Science Evaluation

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Alabama Living Shorelines Restoration and Monitoring Project

LOCATION

Mobile and Baldwin Counties, AL

SPONSOR(S)

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

$10,250,000.00

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

1/10/2015

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

In my opinion, this particular proposal appeared a little fragmented, but willingly admitted gaps in data, monitoring, and funding inconsistencies in regards to the projects it seeks to complete. I would have liked to see more background information for the similar projects funded in the area to know whether they are on track for success or need revision as well.

The one exception was for the Coffee Island Living Shorelines Project. It was a project that is currently underway and is known to need revision for successful implementation. Funding modifications and using this site as a model for other sites may save some money in the long run. The project seemed to be a little more "sound" than the others.

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

I feel more background information of past and current projects is necessary to ensure that a project of this scale and scope can be successful and focused.

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

In regards to natural disasters and unforeseen costs, yes.

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?)

- [x] YES
- [ ] NO
- [ ] NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Yes, 5 years...but could be more detailed and have a mechanism for an extension

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
- [x] NEED MORE INFORMATION

Information Needed:

As stated above, a more thorough review of historical projects and specifics to each project proposed.

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
- [x] NEED MORE INFORMATION

Information Needed:

Same as above

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
- [x] NEED MORE INFORMATION

Information Needed:

Same as above

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)?

The proposal seems like an effort to fill in the gaps of projects that have fallen by the wayside due to lack of funding, oversight, or are in need of revision. While the intentions seem valid, I feel a more detailed descriptive proposal for each concept would help the reviewer or funding agency fully understand the deliverables in a more confident manner.

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

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)

Just cited "mitigation through adaptive management practices"

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

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

The proposal could be more detailed...

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

Yes, but could be more detailed

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

Yes, on Page 8, but would like to see a future monitoring for long-term component (>5 years).

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)

see above.

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

Other than permits on file, I feel this information was absent from the proposal.

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)

No.

Please summarize any additional information needed below:

I feel that this proposal is very broad in its presentation for the scale and the scope. In my opinion, more details are needed in regards to similar projects in the area coupled with more focus.