Science Evaluation

Bucket 2 – Council Selected Restoration Component

PROPOSAL TITLE

Egmont Key Restoration

LOCATION

Tampa Bay, Florida

SPONSOR(S)

Several

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

Planning and Implementation

REVIEWED BY:

DATE:

1 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

The design was developed by using best available local information on how to manage beaches in high energy areas. This is not a research proposal.

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

Again, this is not a research proposal. They are depending upon expertise of local engineers and government agencies which manage beaches.

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

- ○ YES
- ○ NO
- ◉ NEED MORE INFORMATION

Comments

This evaluation is not for a literature review.

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 project is basing its decisions on the experience on the local Jacksonville District in managing beaches. "The Jacksonville District has extensive experience placing sand on beaches through both shore protection projects and beneficial use of dredged material from navigation projects. The feasibility study performed in 2008 determined to use a sheet pile feature to best stabilize the beach associated with a high energy wave environment based on expert hydrologic modeling knowledge. The design will be updated to assess the most

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 project is highly dependent upon local expertise. They mention they are flexible in changing support material design, but they have not done research specific to this project to my knowledge.

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 applicant is basing this proposal upon critical need to protect the natural and cultural resources of this island and local expertise which is available to do the construction.

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:

This is not a research project. The applicant has made reasonable planning with local expertise on how to restore this island.

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:

Again this is not a research project. They are placing faith of project design on local expertise.

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)?

This is a proposal to do restoration and not a proposal to compare methodologies. They are depending on local expertise for the design of their project.

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)

Not to my knowledge. I am not familiar with the Comprehensive Plan and Act

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

They are more concerned with not implementing plan and the risk of losing the island. I am not familiar with the Comprehensive Plan and Act

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

Yes.

Restore and Conserve Habitat 39 acres of habitat and
secondarily Replenish and Protect Living Coastal and Marine Resources.

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 it does, but I am not familiar with the Comprehensive Plan and Act. I don't remember discussions of capturing statistical information.

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)

I am not familiar with the Comprehensive Plan and Act. Yes. An adaptive plan is in place and monitoring of resources are on-going and planned for the future.

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

I am not familiar with the Comprehensive Plan and Act. I am not familiar with statistical information needed.

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)

I am not familiar with the Comprehensive Plan and Act. The project is depending on local expertise which would have dealt with failures and successes.

Please summarize any additional information needed below:

This is a much needed project to restore and conserve a coastal refuge which has important cultural resources and is very important for sensitive natural resources. One of the main issues is the design of the project. Is it the best for the situation? The applicant is depending on local expertise. I am not an engineer and I can not provide that review.
Looking at their budget, one line item stands out. Every time they mobilize it is going to cost $4 million. Minimizing the number of times they have to re-visit the island to re-nourish will save money. Their 2nd entry does not predict a change in cost which should be corrected.