

Forest Harvesting-Mass Wasting RFP: Proposal Review

27 April 2026

Review Panel Proposal Scoring

	Specific Project Criteria* (max pts = 50)	Project Team Qualifications (max pts = 25)	Project Budget (max pts = 25)	Total Points (max pts = 100)
Reviewer 1	50	21	10	81
Reviewer 2	45	23	25	93

* Specific project criteria: responsiveness, timeline, deliverables, methodology, technical merit, QA/QC

** Team qualifications: knowledge, experience, project understanding

***Budget: alignment, reasonableness

Review Panel Comments

Reviewer 1

General Overall Comments. This proposal is well-written, well-conceived, and presented by individuals and an organization well qualified to understand mass movements and their ecological consequences. The nature of their work provides adequate experience in researching both conventional and gray literature, and understanding the data and findings therein. I believe they will provide the information needed for this project.

Proposal Strengths. Proposal details methods used to search for references in both conventional and gray literature, as well as clearly delineating the roles of PI and Assistant, and outlining communications timing and strategy with IRST/AMPC. The PI, especially has deep experience in landslide investigations as well as protocols and reports such as CMER. The proposal notes the importance of both the primary and secondary foci of the RFP.

Proposal Weaknesses. As noted above, neither the PI nor asst. appear to have experience in Rapid Systematic Literature Reviews, although they define and discuss RSLR appropriately. However, their work will have provided plenty of experience in finding references. Geographically, the PI and Asst. and the company in general appear to have little experience in eastern Oregon landscapes (or eastern WA). This should not preclude them from doing an eastside literature search; however, the budget is not detailed and provides no justifications. It would be helpful to IRST/AMPC? ODF (and perhaps to the

proposers) to require that they detail their budget and provide justifications for each item before we award them the project.

Recommend to fund? YES or NO

YES, provisional on the presentation of budget justifications.

Reviewer 2

General Overall Comments. This is a strong proposal that demonstrates clear understanding of the research question, methodology, and deliverables.

Proposal Strengths. The project team is well qualified, the proposed methodology is very robust, and the deliverables are very clearly defined. The timeline and deliverables have been thoughtfully considered and take advantage of multiple personnel to accomplish the project tasks. The proposed methodology is well aligned with the goals of the RFP.

Proposal Weaknesses. The proposed methodology could be rigid, which aligns with the requested timeline but may lack nuance if applied strictly. The project team is well qualified but does not include a large diversity of experience and perspectives that would be valuable in a holistic review of a complex process.

Recommend to fund? YES or NO

Yes