Science Evaluation

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Bahia Grande Coastal Corridor

LOCATION

Bahia Grande Region of Texas

SPONSOR(S)

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

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

6 January 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

Methods are poorly referenced and vaguely described. No data management is described or analytical methods to determine the success of the project.

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

Literature is incomplete. Authors demonstrated little knowledge of how to evaluate project success.

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

- ○ YES
- ◉ NO
- ○ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

Literature is incomplete.

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

Little discussion is given to the pros and cons of risk regarding the project. Little scientific basis is offered.

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

Mention that other agencies would be responsible for this activity is unacceptable.

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:

The proposal indicates a real need. It is just not justified very well with documentation.

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:

Almost no indication of analytical or evaluation methods to determine project success of if milestones are met. No milestones are offered to indicate successful progress to achieving project goals.

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:

A plan for data gathering, methodology, analysis, data archiving, and data distribution should have been included in the proposal

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)?

No rational is given for the methods chosen. Methods are poorly or inadequately described.

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)

Risk management is only briefly mentioned. A rigorous plan is not offered in the proposal.

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

Positive consequences regarding economics is considered. Negative impacts are not addressed.

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

Yes, but no milestones and no measures of that achievement of goals and objectives is indicated.

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

No

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

No

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)

The monitoring plan is inadequately addressed and is only superficially mentioned. Details of the plans, methods of data gathering and analysis should have been included.

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

The is no indication of the use of recent or relevant data used in an analysis here.

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:

The overall project goals and objectives are commendable but the proposal should have presented an professional approach to measures of success and overall project achievement. The proposal is incomplete in its present draft.