

This document compiles all the input from AMPC members to address the questions posed by the IRST on their eastern Oregon steep slopes scoping proposal. Responses are listed in alphabetical order.

Seth Barnes:

1. Was the format of the scoping proposal reader friendly? If not, how could we make it more useful and easier to follow? ***Just my preference, but I like the Executive Summaries to be right up front, not have to wade through the Tables and Figures explanation or the list of abbreviations to get there. I would have rather had the ES right up front.***
2. Was the level of detail for this scoping proposal about right, too little, or too much in the:
 - a. Executive summary? ***This was well done. I thought it was super helpful, and well written.***
 - b. Introduction? ***Fine***
 - c. Methods? ***It's important to be transparent, but it gets tedious to read.***
 - d. Findings? ***It's important, but also tedious to read. Use figures and tables whenever possible- I appreciated the ones you used.***
 - e. Options? ***Appropriate***

If not, what changes in detail and/or use of technical language could improve overall understanding and utility of future scoping proposals?

3. How did the figures and tables add to or detract from understanding and presenting the document content, and would you welcome this approach, or a different approach, to displaying/conveying information in future documents?

I thought the tables and figures were very helpful. I would recommend using tables and figures to illustrate issues whenever possible.

4. How would the AMPC characterize the overall length of the document (e.g., appropriate for the task, too brief, too lengthy)? If the response is anything but "appropriate for the task," please provide guidance about specific changes you would like to see or criteria you would like the INR/IRST to use to assess appropriate length of future documents.

I appreciate brevity, and getting to the point, with additional detail in appendices. Therefore, I really appreciate the ES up front, especially the table laying out the options with potential timing and cost ranges and brief descriptions of each. I think there are portions of this proposal that get a bit too verbose, and could be skimmed down.

5. Given the task of producing the scoping proposal and what was discovered during the initial scoping review, what could the IRST have added to the document to better meet the AMPC's need to make decisions about if and/or how to move forward with an RFP? ***Not sure, this seems like an appropriate amount and type of data for us to move forward with.***

6. The IRST presented four options in the scoping proposal as a menu of opportunity for the AMPC to consider. Was this number of options about right, too few, too many for AMPC when considering next steps? ***Seemed about right to me for this particular question. I could see this being different for other questions.***

David Bugni:

1. Was the format of the scoping proposal reader friendly? If not, how could we make it more useful and easier to follow? **Yes.**
2. Was the level of detail for this scoping proposal about right, too little, or too much in the: **All were fine.**
 - a. Executive summary?
 - b. Introduction?
 - c. Methods?
 - d. Findings?
 - e. Options?

If not, what changes in detail and/or use of technical language could improve overall understanding and utility of future scoping proposals?

3. How did the figures and tables add to or detract from understanding and presenting the document content, and would you welcome this approach, or a different approach, to displaying/conveying information in future documents?
Figures and tables are generally helpful. In this case that is true as well.
4. How would the AMPC characterize the overall length of the document (e.g., appropriate for the task, too brief, too lengthy)? If the response is anything but "appropriate for the task," please provide guidance about specific changes you would like to see or criteria you would like the INR/IRST to use to assess appropriate length of future documents. **Length was fine. It was organized in a manner that allowed for a fairly quick read.**
5. Given the task of producing the scoping proposal and what was discovered during the initial scoping review, what could the IRST have added to the document to better meet the AMPC's need to make decisions about if and/or how to move forward with an RFP? **Nothing -the executive summary was good and to the point. Table ES-1 was particularly helpful and when options are presented that is a good example to follow.**

Stacey Detwiler:

1. Was the format of the scoping proposal reader friendly? If not, how could we make it more useful and easier to follow?
 - Important distinction that the IRST is not actually tasked with doing the research to answer the research question, but instead is providing the scientific expertise to develop an

effective proposal that can be presented to AMPC, BOF, and ultimately put out in an RFP for the actual research to occur. I think that gets a little lost in this document.

- The direction for IRST is to conduct a literature review “that specifies the need or the type of monitoring, research, commissioned studies, or other means of scientific inquiry necessary to answer the finalized research question...” (see below, OAR 629-603-0200).

OAR 629-603-0200(4)(c):

The IRST shall develop, or direct through a third party the development of, a research proposal for each finalized research question. Each research proposal shall include:
(A) A literature review that specifies the need for or the type of monitoring, research, commissioned studies, or other means of scientific inquiry necessary to answer the finalized research question described in subsection (4)(b) of this rule;
(B) A preliminary estimate of the budget for each year of the research, and a timeline to complete the research project with specific deliverables; and,
(C) A preliminary description of research project requirements, scope of work including an estimate of the timeline and key milestones, and an estimate of the degree to which knowledge may be improved if the research proposal is implemented.

- Suggest mirroring the sections in the document in the same format as your questions below (Introduction, Methodology, Findings, Recommendations and Considerations).
2. Was the level of detail for this scoping proposal about right, too little, or too much in the:
- a. Executive summary?
 - Use of passive voice is confusing: “Based on the results of this scoping review, four options are presented...” (p, 7). Could more clearly state, “The IRST therefore presents four options...”
 - Table ES-1 is useful to quickly summarize the options, costs, and considerations. This format will be useful for both AMPC and with BOF. It would be helpful to describe the review process in more detail. For example, the “rapid systematic map” would rely on only one or two reviewers, but no detail is provided regarding the implied more comprehensive review above under the “full systematic map.” Suggest adding a column specific to level and rigor of independent peer review.
 - b. Introduction?
 - Section 1.1: Include the introductory information about the IRST and AMPC in an appendix.
 - 1.3 Types of Literature Reviews seems similarly unnecessary here, or best in an appendix. Is IRST saying that they considered all of these methods and then narrowed it down to the four presented in Table ES-1? It reads more like a primer on literature reviews (or more accurately, on searches). It would be clearer to say – We did a scoping review, which means _____. This was chosen because _____. Additional options considered include _____. We recommend _____ because _____. Or perhaps this could just be another table that compares the different types of searches.
 - c. Methods?

- Is this referring to “2. Scoping Literature Review” (starting p. 13)? Could be clearer to re-name this section as “Methodology” or similar.

d. Findings?

- Seems a little risky to describe these papers so briefly, since as the document states, this isn’t a full comprehensive review and so there may be bias in those summaries (e.g., p. 20; p. 22 “Content Insights”). This is where the document most conflates the purpose. The IRST at this stage are not themselves doing a literature review of the topic, but doing a literature review of possible methods and providing recommendations for HOW one would study the topic. Providing any summary of papers here without appropriate review (according to the recommended methodology) is problematic.
- However, the studies that describe potential methodologies to provide insight to time and cost are useful – Barrett and Reilly 2017; Herrera Environmental Consultants Inc. 2004 - (see p. 22).
- The findings for this document should really be what is covered in “3. Scoping Proposals” where the document clearly describes four options for review (p. 24).

e. Options?

- Provide a table to summarize the options
- Include a discussion of scientific rigor, potential for bias, level of independent review (etc.).
- Describe how well a particular method would meet the standards of peer review (or not) – what criticisms could a descriptive review face vs. a rapid systematic mapping review?
- What papers reviewed used these different methodologies? What are some examples of these approaches that AMPC or BOF could review to understand the approach? Has CMER or a comparable group done research following a particular methodology on this topic?

3. If not, what changes in detail and/or use of technical language could improve overall understanding and utility of future scoping proposals?

Too much detail and not aligned with intent as described in OARs for IRST.

4. How did the figures and tables add to or detract from understanding and presenting the document content, and would you welcome this approach, or a different approach, to displaying/conveying information in future documents?

Tables helpful, some figures interesting but not necessary.

5. How would the AMPC characterize the overall length of the document (e.g., appropriate for the task, too brief, too lengthy)? If the response is anything but "appropriate for the task," please provide guidance about specific changes you would like to see or criteria you would like the INR/IRST to use to assess appropriate length of future documents.

Too long – see above comments for specifics.

6. Given the task of producing the scoping proposal and what was discovered during the initial scoping review, what could the IRST have added to the document to better meet the AMPC's need to make decisions about if and/or how to move forward with an RFP?

More focus on comparison of the methodologies and why the four options were selected. Not productive or aligned with rules to attempt a scoping of the actual topic or summarizing papers (could be biased, incomplete, etc.).

7. The IRST presented four options in the scoping proposal as a menu of opportunity for the AMPC to consider. Was this number of options about right, too few, too many for AMPC when considering next steps?

Appropriate, but this seems to be a case-by-case assessment. It would be most helpful to provide an overview of relevant methods / options, and then recommendations that are described.

Julie Firman:

1. Was the format of the scoping proposal reader friendly? If not, how could we make it more useful and easier to follow? Yes
2. Was the level of detail for this scoping proposal about right, too little, or too much in the: I felt that the level of detail was appropriate overall.
 - a. Executive summary? Y
 - b. Introduction? Y
 - c. Methods? Y
 - d. Findings? Y
 - e. Options? Y

If not, what changes in detail and/or use of technical language could improve overall understanding and utility of future scoping proposals?

3. How did the figures and tables add to or detract from understanding and presenting the document content, and would you welcome this approach, or a different approach, to displaying/conveying information in future documents? I didn't rely on the figures much as they weren't necessary for me to understand the material in this case, but I found the tables to be very helpful.
4. How would the AMPC characterize the overall length of the document (e.g., appropriate for the task, too brief, too lengthy)? If the response is anything but "appropriate for the task," please provide guidance about specific changes you would like to see or criteria you would like the INR/IRST to use to assess appropriate length of future documents.

Appropriate for the task.

5. Given the task of producing the scoping proposal and what was discovered during the initial scoping review, what could the IRST have added to the document to better meet the AMPC's need to make decisions about if and/or how to move forward with an RFP? I have no suggestions for further things to add. I felt that this was a very professional, comprehensive, and accessible document. Thanks for your efforts to help us achieve this goal.

6. The IRST presented four options in the scoping proposal as a menu of opportunity for the AMPC to consider. Was this number of options about right, too few, too many for AMPC when considering next steps?

Wendy Gerlach:

Questions

1. Was the format of the scoping proposal reader friendly? If not, how could we make it more useful and easier to follow?
2. Was the level of detail for this scoping proposal about right, too little, or too much in the:
 - a. Executive summary?
 - b. Introduction?
 - c. Methods?
 - d. Findings?
 - e. Options?

If not, what changes in detail and/or use of technical language could improve overall understanding and utility of future scoping proposals?

3. How did the figures and tables add to or detract from understanding and presenting the document content, and would you welcome this approach, or a different approach, to displaying/conveying information in future documents?
4. How would the AMPC characterize the overall length of the document (e.g., appropriate for the task, too brief, too lengthy)? If the response is anything but "appropriate for the task," please provide guidance about specific changes you would like to see or criteria you would like the INR/IRST to use to assess appropriate length of future documents.
5. Given the task of producing the scoping proposal and what was discovered during the initial scoping review, what could the IRST have added to the document to better meet the AMPC's need to make decisions about if and/or how to move forward with an RFP?

The IRST presented four options in the scoping proposal as a menu of opportunity for the AMPC to consider. Was this number of options about right, too few, too many for AMPC when considering next steps?

Josh Seeds:

1. Format was great, easy to follow.

Commented [WG1]: The report is excellent. I found the format, level of detail, and technical/vernacular language mix all just right. Similarly, I found the figures and tables useful, and the length appropriate. I found the number of options presented, and the detail on them, good. I would have liked to see a recommendation from the IRST about which option to choose, including consideration of cost effectiveness in obtaining substantive information on the overarching goal.

Commented [WG2]: The inserts (such as Timeline, Key Milestones) were a bit blurry and didn't improve upon zooming in.

Commented [WG3]: On p. 13 of the document it's stated that "This scoping review does not directly address the broad, overarching question in Section 1.2." I would have liked that question to have been directly addressed.

Commented [WG4]: I would have appreciated clearer comparison of the components of (i) report on literature that exists and (ii) substantive content from the literature review. For instance, under "rapid systematic mapping" it says "this option could begin to describe the differences in the mass wasting processes Eastside vs. Westside, and what is known about related species habitat vulnerability on the Eastside." If there were a comparable sentence under "Rapid systematic map" it would be easier to compare.

Commented [WG5]: At certain points it's suggested that the research will be directed at determining differences between East and West. While that may be part of the research (in looking at literature from the west and determining its relevance), that is not the research goal in itself. The language of the scoping report could be clearer in its adherence to the overarching question and sub-focuses.

2. Level of detail was good. Allows for informed decision making by AMPC.
3. The tables and figures were very helpful for illustrating the options and the differences between them. The document summaries were also helpful.
4. The document length was appropriate for the task.
5. Can't think of anything.
6. About right on the number of options, given the task. Fewer options might be appropriate for some tasks, more options for others.

Will Tucker:

1. Was the format of the scoping proposal reader friendly? If not, how could we make it more useful and easier to follow? *I thought the depth and layout was great.*
2. Was the level of detail for this scoping proposal about right, too little, or too much in the:
 - a. Executive summary? *I would have appreciated a recommendation, our some guidance.*
 - a. Introduction? *Great*
 - b. Methods? *Great and the layout of what they reviewed was supportive.*
 - c. Findings?
 - d. Options? *Robust description will help us decide path.*

If not, what changes in detail and/or use of technical language could improve overall understanding and utility of future scoping proposals?

3. How did the figures and tables add to or detract from understanding and presenting the document content, and would you welcome this approach, or a different approach, to displaying/conveying information in future documents? *Helped*
4. How would the AMPC characterize the overall length of the document (e.g., appropriate for the task, too brief, too lengthy)? If the response is anything but "appropriate for the task," please provide guidance about specific changes you would like to see or criteria you would like the INR/IRST to use to assess appropriate length of future documents. *I think the report was robust and appropriate.*
5. Given the task of producing the scoping proposal and what was discovered during the initial scoping review, what could the IRST have added to the document to better meet the AMPC's need to make decisions about if and/or how to move forward with an RFP?
6. The IRST presented four options in the scoping proposal as a menu of opportunity for the AMPC to consider. Was this number of options about right, too few, too many for AMPC when considering next steps? *About right*