

Survey: Initial AMPC preferences for research agenda

To help inform the discussion for the June 2nd AMPC meeting regarding the development of a research agenda, the AMPC Co-chairs worked with Terry to develop the following short survey.

Instructions:

1. Please review the Executive Summaries for the following two IRST scoping proposals:
 - a. Eastern Oregon steep slopes literature review; and,
 - b. Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity.
2. Please review this document, fill out the questions, and ***send a completed copy back to Terry by noon on May 28th, 2025.***

***NOTE:** AMPC has also engaged in research question development for amphibians and effectiveness monitoring. Neither is included in this survey because we do not expect to have scoping proposals for either topic by June 2nd.*

Background Information

Available Funding FY 25 – FY 27

The state's budget for FY25-FY27 is not yet final, and likely will not be final by the June 2nd meeting. However, we can provide a range of funding for consideration to inform the research agenda conversation (Note: the AMPC will have those funding numbers before the July 7th meeting at which you will decide the research agenda). It is likely that available funding will range from the following two scenarios:

1. No new funding, which means about \$1.5 million from the current biennium for research.
2. Full funding, which means about \$4.5 million for research.



Direction in the OR Forest Practices Rules

Appendix 1. Rule on the research agenda

OAR 629-603-0200 Adaptive Management Program Process Steps

(5) Step 3: The AMPC shall develop a research agenda.

- (a) The AMPC shall develop a multi-year research agenda that includes:
 - (A) Prioritized research projects;

- (B) Key milestones for each research project;
 - (C) A timeline for progress on research projects; and,
 - (D) A comprehensive IRST budget, including annual budget for each year of each project.
- (b) In prioritizing the research projects, the AMPC shall consider:
- (A) Biennial appropriations from the legislature;
 - (B) Priorities outlined in OAR 629-603-0100(8);
 - (C) Research proposals received from the IRST per subsection (4)(e) of this rule;
 - (D) Board direction;
 - (E) Requirements for continuity of research projects under agreement or out for RFP review; and,
 - (F) Other information as appropriate.

Survey Questions

1. **Eastern Oregon Steep Slopes:** Please rank the following four options in order of priority (1 = high priority, 4 = low priority) for the Eastern Oregon Steep Slopes options provided by IRST in the scoping proposal.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 4 = low)
Full systematic map	
Rapid systematic map	
Descriptive review	
No further searching or review	

2. **Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity:** Please rank the following four options in order of priority (1 = high priority, 2 = low priority) for the Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity options provided by IRST in the scoping proposal.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 2 = low)
Survey 1. Hydrologic Connectivity Only	
Survey 2. Hydrologic Connectivity + Sediment modeling	

Note that the Pre-survey options are not included in this table since they are potential additions to Survey options 1 & 2 and not stand-alone options. We will gain further clarity on the Pre-survey options when we converse with the IRST co-chairs on June 2nd.

3. **Estimated Total Cost:** Please add the total for your highest priority option for Eastern Oregon Steep Slopes and your highest priority option for the Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity and include that total below.

EXAMPLE:

<i>E. OR Steep Slopes Choice 1 = Descriptive Review</i>	<i>(\$15,000 - \$30,000)</i>
<i>Roads Choice 1 = Hydrologic Connectivity Only</i>	<i>(\$1,100,000 – 4,400,000)</i>
<i>Estimated total =</i>	<i>\$1,115,000 – 4,430,000</i>

Your Totals:

E. OR Steep Slopes choice 1 =

Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity choice 1 =

Total =