

DRAFT 5/19/2026



Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity and Sediment Delivery Baseline Assessment Project 2026 Request for Proposals

Announcement Date: Monday, June 1, 2026, 12:00 pm (noon) Pacific Time

Full Proposals Due: Monday, August 24, 2026, before 11:59 pm Pacific Time

Late and/or incomplete applications will not be considered.

Individual Requests: Recommended Cap \$5 million

Anticipated Funding: 1 project, Total approx. \$5.4 million

Project Duration: Approximately December 2026 through June 30, 2030

This RFP has been developed by the Independent Research and Science Team and support staff at the Institute for Natural Resources at Oregon State University as part of the Oregon Department of Forestry's Adaptive Management Program.

Available funding is set by the Adaptive Management Policy Committee based on Oregon Board of Forestry approval and is subject to change or 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
Abbreviations and Acronyms	4
I. General Information	5
A. Introduction	5
B. 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.....	7
B. Statement of Work.....	8
Overview of the Specifications of Work.....	8
Task 1. Project Management	9
Task 2. Technical Approach.....	10
Task 3. Final Report	13
Task 4. After-action Review Meeting	13
C. Project Timeline	14
D. Funding.....	14
E. ODF Data Sharing Requirement	15
III. Full Proposal Submission Guidelines.....	15
A. Requested and Required Information for Full Proposal.....	15
B. Full Proposal Guidelines	15
B.1 Title Page	15
B.2 Proposal Narrative	16
B.3 Supplemental Information.....	17
IV. Proposal Development and Evaluation Process	20

DRAFT 5/19/2026

A.	Transparent Review Process and Guidance for Proposers	20
B.	Proposal Development Process.....	20
C.	Proposal Evaluation Process and Decision Criteria	21
V.	Award Administration Information.....	22
A.	Notice of Award	22
B.	Award Conditions	23
VI.	Contact	23
	Appendix A: AMPC Roads Research Questions Package	24
	Appendix B: Definitions	27

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AMP	Adaptive Management Program
AMPC	Adaptive Management Program Committee
BGO	Biological Goals and Objectives
BOF	Board of Forestry
FRIA	Forest Roads Inventory and Analysis
GIS	Geographic Information System
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
INR	Institute for Natural Resources
IRST	Independent Research and Science Team
LiDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
OFPA	Oregon Forest Practices Act
OAR	Oregon Administrative Rules
ODEQ	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
ODFW	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
ORS	Oregon Revised Statutes
OSU	Oregon State University
PDF	Portable Document Format
PFA	Private Forest Accord
PI	Principal Investigator
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
RFP	Request for Proposal
RCA	Road Condition Assessment
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

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 provide statistically reliable field-based information on how forest road systems on private timberlands in Oregon are contributing to the delivery of water and sediment to streams and other water bodies.

The IRST anticipates awarding one contract via this request for proposal (RFP).

Schedule of Dates for Proposal Submission and Review

Item	Timeline
Request for proposal (RFP) announced	Monday, June 1, 2026
Host RFP meeting	Monday, June 15, 2026
Written questions submission deadline	Monday, June 22, 2026
Responses to questions posted on website	Monday, June 29, 2026
Full proposals due	Monday, August 24, 2026 (before 11:59 pm Pacific Time)
Review period	Approximately late-August to late-September
Tentative notice of funding decisions	Approximately mid-October 2026
Notice to non-awardees	Approximately mid-October 2026
Award agreement set-up period	Approximately October-November 2026
Awarded project begins	Approximately December 2026

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](#).

B. Eligibility Information

Full proposals may be submitted by any proposer with the capacity, expertise, demonstrated experience, and qualifications to successfully complete the tasks and deliverables. Proposers must be part of an entity authorized to do business in the State of Oregon. Eligible respondents include, but are not limited to, sole proprietorships,

partnerships, limited liability companies (LLCs), corporations, academic institutions, and non-profit organizations. State, tribal, federal, and local agencies are also eligible. To be considered, the proposer must be registered and in good standing with the Oregon Secretary of State and demonstrate the capability of meeting all insurance and certification requirements outlined in this RFP and the subaward agreement.

The project's lead Principal Investigator (PI) must be deemed eligible by their institution/organization to receive extramural funding, if such funding is pursued. Note: Only one proposal for each PI may be submitted. [Alternative: Key personnel may only participate on one proposal.]

II. Overview, Purpose, and Statement of Work

A. Overview and Purpose

Adaptive Management Program

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

The AMP will help design effectiveness monitoring of forest practices rules and inform future rulemaking to support the state's application for a programmatic habitat conservation plan (HCP), and subsequent incidental take permits from the 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 (BGO) 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

In Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) [629-603-0100\(8\)](#), "requirements of baseline and trend monitoring of road rules" was one of three topics to be prioritized in the initial phase of the AMP. The AMPC, with input from the IRST, developed the following set of questions to address this legislative direction (for full contextual information see Appendix A):

DRAFT 5/19/2026

1. What is the baseline status of hydrologic connectivity of roads prior to the implementation of the OFPA road rules effective Jan 1, 2024?
 - a. How does the status of hydrologic connectivity differ based on landowner type and East/West regions?
 - b. How do particular elements of the regulatory framework (e.g., road location) or site characteristics (e.g. geology) contribute to hydrologic connectivity?
2. What are the trends in the status of hydrologic connectivity of roads over 5-year intervals? These trends should be assessed for the same variables in question 1.

Based on these questions, in May 2025 the IRST submitted to the AMPC a research scoping proposal framing how these baseline and trends questions could be addressed. The Board of Forestry approved the AMPC research agenda, which included this project, in September 2025.

Relevant Documents

Document Name	Document Location
Private Forest Accord Report (2022)	https://www.oregon.gov/odf/aboutodf/documents/2022-odf-private-forest-accord-report.pdf
AMPC road-stream hydrologic connectivity research questions package (2025)	Appendix A of this RFP
IRST road-stream hydrologic connectivity scoping proposal (2025)	https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/concern/technical_reports/1544bz588?locale=en
Raines et al. (2005)	https://www.dnr.wa.gov/publications/fp_cmer_roads_2005.pdf
Dube et al. (2010)	https://dnr.wa.gov/sites/default/files/2025-05/fp_cmer_08_801.pdf
Martin (2009)	https://www.forestsandfish.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/17/2018/12/Road_Mgmt_Survey.pdf

Purpose

ORAR [629-603-0200\(6\)\(b\)](#) authorizes the IRST to develop RFPs in an open, competitive process for research projects in the AMPC-developed research agenda. This project will provide statistically reliable information on how forest road systems on private timberlands in Oregon are contributing to the delivery of water and sediment to water bodies.

These rules were recently revised (2022) and implemented (2024) to support an application for a federal HCP to preserve and support recovery of certain federally threatened and endangered native fish and five stream-associated amphibians and their habitats in Oregon. As new roads are constructed, and existing roads are improved or decommissioned, the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) anticipates declining trends in road-related water and sediment delivery to water bodies on private forestlands. This monitoring effort will measure baseline conditions soon after implementation of the new rules and subsequently measure trends through time as new roads are built and improvements are made to existing roads. The principal public benefit is knowing (a) whether the new rules are working as intended, and (b) if road management on private forestlands is supporting the persistence of native fish species and amphibians covered under the HCP.

The products and deliverables from this project will be used to evaluate and inform regulation, policy, technical guidance, and training as well as identify information gaps. The target audiences for this project are the AMPC, BOF, ODF, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ), NOAA, USFWS, and ultimately Oregon's citizens.

B. Statement of Work

Overview of the Specifications of Work

The IRST seeks a contractor to provide statistically reliable, field-based information on how forest road systems on private timberlands in Oregon are contributing to the delivery of water and sediment to streams and other water bodies. **We plan to fund this work in two or more phases to test and refine sampling strategies before proceeding with the full field sample. At the end of each phase, the contractor will prepare a progress report, along with an updated plan and budget for the next phase. If the plan is approved by the IRST, the IRST will modify the agreement and budget as needed for the contractor to proceed with the next phase.**

Applicants may structure project phases as they see fit. For example, during an initial phase of approximately 1-2 years, the contractor could perform the pre-survey activities and design and test one or more sampling strategies. A second phase could focus on implementing the full field sample, and a third phase on conducting sediment modeling and preparing a final report. Applicants should provide an estimated timeline and budget for all phases in response to this RFP. However, we recognize the project is likely to begin with some uncertainty about feasible sampling designs and necessary sample sizes, thus

responses may focus on an initial phase and reflect these uncertainties in future phase descriptions and budgets.

The following is a summary of the major tasks:

- A plan for how geospatial data will be used to optimize field work for the study;
- A statistically reliable **field sample of road-stream connectivity stratified by** ownership (large vs. small landowner) and geography (eastern vs. western Oregon);
- A baseline assessment of road-stream hydrologic connectivity and modeled sediment delivery soon after the start of the new Forest Practices Act (FPA) rules; and,
- A plan for assessing hydrologic connectivity and sediment delivery trends over time.

The contractor will also:

- Meet regularly with the IRST;
- At the end of each phase write an interim technical report including findings to date, along with a plan and budget for the subsequent phase;
- Write a final technical report that includes: (1) Methods sufficient to allow others to understand what was done and to evaluate the results and conclusions; and (2) A detailed description of the results;
- 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 as well as conducting the after-action meeting are requirements in OAR [629-603-0200](#).

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 ensure the project is on time and within budget. In addition to the technical aspects of managing the project, the contractor will engage with the IRST as follows:

- A kick-off meeting to convene the research team and the IRST to align goals, scope, roles, and timelines.
- Regular interactions with the IRST liaison and INR staff for key decisions/milestones. These interactions may include monthly (or as needed) meetings, email exchanges, or phone calls.
- An after-action review meeting (required in rule) to assess the project's process, implementation, and intended and actual outcomes to make improvements for future projects.

Task 2. Technical Approach

To assess the baseline status of road-stream hydrologic connectivity (RSHC) under the new Oregon Forest Practices Rules, we are requesting proposals to conduct field surveys and sediment modeling as well as three pre-survey options to help better target where and what data are collected in the field.

The IRST accepted the following as its working definition of road-stream hydrologic connectivity (RSHC): “A road segment is considered hydrologically connected where surface runoff from road cuts, ditches, running surfaces, and fills exhibits a continuous surface flow path to a natural stream channel.”

As a result of this study, summary statistics will be calculated on measured variables related to RSHC for each reporting unit (e.g., all the roads in a watershed or land grid). The baseline status will be summarized by strata (landowner class in each geo-region). Depending on the sampling approach, the summarized baseline status could be metrics, such as the length of connected road over total road length (or sampled area) or length of connected road per length of potentially connected road. Sediment metrics could include amount of sediment delivery to streams (tons/sq mi/year), volume of road sediment delivered to streams per mile of stream (tons/stream mi/year), and characteristics of high delivery road segments (surfacing, traffic, etc.).


This initial survey is intended to establish a baseline for trend monitoring, thus proposals should address how subsequent periodic surveys might be structured to detect connectivity trends.

The PFA recommended that methodology for the monitoring be based on studies by Dubé et al. (2010) and Martin (2009) for the state of Washington. The IRST has reviewed these studies and provides additional recommendations:

Pre-survey Task 1: Assessing Roads and Streams Digital Data

One potential way to boost sampling efficiency and to target the most relevant road segments could be to preselect and sample only road segments with a high probability of being hydrologically connected, using either a simple distance buffer or one of the RSHC models. However, the utility of these locations for field work and avoiding potential sampling bias will depend on the accuracy of the stream and road data used to identify field sampling locations.

The Oregon Department of Forestry’s ownership, hydrography and transportation layers (available from their Geographic Information System (GIS) [Data Hub](#)) are considered the most comprehensive coverages available for private forestland in Oregon. However, the accuracy and completeness of the layers is not well quantified. Thus, using these layers to

guide sampling for RSHC may introduce an unknown level of bias into estimates. If an applicant chooses this type of preselection, we request a description of how the accuracy of these data layers might be assessed and sampling bias minimized.

Pre-survey Task 2: GIS-LiDAR Road Segment Analysis

Identifying road segments and measuring the associated attributes needed for RSHC analysis and sediment modeling takes considerable time in the field. The literature suggests that GIS (desktop) analysis prior to fieldwork could be used to generate road segments and properties from publicly available airborne Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data. The goal of this task would be to test whether such an approach improves the accuracy and efficiency of road segment creation and the quantification of segment characteristics needed for RSHC analysis. If so, then field crews in RSHC Field Survey, described below, could focus on documenting site-specific information, such as road surfacing, that cannot readily be obtained from LiDAR.

After overlaying the ODF road network atop airborne LiDAR, flow routing algorithms and other GIS tools could be used to distinguish road segments and attribute those segments with estimates of relevant properties, including length, slope, configuration, ditch width/position, cut slope height, tread width, and other geometric data. Field crews would focus on verifying these remotely-sensed characteristics.

This approach would require workflow development and testing before adoption and rollout for field crews. Also, some legacy (or older) LiDAR datasets have lower point density, thus testing would be necessary to determine whether data limitations exist. Field validation would also be needed to assess the accuracy of this approach.

Pre-survey Task 3: Sampling design and field site selection

Two possible sampling approaches are the land-grid-based road census approach (used by Dubé et al. 2010) and a watershed-based approach. The latter approach is preferred and would sample within 12th code hydrologic units (HUC 12, subwatersheds) that have significant private forestland ownership.

Either approach will require a large random sample to provide valid statistical data to draw inferences and detect trends across the state of Oregon. The sample is requested to be stratified by landowner type (large/small) and geography (eastside/westside) (see Definitions section). A statistical power analysis will be necessary to determine the sample size needed for each stratum and sampling period to reliably evaluate the baseline status and detect trends.

Landowner Participation

Landowner permission must be secured before conducting monitoring on private lands. Although landowners are required to allow access to their lands for compliance monitoring related to activities reporting requirements, they are not required to allow access for effectiveness monitoring. ODF staff and stakeholder group **representatives will work with the contractor** to develop a process for landowner outreach efforts. The IRST will coordinate this effort with the chosen applicant prior to field surveys. **Recognizing that the exact process will be determined post-award, the applicant is requested to describe any experience and/or ideas they have for this outreach component.** In anticipation of less than a 100% participation rate, the applicant should describe how sampling gaps caused by lack of permission issues will be addressed.

RSHC Field Survey

RSHC will be assessed using field surveys, and associated data will be collected to run a sediment delivery model. We envision data collection methods similar to the field protocol of Dubé et al. (2010), as described in Watershed Professionals Network (2009) with potentially more recent updates (e.g., Bohle and Dubé 2016). Field crews will drive roads included in the sample and use GPS to spatially record features indicating various types and levels of connectivity (such as the five types in Dubé et al. 2010).

Applicants should describe how they would assess elements of the regulatory framework (e.g., road location) or site characteristics (e.g., geology, surfacing) contribute to hydrologic connectivity. Additional data will be collected to support modeling the relative volumes of sediment generation and delivery. Raines et al. (2005) describes the types of variables, e.g., road surface, road age, and cut slope vegetation coverage, for which field data will be collected. Other variables (e.g., road traffic or maintenance activities) may be derived from landowner interviews. The exact variables will depend on the model selected.

Applicants should describe how they would implement quality assurance and control (QA/QC) for data collection, including field crew training and the measurement and minimization of inter-observer variability.

Modeling of Sediment Generation and Delivery

The chronic delivery of fine sediments to streams and their effect on aquatic organisms is one of the principal concerns of RSHC. Although connectivity is needed to deliver sediment, the amount of sediment delivered will depend on a number of local factors. The IRST would like to know the relative amounts of sediment that are estimated to be delivered from measured road segments in each sampled watershed. These estimates will be compared among watersheds and among strata, to gain insight into what factors specific to segments, watersheds, or strata best correlate with road-stream hydrologic

connectivity. The aim is to understand relative, not absolute, amounts of sediment delivered from connected road segments. Therefore, the applicant should describe how sediment delivery will be estimated based on field-collected and other available data.

Baseline Status and Trend Analysis

The desired baseline for RSHC monitoring is the status of roads when the new rules went into effect on Jan 1, 2024. Because actual field assessment will not begin until a significant time after that date, the applicant should consider how to adjust data to achieve the most accurate baseline possible. The new rules include a Forest Roads Inventory and Analysis (FRIA) process that directs large landowners to begin, as soon as possible, identifying and remediating high conservation value sites. These are areas known to have road stream connectivity or chronic sedimentation. Small landowners are exempt from FRIA but must conduct a Road Condition Assessment (RCA) for roads used in active harvest operations. These data will be reported to ODF and could be used to help identify road segments affected by these post-rule changes, which then could either be dropped from the sample or assumed connected in the baseline. Dubé (2010) conducted landowner interviews to determine which portions of the sampled road system had been updated prior to field surveys.

Although this RFP only covers baseline data collection, applicants should describe how the sampling design would support trend analysis. The stakeholder committee requested a trend analysis at 5-year intervals. Applicants should consider potential field data bias associated with different field crews at each sampling interval.

Task 3. Final Report

The contractor will produce a narrative final report of the review that describes the methods used, summarizes the results for RSHC and sediment delivery, describes limitations of the findings, and comments on lessons learned regarding implementation of the monitoring effort. A draft report will be submitted for IRST review, and the contractor will be expected to incorporate comments into a final report. Final reporting will include:

Deliverable 3.1. Final technical report.

Deliverable 3.2. Final copies of data.

Deliverable 3.3. A final presentation to the IRST at a regularly planned IRST meeting.

Task 4. After-action Review Meeting

This will be a meeting between the IRST, the contractor, and other cooperators (e.g., ODF) to assess the project's process, implementation, and intended and actual outcomes to make improvements for future projects.

C. Project Timeline

As part of the proposal, applicants must provide an estimated timeline for project implementation based on the tasks in the table below. Please fill in the Timeframe cells marked with <start-finish dates>. It is acknowledged that currently unknown information and dependencies between tasks preclude precise estimates at this point; the IRST would simply like to get an overall sense of the potential project timeline. Applicants may modify the tasks to fit their proposal.

Anticipated Project Timeline

Phase	Tasks	Frequency / Timeframe
1	Kick-off meeting	Within 3 weeks of project start
1	Interactions with IRST liaison and for key decisions/milestones	Monthly, as needed
	Progress reports due to IRST	Quarterly
	Ad hoc convenings with IRST during substantive decision points	As needed
	Pre-survey Task 1: Assessing Roads and Streams Digital Data	<start-finish dates>
	Pre-survey Task 2: GIS-LiDAR Road Segment Analysis	<start-finish dates>
	Pre-survey Task 3: Sampling design and field site selection	<start-finish dates>
	Landowner Participation plan	<start-finish dates>
	RSHC Field Survey phase 1	<start-finish dates>
	RSHC Field Survey phase 2	<start-finish dates>
	Modeling of Sediment Delivery	<start-finish dates>
	Draft final report & data delivery	<start-finish dates>
	IRST review of draft report	4 weeks
	Final report*	<start-finish dates>
	Present to the AMPC and/or Board of Forestry	Next scheduled meeting
	An after-action review meeting between the IRST and the contractor and other cooperators*	Within 1 month of final report

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

D. Funding

The maximum funding request for this competition is **\$5.4 million, with a recommended cap of \$5 million**. Grant funding comes from ODF. Available funding is subject to change and rescission.

There is no cost share required for this opportunity.

E. ODF Data Sharing Requirement

The Oregon Department of Forestry will serve as the long-term steward for these data, therefore the contractor will need to transfer data collected under this project to ODF staff. Data transfers should occur at the end of each project phase. The specific types of data and desired formats will be identified via discussions between ODF and the contractor in the first phase of the project. Data specific to individual landowners should remain confidential, thus the contractor should plan for a coding scheme that separates identifiable landowner information from the rest of the data collected.

III. Full Proposal Submission Guidelines

Below are details on developing and submitting the full proposal. This guidance, relevant templates and other documents are available on INR's [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#).

Full proposals must be submitted by email to irst-contact@oregonstate.edu by **Monday, August 24, 2026, before 11:59 pm Pacific Time**. The **email subject line should be** “[PI last name], Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity RFP”. No incomplete or late proposals will be accepted. All provided narrative guidance must be followed. An acknowledgement of receiving the proposal will be sent.

A. Requested and Required Information for Full Proposal

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

- Title Page
- Proposal Narrative
- Supplemental Information

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

B. Full Proposal Guidelines

Details on developing and submitting the full proposal are provided below. The full proposal (title page, proposal narrative, and supplemental documents) must be submitted as a single PDF. The proposal budget can be submitted as a separate document (in Excel format).

B.1 Title Page

The [title page form](#), which is also available on the [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#), must be completed, signed, and submitted as part of the full proposal.

B.2 Proposal Narrative

There is a 14-page limit for the narrative. The page limit includes graphs and tables but excludes references and the additional requested/required elements listed below. All pages must be single- or double-spaced, 11- or 12-point font (Calibri, Aptos, Times New Roman, or Arial preferred), and printable on 8.5-inch x 11-inch paper, with 1-inch margins.

The 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 research objectives and requested deliverables considering the goals and desired outcomes. The approach must also include a detailed description of how each objective/component of the proposed work will be achieved and how each links to the deliverables in the Statement 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; and 3) why the methods are appropriate and/or needed.

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 suggestions for tasks and deliverables that could provide enhanced efficiency, i.e., robust deliverables.

b. 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 QA/QC, and milestones.

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

Describe how the team will integrate and solicit voluntary participation from large and small private landowners. The ODF, forestry associations, and large private landowners will work with your team to contact and reassure landowners whose lands are eligible for your study. Please describe how you would work with these partners to successfully include these private land, such as 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.

d. Data Management Plan (2-page limit)

DRAFT 5/19/2026

The Data Management Plan should include the following elements (if they are not covered in the sections above):

[It seems like the initial 3 bullets should all be covered in the sections above, so could be dropped here to avoid redundancy?]

- ~~● The types of data, software, and other materials to be produced.~~
- ~~● How the data will be acquired, including a description of dataset origin when existing data resources are used.~~
- ~~● How the data will be processed.~~
- A description of the QA/QC measures during collection, analysis, and processing.
- A description of the standards to be used for data and metadata format and content.
- How data will be secured from unauthorized access or release.

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

e. References

Provide all references cited in the narrative. Note: This is not part of the 14-page limit.

B.3 Supplemental Information

Supplemental information does not count toward the 14-page proposal narrative limit.

a. Project Timeline (2-page limit) (required and scored)

Using the tasks, deliverables, and general project milestones in the Statement of Work as a guide, provide a detailed timeline 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 (2-page limit).** 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.

d. Demonstrated Experience (optional)

The proposer may submit one page listing up to five 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 **for each year of the project** that reflect the financial plan for accomplishing the effort contained in the 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 budget justification for each dollar value entered for each project year in the budget for various categories, which may include the following:

- **Salaries and Wages:** Salaries and wages should be detailed by level of effort (i.e., numbers of months, etc.) of each labor category and the applicable labor rate. The source of labor rates shall be identified and verified. For Senior Personnel, list the name, title, and months of salary requested. For other personnel, designate the job title, and provide the name (if possible), full-time monthly salary, and months of salary requested. The proposer should also indicate the role each member will play in the project. Requested person months cannot exceed 100% of any individual's time.

EXAMPLE

Senior Personnel:

Principal Investigator, [NAME], is requesting [NUMBER] person months of salary at [\$X,XXX/mo.] to [DUTIES].

Other Personnel:

Research Assistant, [NAME], is requesting [NUMBER] person months of salary at [\$X,XXX/mo.] to [DUTIES].

- **Fringe Benefit:** Fringe benefits are specifically identified to each employee and are charged individually as direct costs.

EXAMPLE

Senior Personnel:

Principal Investigator, [NAME], is requesting [\$X,XXX] in fringe benefits calculated at [XX%] of their salary.

Other Personnel:

Research Assistant, [NAME], is requesting [\$X,XXX] in fringe benefits calculated at [XX%] of their salary.

- **Permanent Equipment:** List any item with a unit cost of over \$5,000 or more and has a useful life of more than one year. List each piece of equipment to be purchased and provide a detailed description of how it will be used in the project. Items that do not meet this definition should be listed under supplies.
- **Materials and Supplies:** Explain the type of supplies to be purchased and how they will be used. If the supplies cost more than \$5,000 or consist of more than 5% of the award, provide a breakdown of supplies by quantity and cost per unit, if known. Indicate the basis for the estimate of supplies, i.e., historical use on similar projects. In the case of computers, explain how it is related to the project as opposed to having an administrative function.
- **Travel:** Describe the travel involved, its purpose, and explain how the proposed travel is necessary for successful completion of the project. Where applicable, include details, such as mileage rates, estimated travel miles, per diem rates, and lodging rates, as well as estimates for number of individuals traveling for each step of the study.
- **Publication Costs.** Briefly describe any publication costs involved. Consider both page charges and reprint costs.
- **Other Costs.** List all other costs, including subcontracts and personal service agreements, and fees for other services. List each Other Cost as a separate item. Describe products/services to be obtained and why they are necessary for the project. **Note:** A letter of commitment is required from each subcontract source. Please use the letter of commitment template, which is accessible on the [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#) in the templates section.
- **Costs Not Requiring Indirect.** Describe all costs listed not requiring indirect (e.g., student tuition) and why they are necessary for the project. List each cost as a separate item. For student tuition, indicate the year and the term.
- **Indirect Cost:**

- a. **OSU PIs.** The negotiated indirect cost rate is 26%. Indirect cost is applied to all direct costs.
- b. **Non-OSU PIs.** If the proposer is submitting from an entity other than OSU, use the indirect rate indicated by your institution/organization. This rate is negotiated with the federal government for each institution/organization. Attach the institution's negotiated rate agreement as part of the full proposal submission.

f. Letters of Commitment and Support

- Letters of commitment from each PI and co-PI's authorized representative **(required)**. Please use the letter of commitment template, which is accessible on the [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#) in the templates section.
- 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 within the full proposal as one PDF.

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), if needed:

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 Co-PIs. Although this may be helpful for traditional reviews, it may make anonymity difficult to maintain.

B. Proposal Development Process

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

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.

DRAFT 5/19/2026

Full proposals must be submitted as one single PDF by email to irst-contact@oregonstate.edu by **Monday, August 24, 2026, before 11:59 pm** Pacific Time. The email subject line should be “[PI last name], Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity RFP”. No incomplete or late proposals will be accepted. All provided narrative guidance must be followed.

Full proposals will be rigorously reviewed following the process outlined in Section IV.C of this RFP.

A review panel comprised of an IRST liaison and external reviewers will evaluate the proposals using the review criteria provided below.

The full IRST will consider these evaluations and select a proposal to recommend for funding.

The IRST selects the successful proposer, as per [629-603-0200\(6\)\(d\)](#).

Proposers will be informed of final decisions by approximately late MONTH YEAR. The Institute for Natural Resources 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. Proposal Evaluation Process and Decision Criteria

Proposals that do not follow the guidelines outlined in this RFP will not be evaluated. Each compliant full proposal will be evaluated by a review panel comprised of external peer reviewers and an IRST liaison. The review panel 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 themselves evaluate the proposals and the review panel scores, make a determination, and award the grant. Review panelists’ names will not be directly associated with their 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](#).

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. Proposals 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 field work proposed incorporate QA/QC into its approach (e.g., approach taken to recruit field workers, approach taken to ensure data are collected per stringent standards and to reduce observer error among sites and across time).

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.

V. Award Administration Information

A. Notice of Award

The IRST, via INR, will send a grant award notification email to the PI. After the Lead PI acknowledges receipt of the email and acceptance of the grant award, an official “Notice of Award” will be sent. The Notice will include some or all of the following:

- Period of performance
- Name of the principal investigator
- Dollars committed and/or obligated
- Future year commitments

- 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.

VI. Contact

Questions regarding the application process, funding policy, or research scope should be submitted by email to irst-contact@oregonstate.edu by **Monday, June 22, 2026, 12:00 pm (noon) Pacific Time**. The **email subject line** should be “QUESTIONS: Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity RFP”.

Responses to the questions will be placed on the [IRST Grant Opportunities webpage](#) by **Monday, June 29, 2026**.

Appendix A: AMPC Roads Research Questions Package

Finalized Research Questions

These finalized research questions were approved by the AMPC at the June 24th, 2024 AMPC meeting.

1. Baseline report
 - 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?
2. Trend monitoring
 - a. What are the trends in the status of hydrologic connectivity of roads over 5-year intervals? These trends should be assessed for the same variables in question 1.
3. Determination of rule effectiveness
 - a. Within 25 years, to what extent are road rules associated with hydrologic disconnection effective at achieving biological goals and objectives?

Preliminary Research Questions Package: Contextual Information

The remainder of this document provides contextual information that details the context for the preliminary research questions, as required by rule¹. The following are organized per the elements in this rule.

B.1 The type of research²

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.”*

B.2 The objective of the research³

1. To assess the current (baseline) status and trend of roads that are hydrologically connected to streams, and how those vary with practice, region, landowner type, and other relevant strata.

¹ OAR 629-603-0200 (3)(a)

² OAR 629-603-0200(3)(a)(A)

³ OAR 629-603-0200(3)(a)(C)

2. Determine the effectiveness of road rules associated with hydrologic disconnection at achieving biological goals and objectives.

B.3 A brief description of the context of the research question⁴

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

“4.3.5 Hydrologic Connectivity in Forest Practice Rules (FPR) Revisions and Proposed Inventory Processes

Hydrologic connectivity occurs where road and ditch runoff is delivered to the natural stream channel system. Roads can generate overland flow due to the relatively impermeable surface of the road prism and can also intercept interflow at cutslopes, effectively converting subsurface flows to surface flows. When these surface flows have a continuous flow path between the road prism and a natural stream channel, hydrologic connectivity occurs (Furniss et al., 2000, pp. 5-6). As Furniss et al. describe, “a hydrologically connected road becomes part of the stream network” (pp. 5-6).

Hydrologically connected roads can deliver increased runoff, sediment, and chemicals associated with roads, such as spills or oils generated on the road surface or cutslope. At the watershed scale, connections between roads and streams can also alter the drainage density of the watershed and change runoff frequency and magnitude (See Furniss et al., 2000; Weaver et al., 2015).

The Authors agree that the goal of disconnecting roads and streams is to minimize sediment delivery, hydrologic change, and risk of road pollutants entering waters of the state.”

4.3.10 Development of Monitoring Requirements

The Independent Research Science Team (IRST) created under the PFA shall design and oversee baseline and trend monitoring for hydrologic disconnection. Compliance monitoring will be conducted through the Department’s process.

- 1. Baseline and Trend Monitoring for Hydrologic Disconnection:** *The methodology for the monitoring shall be based off of Dube et al. (2010) and Martin (2009). The purpose of the monitoring for hydrologic disconnection is to establish a baseline and to monitor and report the change in hydrologic connectivity over time as the FRIA is implemented. The*

⁴ OAR 629-603-0200(3)(a)(D)

overarching goal is to ensure that all forest roads and landings shall be hydrologically disconnected to the maximum extent feasible from waters of the state. The Adaptive Management Program Committee shall use the results of the baseline and trend monitoring to develop regional goals consistent with that monitoring. All hydrologic connectivity data should be public and shared as it becomes available to help focus goals, identify accomplishments, and inform statewide learning.”

B.5 Other information the AMPC deems necessary for the IRST’s work⁵

1. It is essential to maintain the role of the regulatory framework (the OFPA) throughout the design and implementation of studies, including the following considerations:
 - a. There are two stratum classifications:
 - A. FPA regions, of which there are two - East and West of the Cascade Mountains.
 - B. Landowner classifications in the FPA (of which there are two, each with a different regulatory framework for roads) – 1) small forestland owners (RCA); 2) large forestland owners (FRIA).

Assessments should differentiate Type F, SSBT, and N streams, but the design need not be stratified by stream type. Additional attributes listed in Dube et al. (2010) should also be considered.

2. The AMPC wants to know how metrics of interest (e.g., sediment delivery from roads) compares with background levels.
3. Ideally, the baseline would be for the effective date for the road rules (Jan. 1, 2024); however, the AMPC recognizes that it will take time to refine and scope the research questions, decide on the research agenda, develop and then award the RFP.
4. Research should include field data.
5. When assessing effectiveness of rules, it would be helpful to understand results both individually and cumulatively.
6. This entire research question package would be very complex, long, and expensive to implement as a single research project. Thus, the AMPC would appreciate the IRST dividing up this research question package into discrete projects and developing scoping proposals (per OAR 629-603-0200(4)) for each one.

⁵ OAR 629-603-0200(3)(a)(E)

Appendix B: Definitions

Hydrologic Disconnection, OAR [629-600-0100 \(71\)](#). “Hydrologic disconnection” means the removal of direct routes of drainage or overland flow of road runoff to waters of the state.

Hydrologic Function, OAR [629-600-0100 \(72\)](#). “Hydrologic function” means soil, stream, wetland and riparian area properties related to the storage, timing, distribution, and circulation of water.

Road. OAR [629-600-0100](#).

(2) “Abandoned roads” are defined as roads that were constructed prior to 1972 and do not meet the criteria of active, inactive, or vacated roads. This does not include skid trails.

(5) “Active roads” are roads currently being used or maintained for the purpose of removing commercial forest products.

(74) “Inactive roads” are roads used for forest management purposes exclusive of removing commercial forest products.

(154) “Vacated roads” are roads that have been made impassable and are no longer to be used for forest management purposes or commercial forest harvesting activities.

Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity. A road segment is considered hydrologically connected where surface runoff from road cuts, ditches, running surfaces, and fills exhibits a continuous surface flow path to a natural stream channel. (This working definition was adopted by the IRST on 6 March 2025.)

Small Forestland, OAR [629-600-0100\(124\)](#). “Small forestland” means forestland that has an owner that owns or holds common ownership interest in less than 5,000 acres of forestland in this state, regulated under section 5(1)(b), chapter 33, Oregon Laws 2022.

Small Forestland Owner, OAR [629-600-0100\(125\)](#). “Small forestland owner” pursuant to section (16), chapter 33, Oregon Laws 2022 and section 2, chapter 34, Oregon Laws 2022, means a landowner who:

(a) Owns or holds in common ownership interest in less than 5,000 acres of forestland in this state;

DRAFT 5/19/2026

(b) Has harvested no more than an average yearly volume of two million board feet of merchantable forest products from the landowner's forestlands in this state, when averaged over the three years prior to:

(A) The date the department receives a harvest notification from the landowner; or

(B) If applying for a Small Forestland Investment in Stream Habitat Program grant, the date the landowner submits a grant application; and

(c) Affirms that they do not expect to exceed an average yearly volume of two million board feet of merchantable forest products to be harvested from the landowner's forestlands in this state for 10 years after the department receives the harvest notification or grant application; or

(d) Emergency exception: Any landowner who exceeds the two million board feet average harvest threshold from their land in the three years prior to submitting a harvest notification or grant application to the department, or who expects to exceed the threshold during any of the following 10 years, shall still be deemed a "small forestland owner" if the landowner establishes to the department's reasonable satisfaction that the harvest limits were, or will be, exceeded to raise funds to pay estate taxes or for a compelling and unexpected obligation, such as for a court-ordered judgment or for extraordinary medical expenses.

Western and Eastern Oregon (OAR [629-635-0220](#)). For the purposes of assigning protection measures to waters of the state, the State Forester has defined two geographic regions west and east of the Cascade Crest in Oregon, depicted as Western Oregon and Eastern Oregon, respectively. The boundaries and names of the geographic regions are displayed in Figure 1. Geographic regions are not "forest regions" established pursuant to ORS 527.640.

Figure 1: Western Oregon and Eastern Oregon Geographic Regions

