Science Evaluation

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Pensacola Bay Watershed Restoration

LOCATION

Pensacola Bay Watershed Restoration

SPONSOR(S)

State of Florida

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

Planning, Technical Assistance, Implementation

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

1/23/2015

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

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

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

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

Comments

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

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

Comments

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

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

To the extent possible, risk was addressed. There was not a risk assessment addressing obsoleteness directly, however.

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:

There is certainly more science that is applicable to this proposal from other areas in the Gulf region or elsewhere, but the authors have used the most locally relevant published science.

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)?

As a collection of related, but independent, set of five projects all intended to improve the environmental conditions of Pensacola Bay, the proposed science is sound and justified. There was not, however, any note assessment of alternative methods, or explanation of specifically why the set of methods were chosen.

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

Ecosystem restoration; yes. Estuarine restoration; yes. Specific to the GOM; no.

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)

To the degree that it can be assessed and addressed; yes. The risks are many and varied (e.g., severe weather to no demand for reused water), but at least the proposal identifies what they are.

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

Not to any significant degree.

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

Yes. Well written and identified on page 7 and "other page" 1.

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

Yes, "other page" 1.

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

Yes, for each of the five sub projects. The proposed quantitative measure is stated, but statistical treatments of the measures is not.

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)

Yes. A detailed "Monitoring and adaptive management" was provided for each sub project.

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

Yes. To my knowledge they used the available relevant information for the proposed project area.

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)

Minimally. This could have been stronger

Please summarize any additional information needed below:

Well written proposal on a field area that does not get a lot of attention among more iconic or famous embayments. The Pensacola Bay has incurred significant environmental degradation, and this proposal seeks to improve those conditions.