Science Evaluation

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Strategic Land Protection, Conservation, and Enhancement of Priority Gulf Coast Landscapes

LOCATION

Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana,Texas,

SPONSOR(S)

Mississippi

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

Planning and Implementation

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

The supporting information in the proposal directly relates 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

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 general, however, the risks and uncertainties associated with climate variability and potential impacts on landscape changes were not discussed. There were no uncertainties or risks identified by the public or Council members provided.

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

The proposal primarily focused on economic risks and uncertainties and provided a mechanism to minimize risks. The risks and uncertainties associated with climate variability and potential impacts on landscape changes were not discussed.

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:

The risks and uncertainties associated with climate variability and potential impacts on landscape changes were not discussed.

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)?

Yes, the proposal includes discussions of successful land acquisition programs and methods for prioritization.

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 implicit within the proposal but perhaps implied with discussions of prioritization approaches.

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 for economic considerations. While environmental benefits/services are considered, there is little discussion regarding potential impacts on landscape changes associated with climate variability.

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)

Not specifically but does include monitoring and prioritization. The proposal also builds on successful ongoing conservation and protection practices which can provide information on measures of success.

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 as part of the proposal but specifics are not identified. No statistical information was provided.

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

Yes but no statistical information was provided.

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)

Partially. There was no real evaluation of ongoing programs with respect to success. There was very good discussion and rationale for conservation/acquisition that supports the proposal.

Please summarize any additional information needed below: