

Survey: Initial AMPC preferences for adding Amphibians questions 1 & 2 to research agenda

To help inform the discussion for the September 3rd AMPC meeting regarding modifying the research agenda, the AMPC Co-chairs worked with Terry to develop the following short survey. The purpose of this survey is to guide the discussion at the September 3rd meeting. The ODF staff and co-chairs will use the results to inform facilitation of the meeting. We realize that many are still forming thoughts, please do your best to write down your early impressions/ thoughts.

Instructions:

1. Please review the [IRST scoping proposal for Amphibian questions 1 & 2](#):
 2. Please review this document, fill out the questions, and **send a completed copy back to Terry by noon on August 31st, 2026.**
-

Seth Barnes response:

Survey Questions

1. **Amphibians question 1:** Please numerically rank the following five options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question 1. #1 represents your first choice and #5 represents your last choice.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 5 = low)
1. No action	5
2. Targeted Geographic Range & Distribution Refinement	2
3. Among Watershed Habitat Associations	1
4. Within Watershed Habitat Associations - stream network	3
5. Population Diversity — Genetics & Demography	4

On a scale of 1-10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

5

2. **Amphibians question 2:** Please numerically rank the following two options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question #2.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 2 = low)
1. Broad-Scale Torrent Salamander Monitoring Network	1
2. Intensive Torrent Salamander Monitoring + Demography	2

On a scale of 1 to 10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

5

- Is there information missing that would help you to make this decision? Please add any additional comments or questions here. This will help ODF staff, and potentially IRST co-chairs, prepare for the September 3rd meeting.

- Estimated Total Cost:** Please add the total for your highest priority options for Amphibians questions 1 & 2 below.

EXAMPLE:

Amphibians question 1, Option 3 = \$0.7-1.7 million

Amphibians question 2, Option 1 = \$2.3-7.4 million

Estimated total = \$3 – 9.1 million

Your Totals:

Amphibians question 1 = \$700K—\$1.7M

Amphibians question 2 = \$2.3M—7.4M

Total = \$3M—\$9.1M

Table Ex-1, p. 3 from Scoping Proposal

David Bugni response:

Survey Questions

- Amphibians question 1:** Please numerically rank the following five options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question 1. #1 represents your first choice and #5 represents your last choice.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 5 = low)
1. No action	4
2. Targeted Geographic Range & Distribution Refinement	2
3. Among Watershed Habitat Associations	1
4. Within Watershed Habitat Associations - stream network	3
5. Population Diversity — Genetics & Demography	5

On a scale of 1-10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

- Amphibians question 2:** Please numerically rank the following two options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question #2.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 2 = low)
1. Broad-Scale Torrent Salamander Monitoring Network	1

2. Intensive Torrent Salamander Monitoring + Demography	2
---	---

On a scale of 1 to 10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

3. Is there information missing that would help you to make this decision? Please add any additional comments or questions here. This will help ODF staff, and potentially IRST co-chairs, prepare for the September 3rd meeting. *It appears to me, from reading the descriptions of the options, that some are not at the same level as others. For example, Q105 appears to be a recommendation to be implemented alongside Q103 or O4. This is why I selected Options 1, 2, 3, and 4 over Option 5. Similar for the Question 2 options. Therefore, it would seem best to combine Q103 with Q105 and Q201 with Q202, but these combinations do not seem financially realistic.*

4. **Estimated Total Cost:** Please add the total for your highest priority options for Amphibians questions 1 & 2 below.

EXAMPLE:

Amphibians question 1, Option 3 = \$0.7-1.7 million

Amphibians question 2, Option 1 = \$2.3-7.4 million

Estimated total = \$3 – 9.1 million

Your Totals:

Amphibians question 1, Option 3 = \$0.7-1.7 million

Amphibians question 2, Option 1 = \$2.3-7.4 million

Estimated Total = \$3 – 9.1 million

Table Ex-1, p. 3 from Scoping Proposal

Stacey Detwiler response:

Survey Questions

1. **Amphibians question 1:** Please numerically rank the following five options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question 1. #1 represents your first choice and #5 represents your last choice.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 5 = low)
1. No action	5
2. Targeted Geographic Range & Distribution Refinement	3

3. Among Watershed Habitat Associations	1
4. Within Watershed Habitat Associations - stream network	2
5. Population Diversity — Genetics & Demography	4

On a scale of 1-10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

Based on initial review and without further conversation to date, I would give my certainty on these rankings around 4. Much of this is impacted by available funding and timing, and it also doesn't easily convey the options to combine multiple approaches.

2. **Amphibians question 2:** Please numerically rank the following two options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question #2.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 2 = low)
1. Broad-Scale Torrent Salamander Monitoring Network	1
2. Intensive Torrent Salamander Monitoring + Demography	2

On a scale of 1 to 10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

Based on initial review and without further conversation to date, I would give my certainty on these rankings around 5.

3. Is there information missing that would help you to make this decision? Please add any additional comments or questions here. This will help ODF staff, and potentially IRST co-chairs, prepare for the September 3rd meeting.

4. **Estimated Total Cost:** Please add the total for your highest priority options for Amphibians questions 1 & 2 below.

EXAMPLE:

Amphibians question 1, Option 3 = \$0.7-1.7 million

Amphibians question 2, Option 1 = \$2.3-7.4 million

Estimated total = \$3 – 9.1 million

Your Totals:

Amphibians question 1 = \$700k to \$1.7M

Amphibians question 2 = \$2.25M - \$7.4M

Total = \$2.95M - \$9.1M

Table Ex-1, p. 3 from Scoping Proposal

Wendy Gerlach response:

Survey Questions

1. **Amphibians question 1:** Please numerically rank the following five options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question 1. #1 represents your first choice and #5 represents your last choice.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 5 = low)
1. No action	5
2. Targeted Geographic Range & Distribution Refinement	4
3. Among Watershed Habitat Associations	2
4. Within Watershed Habitat Associations - stream network	1
5. Population Diversity — Genetics & Demography	3

On a scale of 1-10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

7

2. **Amphibians question 2:** Please numerically rank the following two options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question #2.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 2 = low)
1. Broad-Scale Torrent Salamander Monitoring Network	2
2. Intensive Torrent Salamander Monitoring + Demography	1

On a scale of 1 to 10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

3. Is there information missing that would help you to make this decision? Please add any additional comments or questions here. This will help ODF staff, and potentially IRST co-chairs, prepare for the September 3rd meeting.

4. **Estimated Total Cost:** Please add the total for your highest priority options for Amphibians questions 1 & 2 below.

EXAMPLE:

Amphibians question 1, Option 3 = \$0.7-1.7 million

Amphibians question 2, Option 1 = \$2.3-7.4 million

Estimated total = \$3 – 9.1 million

Your Totals:

Amphibians question 1 OPTION 4= \$375--\$500K ann.; \$1.1 million-2.5 million

Amphibians question 2 OPTION 1= \$450-700K ann.; \$2.3 million –7.4 million

Total = \$3.4 million to \$9.9 million

Haley Ohms response:**Survey Questions**

1. **Amphibians question 1:** Please numerically rank the following five options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question 1. #1 represents your first choice and #5 represents your last choice.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 5 = low)
1. No action	5
2. Targeted Geographic Range & Distribution Refinement	4
3. Among Watershed Habitat Associations	3
4. Within Watershed Habitat Associations - stream network	2
5. Population Diversity — Genetics & Demography	1

On a scale of 1-10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

I'm a 5 on the above ranking, please see my response to question 3.

2. **Amphibians question 2:** Please numerically rank the following two options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question #2.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 2 = low)
1. Broad-Scale Torrent Salamander Monitoring Network	1
2. Intensive Torrent Salamander Monitoring + Demography	2

On a scale of 1 to 10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

I'm a 5 on the above ranking, please see my response to question 3.

3. Is there information missing that would help you to make this decision? Please add any additional comments or questions here. This will help ODF staff, and potentially IRST co-chairs, prepare for the September 3rd meeting.

I feel strongly that our research investments should help answer the fundamental management question we were tasked with addressing: Are the current rules sufficient to support amphibian population persistence? Some of the topics above could potentially be adapted to address rule effectiveness, but as currently described, I don't

see a direct connection between the proposed studies and that question. For that reason, I do not support funding any of the studies as currently described.

To help think through this, I reached out to a USGS colleague who studies amphibians and their habitat use. She provided a literature review and summary of her thoughts, which I found very informative. Her assessment was that even though there are some knowledge gaps, there was enough information about the ecology of the focal amphibians to formulate and research the effectiveness of the harvest rules.

Given our mandate, I think we should prioritize research that tests management- and rule-relevant hypotheses and helps us evaluate whether the current protections are achieving their intended outcomes, rather than investing in broad basic research that does not have a clear connection to rule effectiveness.

4. **Estimated Total Cost:** Please add the total for your highest priority options for Amphibians questions 1 & 2 below.

EXAMPLE:

Amphibians question 1, Option 3 = \$0.7-1.7 million

Amphibians question 2, Option 1 = \$2.3-7.4 million

Estimated total = \$3 – 9.1 million

Your Totals:

Amphibians question 1 =

Amphibians question 2 =

Total =

Table Ex-1, p. 3 from Scoping Proposal

Josh Seeds response:

Survey Questions

1. **Amphibians question 1:** Please numerically rank the following five options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question 1. #1 represents your first choice and #5 represents your last choice.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 5 = low)
1. No action	3
2. Targeted Geographic Range & Distribution Refinement	5

3. Among Watershed Habitat Associations	2
4. Within Watershed Habitat Associations - stream network	1
5. Population Diversity — Genetics & Demography	2 (as an add-on only); 4

On a scale of 1-10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

9

2. **Amphibians question 2:** Please numerically rank the following two options in order of preference to best address Amphibians research question #2.

Option	Ranking (1 = high, 2 = low)
1. Broad-Scale Torrent Salamander Monitoring Network	1
2. Intensive Torrent Salamander Monitoring + Demography	2

On a scale of 1 to 10, how solid are you on your ranking above? (1 is least solid, 10 is most solid)

6

3. Is there information missing that would help you to make this decision? Please add any additional comments or questions here. This will help ODF staff, and potentially IRST co-chairs, prepare for the September 3rd meeting.

4. **Estimated Total Cost:** Please add the total for your highest priority options for Amphibians questions 1 & 2 below.

EXAMPLE:

Amphibians question 1, Option 3 = \$0.7-1.7 million

Amphibians question 2, Option 1 = \$2.3-7.4 million

Estimated total = \$3 – 9.1 million

Your Totals:

Amphibians question 1 = \$1.1-2.5 million

Amphibians question 2 = \$2.225-7.075 million

Total = \$3.325-9.575 million

Table Ex-1. Summary of research options addressing AMPC Questions 1 and 2, including timeframe, general cost estimates, and knowledge contributions.

Option	Timeframe	Cost	Knowledge Contribution
Option 1	None	\$0	No Action: Maintains current understanding from existing data; does not generate new information on watershed-scale distribution, habitat associations, population diversity, or population trends.
Q1- Option 2	1-2 years	\$130k–\$400k (\$130k–\$200k/year)	Targeted Range & Distribution Refinement: Limited new presence/absence records to refine range boundaries and reduce distributional uncertainty. Provides foundation for designing future field studies.
Q1 Option 3	2-3 years	\$700k–\$1.7m (\$350k–\$575k/year)	Watershed-Scale Habitat Associations -- Broad Sampling: Systematic, range-wide characterization of watershed-scale species presence/absence data and landscape- and watershed-scale habitat associations. Does not support reach-scale inference; apparent absences species carry uncertainty.
Q1 Option 4	3-5 years	\$1.1m–\$2.5m (\$375k–\$500k/year)	Reach-Scale Habitat Associations -- Intensive Sampling: Accommodates detection-corrected occupancy methods for species presence/absence at the stream-reach scale within a smaller number of watersheds, supporting more reliable habitat association inference at reach-scales within sampled watersheds. Most informative alongside Q1-3.
Q1 Option 5	3-5+ years	\$625k–\$1.7m (\$200k–\$275k/year)	Population Diversity — Genetic and Demographic Approaches: Population connectivity, genetic structure, and demographic rates. Most valuable as an add-on to Q1-3 or Q1-4. Each approach provides only a partial view independently.
Q2 Option 1	5-10 years	\$2.3m–\$7.4m (\$450k–\$700k/year)	Broad-Scale Torrent Salamander Monitoring Network: Detection-corrected occupancy trends for Columbia and southern torrent salamanders across a broad geographic extent on FPA lands. Trend detection is the primary objective. Does not explain demographic mechanisms driving observed trends.
Q2 Option 2	7-10+ years	\$3.4m–\$7.1m (\$475k–\$700k/year)	Intensive Torrent Salamander Monitoring Network with Demographic Components: Detection-corrected occupancy trends for Columbia and southern torrent salamanders within intensively monitored watersheds on FPA lands; abundance estimation, demographic data collection, and habitat characterization are optional enhancements; most informative when implemented alongside Q2, Option 1.

Background Information

Available Funding

2023-25 Funding carried forward:

\$3M to IRST housed at INR

New funding in 2025-27 biennium:

\$3.1M* for next round of research projects, BUT \$0.5M removed (June 2026 EBoard request), which leaves \$2.6M*

2027-29 funding:

Unknown

Total funding available for AMP: \$3M + \$2.6M* + ?? (2027-29) = \$5.6M* + ??

**Note: Governor's July 2025 signing letter is still in effect.*

Board-approved research agenda (Sept. 2025)

Project	Budget for 2025-2027 biennium	Total budget^
Road-Stream Hydrologic Connectivity	\$2.7 M**	\$5.4 M
Eastern Oregon Steep Slopes	\$80,000	\$80,000
Amphibians/other	TBD	TBD
TOTAL		\$5.48 M

^Not to exceed

**Note: Roads spending likely less than \$1.5M during this biennium.

Direction in the OR Forest Practices Rules

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.
-

