providing clean, cool, connected, and complex habitats.

Goal 1: Provide clean water and substrate for the covered species.

o **Objective 1.1** - Forest practices near streams minimize sediment delivery.

o **Objective 1.2** – Slope Retention Areas reduce episodic sediment delivery to fish-bearing streams.

o **Objective 1.3** – Road runoff directly to streams is minimized.

o **Objective 1.4** – Roads are not a significant source of episodic sediment delivery to streams.

Goal 2: Shade and watershed processes controlling stream temperature provide cool water compatible with the needs of the covered species.

o **Objective 2.1** – Forest practices maintain stream shade sufficient to support desired cool water temperatures on fish-bearing streams.

o **Objective 2.2** – No-harvest RMAs maintain stream shade sufficient to support desired cool water temperatures for covered amphibians.

o **Objective 2.3** – Forest practices near non-fish-bearing perennial streams do not notably increase water temperatures in fish-bearing streams.

Goal 3: Stream network connectivity satisfies freshwater habitat needs for covered species.

o **Objective 3.1** – Road crossings on fish-bearing streams are passable by the covered fish species.

o **Objective 3.2** – Forest practices maintain the hydrologic continuity of stream-associated wetlands and stream-adjacent seeps and springs to stream habitats.

o **Objective 3.3** – Timber harvest maintains stream-associated connectivity in riparian areas along non-fish streams sufficient to support covered amphibians.

Goal 4: Riparian areas function to support complex habitats for the covered species.

o **Objective 4.1** – Mature, complex riparian forests are fostered in no-harvest zones of RMAs.

o **Objective 4.2** – Forest practices within tree retention areas of RMAs promote delivery of large wood.

o **Objective 4.3** – Designated Debris Flow Traversal Areas function to deliver large wood to fish-bearing streams.

⁴ OAR 629-603-0200(3)(a)(B)

⁵ The most recent version of the BGOs is in the Dec. 2022 draft HCP. The BGOs will be finalized within the HCP due Dec. 31, 2027.

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

o **Objective 4.4** – Forest practices maintain stream-associated wetlands and stream-adjacent seep and spring habitat for amphibians.”

The issue being studied is outlined in the PFA Report direction, cited below under context of the research question.

B.3 The objective of the research⁶

AMPC response:

The objective of this research is to inform deliberations about whether rules or other policies are needed regarding timber harvest and other forest practices on steep slopes in eastern Oregon to protect HCP-covered species.

B.4 A brief description of the context of the research question⁷

AMPC response: The following direction was provided in the PFA Report and provides the foundation for these research questions:

“CHAPTER 3. TIMBER HARVEST ON STEEP SLOPES

3.2 Goals

- *The goals of the PFA commitments regarding timber harvest on steep slopes is to provide large wood and sediment consistent with maintaining or improving aquatic habitat within large basins over long timeframes. (For the purposes of this Chapter, large basins are those of a size equivalent to those supporting independent populations of Oregon coastal coho salmon. In modeling to support the PFA, these are USGS HUC 4th Field [8-digit] basins). To accomplish this, sediment sources and debris flow runout paths will be identified and a subset of these will be managed during timber harvest activities to retain trees and other vegetation. These actions, together with other HCP commitments, are intended to provide high-quality habitat to support recovery and long-term conservation of the species covered by this HCP on private forestlands.*
- **3.2.1 Objectives**
- *Aligned with the overall goals for timber harvest on steep slopes to provide high-quality habitat that supports the recovery, protection, and long-term conservation of covered species on private forestlands, the Authors establish the following objectives under the PFA:*
 - a. *Leave trees in Designated Debris Flow Traversal Areas to help create and maintain high-quality habitat in:*
 - 1) *Type F or Type SSBT streams by delivering large wood and regulating sediment storage and transport.*

⁶ OAR 629-603-0200(3)(a)(C)

⁷ OAR 629-603-0200(3)(a)(D)

DRAFT STEEP SLOPES – January 2026

- 2) *Type N streams by creating shade and cover for amphibians covered under the HCP.*
- b. *Leave trees in Slope Retention Areas to:*
 - 1) *Reduce timber-harvest-related increases in the frequency and volume of sediment delivered to Type F or Type SSBT streams from mass wasting events.*
 - 2) *Contribute large wood to Type F or Type SSBT streams.*
- c. *Leave trees on a subset of steep (>70%) slopes immediately adjacent to Type F or Type SSBT streams to:*
 - 1) *Stabilize these areas.*
 - 2) *Contribute large wood to Type F or Type SSBT streams.*

3.3.8 Timber Harvest on Steep Slopes in Eastern Oregon

- *The Private Forest Accord does not prescribe new management measures for landslide initiation zones or debris flow traversal channels in Eastern Oregon. The Authors agree that Eastern Oregon’s unique geologies and climates likely mean that these processes are different in magnitude, frequency, and impact on the covered species, when compared to Western Oregon. Similarly, the impact of timber harvesting on these processes is potentially different in Eastern Oregon. In light of this uncertainty, the Authors agree that the Adaptive Management Program shall, beginning no later than January 1, 2024, examine the scientific literature on the impacts that hillslope processes have on the covered species in Eastern Oregon. The primary focus will be on upslope initiated shallow rapid slides and how timber harvesting may impact these in Eastern Oregon environments. A secondary and more limited focus is whether other hillslope processes that likely affect covered species are changed by forest practices. Findings of the Adaptive Management Program on these topics will be presented to the Board of Forestry. These findings should focus primarily on the importance of shallow rapid landslides in Eastern Oregon to habitat for the covered species and the potential modification of these processes by forest practices or lack thereof. The report on this primary topic may or may not include recommendations as to desirability and relative importance of potential management measures. In addition, the report should convey whether the secondary review of literature on the effect of forest practices on other hillslope processes merits more thorough consideration by the Adaptive Management Program in light of scientific literature on the connection of these processes to covered species. Nothing in this Report should be read to suggest that any additional Eastern Oregon steep slope or other hillslope prescriptions are, or are not, necessary. The timber harvest prescriptions for steep slopes established under Section 3.3.3 of this Chapter for Designated Debris Flow Traversal Areas and under Section 3.3.4 of this Chapter for Designated Sediment Source Areas and Slope Retention Areas do not apply to any private forest ownership class east of the summit of the Cascade Mountains. The timber harvest prescriptions for steep slopes established under Section 3.3.7 Stream Adjacent Failures apply to all private forest ownership classes both west and east of the summit of the Cascade Mountains.”*

ATTACHMENT A: Example Agreement

THIS WILL BE A SEPARATE DOCUMENT.

DRAFT