Science Evaluation

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Apalachicola Bay Watershed Restoration

LOCATION

Apalachicola Watershed within Florida

SPONSOR(S)

State(s): Florida County/City/Region: Franklin and Gulf Counties

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

$26,141, 107

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

January 7 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

The proposal generally reads in a reassuring way, but it is shy in citations. Much work exists on hydrological restoration, nutrient input reduction, and living shorelines restoration, but some seminal background is glaringly missing here.

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

The activities would occur in the Gulf of Mexico

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

- ◉ YES
- ○ NO
- ○ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

The sources listed are accurate, but they should have been more numerous and diverse (see point 1)

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

- ◉ YES
- ○ NO
- ○ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Objective and well balanced treatment

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

The pros and cons of the science behind many of the activities proposed here is not well elaborated

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

The authors present a frank elaboration of potential risks and well thought plan for adaptive management

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:

more references 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)?

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

Information Needed:

The proposal reads in a reassuring way, and there is little doubt the applicants have sufficient expertise for success. However they should have elaborated better the science behind their planned activities

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?

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

Information Needed:

Risks well elaborated and solutions/adaptations planned for

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)?

Not too well

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

Yes

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)

Yes

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

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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

Not too well

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)

To a extent

Please summarize any additional information needed below:

Good proposal, but lacking a better elaboration of the pros and cons of the science behind the proposed activities