Science Evaluation

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Gulf of Mexico Habitat Mapping and Water Quality Monitoring Network

LOCATION

Across the Gulf with potential targeted case study areas.

SPONSOR(S)

DOC/NOAA; DOI/USGS

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

Technical Assistance

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

Jan 6, 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

it does directly pertain to the Gulf Coast region

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

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

Comments

Some formatting inconsistencies, but information is there.

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

Salary increases are incorporated in the budget; adaptive management is planned; observing system simulation experiments are conducted to (re)evaluate prioritization of monitoring locations.

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)?

While other methods have not been discussed, reasons are provided as to why the method is being selected.

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

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)

Not explicitly, but this goal would be achieved with the described use of adaptive management.

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

Yes, through adaptive management.

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

Yes, monitoring and habitat mapping. Ultimately, this would help other projects determine e.g. whether (restoration) goals are met.

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

Yes, laying the foundation for a regional habitat and water quality monitoring and assessment network.

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

Yes, the maps created will be measures of success. The data resources as a result of monitoring and mapping (water quality data as well as habitat information) are measures of success as well.

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, the proposed work itself is a monitoring program, and has incorporated adaptive management.

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

Yes.

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)

Yes. This monitoring program also aims to include and built upon similar past and ongoing efforts.

Please summarize any additional information needed below: