SCIENCE EVALUATION

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Gulf of Mexico Alliance (GOMA) Gulf-wide Restoration and Support

LOCATION

Gulf-wide

SPONSOR(S)

State of Alabama

TYPE OF FUNDING REQUESTED (Planning, Technical Assistance, Implementation)

Planning, Technical Assistance and Implementation

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

Jan. 10, 2015

Best Available Science:

These 6 factors/elements help frame the reviewers answers to A, B and C found in next section:

1. Have the proposal objectives, including methods used, been justified using peer reviewed and/or publicly available information?

(●) YES ( ) NO ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Justified by way of currently being done and desire to broaden scope, along with implementing peer-reviewed projects

2. If information supporting the proposal does not directly pertain to the Gulf Coast region, are applicant's methods reasonably supported and adaptable to that geographic area?

(●) YES ( ) NO ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Pertains to entire five state Gulf region

3. Are the literature sources used to support the proposal accurately and completely cited?

(●) YES ( ) NO ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Includes the most pertainent literature, much more could be included but space limited on this proposal document

4. Are the literature sources represented in a fair and unbiased manner?

(●) YES ( ) NO ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Cited without subjective analysis

5. Does the proposal evaluate uncertainties and risks in the scientific basis for the proposal, including any identified by the public and Council members?

(●) YES ( ) NO ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

This proposal is for scientific evaluation and therefore subject to all risks and uncertainities of any inquiry when objectives are not predetermined; also includes implementation of successfully implemented projects in locations where desired benefits can be expected

6. Does the proposal evaluate uncertainties and risks in achieving its objectives over time? (e.g., is there an uncertainty or risk that in 5-10 years the project/program will be obsolete or not function as planned given projections of sea level rise?)

(●) YES ( ) NO ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

All risks and uncertainities continue over time and do not change as studies continue; projects being proposed have gone through extensive peer-review where implemented in the past

Based on the answers to the previous 6 questions, and giving deference to the sponsor to provide within reason the use of best available science the following three questions can be answered:

A. Has the applicant made a reasonable determination that the proposal is based on science that uses peer-reviewed and publicly available data?

(●) YES ( ) NO ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Information Needed:

B. Has the applicant made a reasonable determination that the proposal is based on science that maximizes the quality, objectivity, and integrity of information (including, as applicable, statistical information)?

(●) YES ( ) NO ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Information Needed:

C. Has the applicant made a reasonable determination that the proposal is based on science that clearly documents and communicates risks and uncertainties in the scientific basis for such projects?

(●) YES ( ) NO ( ) NEED MORE INFORMATION

Information Needed:

Science Context Evaluation

A. Have other methods been discussed and reasons provided to why the method is being selected (e.g., scientifically sound; cost-effectiveness)?

Many methods proposed fit the various areas where they would be implemented and monitoring will be done in appropriate format. Primary goal is sharing information and providing guidance.

B. Has your agency/vendor/project manager conducted a project/program like the one proposed?

I have done similar studies on some some of the proposed project types prior to my retirement also using multi-agency/academic peer-review.

C. Is there a risk mitigation plan in place for project objectives? (captures risk measures as defined under best available science by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

Follow peer-reviewed protocol by incorporating projects from all five state along with fedral and state agencies and their regulations for risk, etc.

D. Does the project/program consider consequences with implementation? (captures risk measures as defined under best available science by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

Consequences examined and cumulative effects considered.

E. Does the project/program have clearly defined goals?

Goals are clear

F. Does the project/program have clearly defined objectives?

Objectives are clear

G. Does the project/program have measures of success? (captures statistical information requirement as defined by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

Monitoring provides necessary guidance so planned results are met

H. Is a monitoring program in place to determine project goals, success and help adaptive management (if applicable)? (captures statistical information requirement as defined by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

Monitoring is included

I. Does the project/program consider recent and/or relevant information? (captures statistical information requirement as defined by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

Follows current efforts being done in all states doing similar work

J. Has the project/program evaluated past successes and failures of similar efforts? (captures the communication of risks and uncertainties in the scientific basis for such projects as defined by the Comprehensive Plan and Act)

Follows existing protocol

Please summarize any additional information needed below: